



The Dean Burgon Society News

In Defense Of Traditional Bible Texts

\$2.00 a Copy---\$10.00/year (Canada \$15/year)--856-854-4452;

Website: www.DeanBurgonSociety.org

No. 75 Official Organ of the Dean Burgon Society

Nov. 2005–March, 2006

"The Words of the Lord are pure Words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.
Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." (Psalm 12:6-7)

The Dean Burgon Society's 28th Year

Thank You!

Thank you to the members of the Dean Burgon Society. You have helped make 28 years of the Dean Burgon Society a success. Your continued help is needed. The battle for the recognition of God's preserved Words in the traditional Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts and the best translation of the texts into the languages of the world continues unabated.

DBSN Different

This issue of the Dean Burgon Society News will assume a different look and will emphasize the *response* by members of the Society to *attacks* (1) on the plenary, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God, (2) on the best translations of those Words, and (3) on individuals who defend those Words. It is appalling to us who love His Words to see the imaginary, false premises of men who are trapped in academia, who are blinded by unbelief, and who attack the preserved Words of God *and* men who defend those Words. It is one thing to ask a question, seek an answer, or defend a position, but it is quite another thing to be bitter, to twist the truth, and to practice character assassination. This is a world wide problem and articles from various areas that defend the preservation of God's Words have been chosen. Therefore, the nature of this issue of the DBS News will assume a different look.

DBS Next Year

The next annual meeting of the of the DBS will be hosted by Pastor Monte at Calvary Baptist Church, Robbinsdale, MN. The dates are July 19th and 20th, 2006. Mark your calendar, now. We would like to see you at these meetings if possible. Pray for them.

Editor's Corner

by **Dr. D. A. Waite**

President of the Dean Burgon Society

The first article in this issue of the DBSN was written by Dr. Jack Moorman, a DBS Executive Committee member who resides in England. He is one of the world's foremost manuscript scholars, a missionary, and a Baptist pastor. His article is a response to articles by Dr. Dan Wallace, professor of New Testament studies at Dallas Theological Seminary.

The second article is by Dr. Jeffery Khoo, Academic Dean of the Far Eastern Bible College in Singapore. He presents clear statements against vain attacks by those who denigrate the defensive work of Bible believers such as Edward F. Hills, David Otis Fuller, D. Á. Waite, Thomas Strouse, David Cloud, Denis Gibson, and others.

Dr. Thomas Strouse, Dean of Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary, has crystallized the reasons for this issue of *DBS News* by making these statements in an article written in 2001.

...those fellowships and educational institutions that tout themselves as "bastions of fundamentalism" apparently fail to recognize that the sword of theological separation swings both ways. For them, separating from other fundamentalists is "standing for the truth," but when others separate from them, it is "sowing discord among the brethren." However, the Bible clearly teaches that "the bastion of fundamentalism" is the local church which is "the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. 3:15). That local New Testament (NT) churches have the biblical responsibility to separate from all theological error regarding any doctrine, including bibliology, is non-controversial. Pastors and members of NT churches

should not be cajoled into thinking they are sowing discord when they personally or collectively fulfill their God-given mandate to separate from systems of theological compromise. ["Should Fundamentalists Use the NASV," *Sound Words from New England*, Vol. 2., Issue 1, June-August 2001]

**A Reply to Dr. Daniel Wallace's
Why I Do Not Think the King
James Bible is the Best
Translation Available Today
Twenty Points of Criticism
Answered**

**By Dr. Jack A. Moorman
DBS Advisory Council Member
October 5, 2005**

Dr. Wallace is professor of New Testament Studies at Dallas Theological Seminary, and has written frequently concerning the textual debate. Some ten or so articles listed on his Website oppose the AV/TR position.

Dr. Wallace's Views Incorrect

The views Dr. Wallace expresses in *Why I Do Not Think the King James Bible is the Best Translation Available Today* are incorrect for the following reasons:

Reason #1

(1) The points raised against the AV/TR are the usual ones. They have been raised and answered repeatedly and fully. Substantial rebuttal is available in print and on the web. Dr. Wallace should have, in fairness, made some acknowledgment of this. For a thorough review of many of these and other points, see the three recent books by Dr. D. A. Waite: *Fundamentalist Deception on Bible Pre-Preservation*, *Fundamentalist Misinformation on Bible Versions*, and *Fundamentalist*

THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY, INC., proudly takes its name in honor of John William Burgon (1813-1888), the Dean of Chichester in England, whose tireless and accurate scholarship and contribution in the area of New Testament Textual Criticism; whose defense of the Traditional Greek New Testament Text against its many enemies; and whose firm belief in the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible; we believe, have all been unsurpassed either before or since his time.

Distortions on Bible Versions. It should be noted that Dr. Wallace is not a fundamentalist.

Reason #2

(2) After disparaging the AV (and TR), Wallace does not tell us which is “*the best available translation!*” He does not identify a preferred replacement. This is not untypical today. In the recent *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man* book, no clear direction is given as to what we should put in the place of the AV. This is a tacit acknowledgment that nothing in any permanent sense has taken the place of the AV. They find themselves in a limbo!

Reason #3

(3) An attempt is made to put the first editor of the printed Received Text in an unjustly negative light. “*The man who edited the text was a Roman Catholic priest and humanist named Erasmus.*” Material is available today that gives a much fairer perspective to Erasmus and his work. Edward Hills, *The Kings James Version Defended*, is still one of the best sources. (See also the sources in *The Bible Version Question/Answer Database* by David Cloud). Erasmus (1466-1536) was of course Roman Catholic as was nearly everyone else at that time. But, at his monastery, he was far more of a continual student with a voracious appetite for knowledge than a priest in the normal sense. It is in this respect rather than in the modern atheistic sense that he was a humanist. Many of his writings were scathing against the Catholic Church. He died among his Protestant friends and was buried in a Protestant cemetery. He had embraced much of the teaching of the Reformation, but had not come out openly in its support by formally leaving the Catholic Church.

Erasmus was acclaimed the greatest intellect of Europe, and became the man of the hour to initiate the transfer of the Traditional Text from manuscript to printed form. His Greek editions provided the base for the great Reformation Bibles, and lit the fire for the Reformation itself. Wallace and others would like us to concentrate instead on his deficiencies, and have us jump from Erasmus and his 1516 edition directly to the AV of 1611. By this they seek to attach any deficiency in the man and his work to the AV itself. Wallace will of course not acknowledge that the AV was the product of nearly a century of prayerful textual and linguistic refinement.

Reason #4

(4) Wallace would also have us make much of the publisher Froben's haste in printing Erasmus' first edition (1516) before the Spanish Cardinal Ximenes' *Complutensian*

Polyglot Bible went to press. He makes no mention that in the following year the Reformation was to break out in Wittenberg, in which this first printing of the Greek NT was to become a (in fact, *the*) major impetus. This is a powerful demonstration of God's providence in the timing of the publication. (See Hills, and also S.P. Tregelles, *An Account of the Printed Text*, p. 20).

Reason #5

(5) Erasmus “*only used half a dozen, very late manuscripts for the whole New Testament.*” Wallace ignores that Erasmus was conversant with many manuscripts in his searches across Europe. Those which he had before him at Basel for his 1516 edition can be demonstrated to have been good representatives (See Hills, p.198). David Cloud in his *The Bible Version Question/Answer Database* has gathered a number of important citations on this question, including the following:

For the first edition Erasmus had before him ten manuscripts, four of which he found in England, and five at Basle...The last codex was lent him by John Reuchlin...(and) 'appeared so old to Erasmus that it might have come from the apostolic age'. (Preserved Smith, *Erasmus: A Study of His Life, Ideals, and Place in History*, 1923).

'If I told what sweat it cost me, no one would believe me.' He had collated many Greek manuscripts of the N.T. and was surrounded by all the commentaries and translations. (D'Aubigne, *History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*, vol. 5, p. 157).

Reason #6

(6) Erasmus' manuscript of Revelation is said to have been lacking in the last six verses (22:16-21), and was supplied by referring to the Latin Vulgate. Herman Hoskier in his massive, and I must add, difficult to use, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, has shown that Erasmus may have had Greek manuscript 2049 (Hoskier's 141) covering these verses (I 474-77; II 454, 635). But whatever the case, Dr. Wallace should have told the rest of the story; that is, if indeed Erasmus used the Vulgate, in his later editions it was corrected by direct reference to the Greek.

One notable exception is claimed to be 22:19 where the AV/TR reads: “... shall take away his part out of the book of life.” This has fairly substantial support in other sources, but is found in only three Greek manuscripts (296 2049 2067mg.). The variant reading, though supported by the Greek, can hardly be said to make sense: “... shall take away his part out of the tree of life.” In *When the KJB Departs from the “Majority” Text*, and using Hoskier, I have listed support from the manuscripts, versions, and fathers for eight passages in Revelation 22:15-21.

Reason #7

(7) Dr. Wallace repeats the familiar arguments against I John 5:7, and the circumstances of Erasmus “*placing it in the text if someone could show him a Greek manuscript containing the passage, to which a manuscript was hastily prepared for that purpose.*” A letter from the Erasmian scholar H. J. de Jonge to Michael Maynard in 1995 puts the matter in a different light. Quoting Erasmus in his dispute with Edward Lee, de Jonge says:

Erasmus first records that Lee had reproached him with neglect of the MSS. of I John. Erasmus (according to Lee) had consulted only one MS. Erasmus replies that he had certainly not used only one MS., but many copies, first in England, then in Brabant, and finally in Basle. He cannot accept, therefore, Lee's reproach of negligence and impiety. 'Is it negligence and impiety, if I did not consult manuscripts which were not within my reach? I have at least assembled whatever I could assemble. Let Lee produce a Greek MS. which contains what my edition does not contain and let him show that that manuscript was within my reach. Only then can he reproach me with negligence in sacred matters.

From this passage you can see that Erasmus does not challenge Lee to produce a manuscript etc. What Erasmus argues is that Lee may only reproach Erasmus with negligence of MSS. if he demonstrates that Erasmus could have consulted any MS. in which the *Comma Johanneum* figured. Erasmus does not at all ask for a MS. containing the *Comma Johanneum*. He denies Lee the right to call him negligent and impious if the latter does not prove that Erasmus neglected a manuscript to which he had access. (Michael Maynard, *A History of the Debate over I John 5:7,8*, p. 383).

Jeffrey Khoo points out:

Yale professor Roland Bainton.... agrees with de Jonge, furnishing proof from Erasmus' own writing that Erasmus' inclusion of I John 5:7f was not due to a so-called 'promise' but the fact that he believed 'the verse was in the Vulgate and must therefore have been in the Greek text used by Jerome'. (*Kept Pure in all Ages*, p.88; cited from D. W. Cloud, *The Bible Version Question/Answer Database*, p.343). See also *And These Three are One* by Jesse Boyd, Wake Forest, 1999.

Michael Maynard's monumental work on the disputed passage will, I think, demonstrate to many that this has not been a debate over “thin air.” His book chronicles the fact that defense of the faith and defense of this passage frequently went hand in hand. Beginning from the days of Cyprian of Carthage (died 258), there is indeed substantial evidence for the passage. Cyprian said:

The Lord saith, “I and the Father are one;” and again it is written concerning the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, “And three are one”. (de *Catholicae ecclesiae unitate*, c.6)

Critics have argued that Cyprian was merely giving a Trinitarian interpretation to verse 8. *The spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.* The answer to this is obvious; the figures of verse 8 cannot naturally be interpreted as the Persons of the Holy Trinity. (See Hills).

Though missing in most Greek manuscripts, it nevertheless leaves in them its *footprint* with the mismatched genders that result when the disputed Words are removed. The loose ends do not match up grammatically! Native Greek speakers find this “glaring.” Here in London, the printed *Apostolos* (the lectionary text used in Greek Orthodox services) contains the passage.

Reason #8

(8) Wallace says of the AV translators: “*These scholars, who admitted that their work was provisional and not final (as can be seen by their preface and by their more than 8,000 marginal notes indicating alternate renderings), would wholeheartedly welcome the great finds in MSS that have occurred in the past one hundred and fifty years.*”

In neither *The Dedication to the King*, nor *The Translators to the Reader* do I find an inference where the AV translators “admitted that their work was provisional.” To the King they declare: “*out of the Original Sacred Tongues...there should be one more exact translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue.*” And, to the Reader they write: “*Truly, good Christian Reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones one principle good one, not justly to be accepted against.*” (pp. xv, xvi). Wallace calls their work “provisional”; the AV translators say it is “*one principle good one.*”

Reason #9

(9) Regarding marginal readings, these provided a kind of miniature commentary. In the comparatively few places where we find them, those translators who “*trusted in Him that hath the key of David*” (*Translators to the Reader*, p. xvi), showed by inclusion in the text what their decision had been, while at the same time giving insight into what the Original was capable of expressing. In some cases they show a strictly literal rendering which to translate directly into English would have been awkward.

In only 104 instances (Scrivener) is a variant reading from different manuscripts given. Here they show their awareness, but not to the point of distracting the reader, and certainly not to the point of Wallace’s claim that the AV translators would have “*welcomed the great finds in MSS that have occurred in the last 150 years.*” Erasmus’ knowledge of variant readings in Codex B is well documented. In an attempt to persuade Erasmus of the superiority of B, 365 variant readings were sent to him in early November 1533, from Rome by the Spaniard Sepulveda

(Maynard, pp. 87,88). Erasmus rejected these for his 1535 edition. They were rejected by succeeding editors of the Received Text, and by the great Reformation Bibles both in English and other languages. The men of the AV knew where the dangers lurked in the manuscript record. For example, Codex D, and the Clementine Vulgate (a much more corrupt 1592 replacement for the Sixtine edition), were at their disposal. They had the spiritual discernment to reject the corrupt variants that these and other sources presented.

Reason #10

(10) Wallace speaks of a “*100,000 changes*” being made to the AV over the centuries. Nearly all of the changes were updated punctuation and spelling, along with correction of some printing errors. Dr. D. A. Waite’s thorough research into this question has shown that very little difference can be detected when reading a 1611 edition and the AV of today. Among the 791,328 words in the AV only 421 showed a “*change in sound.*” Of these there were only 136 changes of substance, such as an added “of” or “and”. (See *Defending the King James Bible*, pp. 3-5, [B.F.T. #1594] and B.F.T. #1294). When writers speak of many thousands of changes, and especially Wallace with his “*100,000*” (!), we wonder if they mean to be taken seriously. It is completely false.

Reason #11

(11) In attempting to explain why the TR is fuller than the Aleph-B text, (“*The KJV is filled with readings that have been created by overly zealous scribes*”), Wallace repeats one of the Westcott and Hort canons when he says: “*textual evidence shows me that scribes had a strong tendency to add rather than subtract.*” It is in fact the opposite! Where there is deliberate alteration, it is far easier to remove Words than to add them. Given that there are nearly 2900 additional Words in the TR (including the bracketed portions), let him explain how such could have taken place without a mention in textual history of the wholesale editing venture necessary to bring this about.

In view of the huge majority of manuscripts containing this fuller text, with countless scribes involved, spanning many centuries, covering a wide geographic area, Dr. Wallace must also explain how it could have been done so consistently. How could this vast majority of manuscripts show the same so-called “*additions*”? How is it that he fails to see or admit that it is far easier to *take away from the few than to add to the many*? Wallace is at variance with other critical editors on this point:

But these figures suggest strongly that the general tendency during the early period of textual transmission was to omit...Other things being equal one should prefer the longer reading. (James R. Royce, “Scribal Tendencies in the Transmission of the Text”, *The Text of the N.T. in Contemporary Research*, Ehrman and Holmes eds., 1995, p. 246).

The few manuscripts after being tampered with were generally ignored by copyists. Nothing approaching an extended direct copy or exemplar of either Aleph or B has been found! The search has been “fruitless.” (See T. C. Skeat, “The Codex Sinaiticus, The Codex Vaticanus and Constantine,” *Journal of Theological Studies*, 50, pp. 619,20.). In fact Skeat goes on to say that Aleph remained “*a pile of loose leaves*” for some considerable time, (perhaps as much as two centuries!), before being bound up (p. 609). Dr. Wallace must be pressed to explain how such a thing could have befallen these few which he says are the “*best manuscripts.*”

Reason #12

(12) Wallace claims that “*very few of the distinctive King James readings are demonstrably ancient.*” In our book *Early Manuscripts, Church Fathers, and the Authorized Version* (BFT #3230 @ \$20.00), there is a thorough manuscript-by-manuscript evaluation of this question. The entire range of Greek manuscripts, early versions, and fathers before 400 AD are asked to vote on 356 distinctive and doctrinal AV passages. Overall they vote strongly in favor of the AV. Regarding the Egyptian papyri, all but six are fragments, and many of the doctrinal passages are indeed missing. However, Harry Sturz in his *The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism* has shown that there is considerable support for the other distinctive AV readings in the papyri. The “Five Old Uncials,” Aleph, A, B, C, D, have long been claimed as the sole domain of the Critical Text. There is in fact among them considerable support for the distinctive AV doctrinal passages. In *Early Manuscripts, Church Fathers, and the Authorized Version* (BFT #3230 @ \$20.00), an investigation of five categories of Greek manuscripts, eighteen categories of early versions, Tatian’s Diatessaron, and the fathers before 400 AD, show a decisive preponderance of evidence for the AV/TR.

Reason #13

(13) Again, Wallace says: “*There are over 400,000 textual variants among the N.T. manuscripts. But the differences between the Textus Receptus and the texts based on the best Greek witnesses number about 5,000.*” He should have explained how he arrived at 400,000. Had he gone to the trouble, he would have tacitly revealed a very

uncomfortable fact for his position. A hugely disproportionate amount of the variation is to be found among the relatively few manuscripts supporting the Aleph-B text. The critical editors, Barbara Aland and Klaus Wachtel admit this:

The papyri and majuscules are for the most part individual witnesses: despite sharing general tendencies on the forms of their texts, they differ so widely from one another that it is impossible to establish any direct genealogical ties among them. ("The Greek Minuscule Manuscripts of the N.T.", *The Text of the N.T. in Contemporary Research*, p.46).

If these few cannot agree among themselves, then how can Wallace call them the "best Greek witnesses"? As so little of an Aleph-B kind of manuscript is available, clearly early scribes did not think them best. Nor did the scribes of the 8th/9th Centuries think them best when they transferred the text from uncial to minuscule script. Further, the manuscripts that were widely copied are known to be strongly cohesive, with narrow variation margins. Their variation is usually just enough to let us know that they are independent productions with long transmissional lines.

Reason #14

(14) Though admitting 5000 differences between the AV and modern version text, Wallace seeks to downplay the extent of difference. He says, "the two are remarkably similar" and "agree 98% of the time" and "that the vast majority of variations are so trivial as to not even be translatable, (the most common is the moveable nu...)"

He is wrong on the number of differences. In our book *8000 Differences* (BFT #3084 @ \$64.00), a total of 8,032 variation units are listed. Not one of these is a moveable nu. A variation unit may involve the spelling of a Word, substitution of different Words, changing the order of the same Words, frequently the removal of Words, and at times the addition of Words. A variation unit may comprise anything from one Word to many verses.

He is wrong to say that the two texts agree "98% of the time." If there are a total of 140,521 Words in the Received Text, with 8000+ variation units of difference between it and the revised text, and with many of these variation units containing multiple Words, clauses, sentences, and even verses, then simple arithmetic will show that a substantial part of the New Testament has been affected.

In order to check further the list of variation units in my book *8000 Differences* (BFT #3084 @ \$64.00), a friend prepared a computer-generated printout in which the two texts were combined. In this, the unaffected portions of text are shown along with the

variations. Here, side-by-side the TR reading (Scrivener) is underlined, and the Nestle-Aland is crossed out. Vertical markings beside the text show further where a line of Scripture is affected. This gives a remarkable visual demonstration of the extent to which the lines of New Testament text are affected.

He is wrong in saying, "that the vast majority of variations are so trivial as to not even be translatable." Where, for example, it is "only" the spelling of a Word, it will still affect the sound of the Word and frequently the inflection and structure of the Greek sentence. When we believe that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. 3:16), and that "every Word of God is pure" (Prov. 30:5), questions will not be raised as to which differences are "trivial," and which are not. If this is how God breathed out His Words, then this is how it must stand!

The variation will often affect the English translation. Where the variation is not translatable, a search of the list will show that the underlying text is frequently weakened or lessened in some way. This I suppose would be like having green grass even though the root structure beneath has been weakened.

Reason #15

(15) Wallace tells us "most textual critics for the past 250 years would say that no doctrine is affected by these changes." Yes, that is what they and he say, and it is false. Many of God's faithful servants have over the years compiled long lists of these alterations and omissions. They have set out clearly the extent to which the great doctrines have been weakened and undermined. It can only be due to peer pressure, scholarly pride and wilful blindness that this statement is made. My own list of 356 passages gives a clear demonstration (see BFT #2956 @ \$10.00 and BFT #3230 @ \$20.00). He cannot merely brush this aside by saying: "Those who vilify the modern translations and the Greek texts behind them have evidently never really investigated the data. Their appeals are based largely on emotion, not evidence." Yes, we are filled with emotion when we see our Bible treated in this way, and we have also investigated the data.

Reason #16

(16) The AV English is said to be "difficult to understand." Indeed, it is different. It is not like your morning newspaper, but its English is not difficult, as a section-by-section comparison with other translations will show. For a computer generated analysis of this question see *The Reading Ease of the King James Bible* by D. A. Waite Jr. (BFT #2671 @ \$6.00). Here using four readability formulas, (Flesch Reading Ease, Flesch Grade

Level, Flesch-Kincaid, Gunning Fog Index), Mr. Waite's research shows the AV to be rated as "fairly easy." Though nearly 400 years old, on the question of readability alone (i.e. to understand what was written), the AV achieved approximately the same scores as five recent versions. He also shows that AV words are frequently shorter in syllables and letters.

In other respects, there is no comparison. A section-by-section comparison will show that while the AV is a verbal and formal equivalence translation (word for word from the original) rather than the so-called dynamic equivalence. Its English has depths, fountains, and is living and rhythmic. In contrast, modern version English have been said to be "Formica flat," tepid, wooden. Recent authors, often secular, have stressed this point. The AV can be read aloud, memorized, and quoted with authority and reverence. It has rhythm. It flows. Whereas, in public reading, the cadence and timing of the NIV, NASV and NKJV is flawed, with halts and breaks.

Meditation, memorization and earnest study are all greatly diminished with the modern Bibles. They are not held dear as the AV was. Perhaps the following quotation from Psalm 23:1 of the *Contemporary English Version* gives a classic example of the reason why.

You, Lord are my shepherd, I will never be in need. You let me rest in fields of green grass.

The AV displays the full flowering of the English language, and in fact shaped that language. It is not archaic or Elizabethan, as comparison with that era will show. It was never contemporary, but always a step apart from the common. In this sense it is somewhat more refined than Tyndale's Version. It has maintained a timeless reverence and grandeur that draws the heart upward to God

Reason #17

(17) Wallace points to "Suffer little children," and "Study to show thyself approved," as two examples of AV words "which no longer bear the same meaning." I think he considerably overstates the case. Yes, we could replace these with "permit" and "give diligence," but the impact would be lessened. We could change "noised about" to "reported," but the former gives a better picture of what was actually taking place in Luke 1:65 and Mark 2:1. We could attempt to replace the "eth" verb endings in the AV with a present tense or perhaps a past, but would find that the "eth" (historical present) is not adequately translated by either. (See, *The New King James Bible*, G. W. and D. E. Anderson, Trinitarian Bible Society, pp. 12,13). We could replace the "thees" and "thous" with "you," but would then remove the means of

distinguishing between singular pronouns (thee, thou, thy), and plural pronouns (you, ye). With their removal we would also be removing a more reverent form of address to God.

Given the age of the AV, it is remarkable that so little *is* archaic. Again, much more has been made of this than the case warrants. Among the words generally termed archaic, I would estimate from a list I have seen that not many over 35 or 40 would perhaps need a dictionary. Often, the context indicates the meaning. A study of these so-called archaic words will show that they frequently have a greater depth of meaning than their modern replacements.

Reason #18

(18) Wallace tells us that “*as the Greek has strain out a gnat*”; the AV’s “*strain at*” a gnat (Matt. 23:24) is “*one very definite error in translation*.” Wycliffe (1395) had “*clensing a gnatte*,” but the four Reformation Bibles before the AV (Tyndale, Coverdale, Geneva, Bishops) read “*strayne out a gnat*.” As subsequent refinements to the AV text allowed this reading to remain, it is highly unlikely, as some have suggested, that this was a printer’s error.

The AV translators made a decision to go against their predecessors, and this likely for the following reasons:

(1) The word *strain* (*diulizontes*) is found only here in the N.T. It is a present participle (rather than an aorist) and means to strain or filter. The present participle indicates that an ongoing rather than completed action is taking place. It points to the effort involved, rather than that they actually succeeded and got the gnat out. In 1729, Daniel Mace made a translation of the N.T., and rendered the words, “*strain for a gnat*,” which conveys the same meaning as the AV.

(2) Only one gnat is involved. At first discovery of this tiny, lone, solitary creature all else stopped. Rather than remove it with a spoon, the entire contents must be filtered, suitable cloths were brought, and with much show and ritual the filtering process began. Thus “*they strain at a gnat*.” That is, at the first sight of only one gnat the filtering ceremony begins.

(3) When “out” is used in the N.T., we expect to see an underlying Greek preposition, usually *ek* or *apo*. There is none here.

Commentators as Poole, Henry, and Gill (non-revised) do not take issue with the AV reading. See also:

www.geocities.com/brandplucked/strain.html

There is no proven gnat here for Dr. Wallace to strain at.

Reason # 19

(19) The second translation error alleged is Hebrews 4:8: “*For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day*.” Wallace says: “*This sounds as though Jesus could not provide the eternal rest that we all long for! However the Greek Word for Jesus is the same as the Word for Joshua. And in the context of Heb. 4, Joshua is obviously meant. There is no textual problem here; it is rather simply a mistake on the part of the translators, perpetuated for the last 400 years in all editions of the KJV*.”

Indeed the passage is not textual or for that matter translational; this is exactly what the Greek says. It has though been an interpretational issue. Translators are to translate, rather than interpret. The men of the AV translated the Hebrew O.T. names as they appeared in Greek. See for example, the genealogies in Matthew 1 and Luke 3. Notice that they gave the same translation in Acts 7:45: “*Which also our fathers that came after brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles, whom God drove out before the face of our fathers*.” By reading “Jesus” in Heb. 4:8, the AV followed most of the English Bibles which came before: Wycliffe, the Great, Taverner’s, Matthew’s, Bishop’s and the Geneva; whereas Tyndale and Coverdale read “Joshua.” Wallace wrongly gives the impression that this began with the AV.

Joshua was a pre-eminent Old Testament type of Christ. There is agreement in their names. There is agreement in their work, both led and lead into rest. By translating (actually *transliterating*) rather than interpreting the Greek, this parallel between type and antitype is clearly shown in the New Testament. And to repeat, by this we are put on notice that *both have the same name*.

It is also to be pondered (Josh.5:13-15), that on the eve before Joshua led Israel across Jordan, *he was on his face before Jesus!* Thus it was Jesus Himself who provided their way across Jordan and into the Promise Land. But, the rest He then gave was not the final rest. Type and Antitype are very close here.

The four examples Wallace gives of so-called archaic English and incorrect translation have simply not made their point.

Reason #20

(20) Dr. Wallace concludes: “*I trust this brief survey of reasons I have for thinking that the King James Bible is not the best available translation will not be discarded quickly*.” In fact both for his own good and those who follow him, his “reasons” should be “discarded quickly.” It is a downward course. After announcing that he no longer accepts passages as John 3:13, John 7:53- 8:11, I

Timothy 3:16, he says, “*I find it difficult to accept intellectually the very passages which I have always embraced emotionally*.” And, matters will and do slide further. The following is from a 9/12/94 article in *Christianity Today* where Wallace praises Karl Barth and bemoans *bibliolatry*.

One of the chief legacies Karl Barth left behind was his strong Christocentric focus. It is a shame that too many of us have reacted so strongly to Barth, for in our zeal to show the deficiencies of his doctrine of Scripture, we have become bibliolaters. (O Timothy, Oct. 94).

In *The Synoptic Problem*, which is available on his Website, he supports the redaction approach to the Gospels. This theory teaches that the Gospels were given, not by direct inspiration, but rather by copying from each other, and from a common secondary source. (See *O Timothy*, vol. 15-7, 98).

It is quite impossible to hold that the three synoptic gospels were completely independent from each other. In the least, they had to have shared a common oral tradition (p.1).

We shall see later that before the Gospels were written there did exist a period in which the gospel materials were passed on orally, and it is clear that this oral tradition influenced not only the first of our synoptic Gospels but the subsequent ones as well (p. 4).

The majority of NT scholars hold to Markan priority....This is the view adopted in this paper as well (p.6).

One argument concerning Mark’s harder readings...is the probability that neither Luke nor Matthew had pristine copies of Mark at their disposal...An intermediate scribe is probably responsible—either intentionally or unintentionally—for more than a few of the changes which ended up in Luke and Matthew (note 49).

When verbal preservation is abandoned, a denial or weakening of verbal inspiration will generally follow. In fact upon examination one cannot really hold to the one without the other.

We can do no better in closing than to contrast the kind of scholarship which characterizes support for today’s versions with that of the men who translated the AV.

Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtain, that we may look into the most holy place; that removeth the cover of the well, that we may come by the water; even as Jacob rolled away the stone from the mouth of the well, by which means the flocks of Laban were watered (*Translators to the Reader*, p. vii).

And in what sort did these assemble? In the trust of their own knowledge, or of their sharpness of wit, or deepness of judgment, as it were in an arm of flesh? At no hand. They trusted in him that hath the key of David, opening, and no man shutting; they prayed to the Lord, the Father of our Lord, to the effect that St Augustine did; O let thy Scriptures be my pure delight; let me not be deceived in them, neither let me deceive by them. In this confidence, and with this devotion, did they assemble together (p. xvi).

TRUTH OR LIES?

Dr Jeffrey Khoo
Academic Dean, Far Eastern
Bible College, Singapore and
DBS Advisory Council Member
Accusers and Allegations

A number of Websites seek to attack and destroy the verbal and plenary perfection of the Bible. They claim that the Bible is verbally and plenary inspired (VPI) but not verbally and plenary preserved (VPP). Simply put, they want Christians to believe that the Bible was only infallible in the past but no longer infallible today.

In attacking the present infallibility and inerrancy of the Scriptures and the identification of an existing infallible and inerrant Scripture in the original languages in the inspired and preserved Hebrew and Greek Words underlying the Reformation Bibles best represented by the KJB, these anti-perfectionist, anti-preservationist, anti-TR/KJB, pro-Westcott-Hort, and pro-modern-versionists falsely accuse believers of the present perfection of Scriptures as schismatics, heretics and even cultists by linking them to Ruckmanism and Seventh-Day Adventism (SDAism). Their writings imply that it is simply unscholarly and even sinful to suggest that Christians today indeed possess a 100% infallible and inerrant Bible. Henceforth, I will refer to such propagators of untruth generally as “the accusers,” bearing in mind that not all of them share exactly the same beliefs with regard to the VPP and the KJB, as some among them even inexplicably profess love for the KJB—notwithstanding their readiness to find fault with the KJB and/or the original language texts (Words) underlying the KJB. The title of “arch-accuser” goes to Doug Kutilek who contributed a chapter to the faith-denying and doubt-casting book called *One Bible Only?* authored by the faculty of Central Baptist Theological Seminary (with support from Bob Jones University). In that book, Kutilek maliciously and mischievously paints with a broad and contemptuous brush all pro-KJB advocates as Ruckmanites.

If Kutilek had kept his criticisms of Ruckman to Ruckman alone we would not have cared, but he linked sound defenders of the KJB like Edward F Hills, David Otis Fuller, David Cloud, and D. A. Waite to Ruckman! This is hitting below the belt. He also unjustly accused pro-KJB defenders of SDAism just because D. O. Fuller quoted from

SDA Benjamin Wilkinson who so happened to defend the KJB as well in his book *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* (1930) [BFT #1123 @ \$13.00]. This is a common tactic by detractors to mislead, to paint white as black so that people will not see the white but only the black, and to make people think that the black they see is indeed white. Such sophistry is usually employed by those who have no case or a weak case, who have to resort to such low blows to score their points in order to look credible.

VPP Is Not Ruckmanism

It is a well-known fact that authors like Hills, Fuller, Cloud, and Waite by no means defend the KJB in the way Ruckman does. It is clear from the writings of Hills, Fuller, Cloud, and Waite that they do not espouse at all the beliefs of Ruckman that: the KJB is doubly inspired; the KJB is advanced revelation; the English KJB is as or more inspired than the original language Scriptures; the KJB can be used to correct the original language Scriptures; there is no need whatsoever to study the Biblical languages of Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek due to an “inspired” English translation; the KJB cannot be improved on (*The Defined King James Bible* [BFT #3000] edited by Waite and Tow and published by Bible For Today is certainly an improvement of the KJB); the KJB is the only Bible that has gospel or salvific content; those who do not use the KJB are condemned to hell; and all non-English speaking believers must learn English to know the Truth.

Hills, Fuller, Cloud, and Waite are all essentially speaking of the infallibility and inerrancy of the inspired Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Scriptures behind the Reformation Bibles best represented by the KJB. The KJB does not stand independently or separately. It is dependent on its original language source texts, and these source texts (Words) known by various names—Byzantine, Majority, Received—are the infallibly preserved apographs of the inerrant autographs.

As far as non-English translations or versions of the Bible go, all non-English speaking believers are encouraged to use the Bibles they have in their own native tongue, but they ought to use that version which is closest to the inspired and preserved Byzantine, Majority and Received texts, and as far removed as possible from the Alexandrian, Minority, and Westcott-Hort texts. They ought also to use a Bible that is translated by means of the verbal equivalence method (word-for-word) rather than the dynamic equivalence method (thought-for-thought) in keeping to the twin doctrines of VPI and VPP. Biblically and theologically

trained pastors and teachers are necessary to teach faithfully the whole counsel of God, expounding from the inerrant Hebrew and Greek Scriptures God has infallibly preserved, namely, the Masoretic Text and the Textus Receptus of the Protestant Reformation, all the truths that God has given using the best version or translation the people have in their hands.

VPP Is Not SDAism

Dr. Benjamin Wilkinson (an SDA) does not own the King James Bible. The King James Bible was not translated by SDAs but by Reformation and Protestant scholars of the highest caliber during the reign of King James in the early 17th century. The King James Bible is for everyone who loves the Bible and desires to have the best and most faithful English Bible ever produced for their meditation and edification. Neither does Wilkinson own the “copyright” to the Biblical doctrine of VPP which belongs only to the Lord Jesus Christ who said in all three Synoptic Gospels, “*Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my Words shall not pass away*” (Matt 24:35, Mark 13:31, Luke 21:33).

Wilkinson did not pioneer the defense of the KJB. The original defense of the KJB may be traced to the Trinitarian Bible Society (TBS) which was originally founded in 1831 to defend the biblical and fundamental doctrine of the Trinity and the perfect deity of Christ—hence its name “Trinitarian.” The clearest proof-text for the doctrine of the Trinity is 1 John 5:7, “*For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.*” This most excellent verse has been scissored out by Westcott and Hort, and the modern versions. The TBS in its defense of the Trinity found it most necessary also to defend 1 John 5:7 as found in the underlying preserved Greek text of the KJB. By so defending the KJB and its preserved underlying Greek text, is the TBS now SDA just because Wilkinson at a later time happened to defend the KJB and its underlying Greek text too? Note that the TBS is stoutly against Westcott and Hort, and the modern versions, and even considers the NKJV untrustworthy.

The Bible League is another early defender of the KJB. Founded in 1892, the Bible League resisted the “Downgrade” controversy in Great Britain. The modernists were throwing out one doctrine after another including the foundational and indispensable doctrine of the divine inspiration and total inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures. The Bible League was founded to contend earnestly for the historic Christian Faith. Since its

inception, the League has endeavored “[t]o promote the Reverent Study of the Holy Scriptures, and to resist the varied attacks made upon their Inspiration, Infallibility and Sole Sufficiency as the Word of God.” Insofar as the Bible versions issue is concerned, the Bible League unashamedly holds to the view that “the Authorised Version is the most accurate and faithful English Bible translation available today.” Its latest publication (2004), a 126-paged book authored by Alan J Macgregor and titled *Three Modern Versions* is a most timely critique of the NIV, ESV and NKJV. It is significant to note that Macgregor quoted Wilkinson’s *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* [BFT #1123 @ \$13.00], but in a footnote (pp.12-13-13) Macgregor wisely explained his use of Wilkinson’s material thus:

It must be pointed out here that while there is some good material in Dr Wilkinson’s book, there are also a number of inaccuracies. He was a Seventh-day Adventist (a fact that many who quote from him fail to reveal). Some who support the use of modern versions of the Bible allege that one of the reasons for Dr. Wilkinson’s strong opposition to the Revised Version of 1881 was that it altered two verses which Adventists regard as proof-texts in support of their doctrines: Acts 13:42 (which they regard as teaching the necessity of Gentiles keeping the Sabbath or Seventh Day), and Hebrews 9:27 (which Adventists believe teaches soul sleep). I have sought to be selective in the quotes I have used. Some might argue, why quote from him at all, if he was a member of a cult? The answer is that despite his Adventist views ... there is nonetheless some sound evidence in his book that rightly exposes facts concerning the Westcott and Hort Text, and the errors of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. He also provides solid, factual support for the superiority of the Received Text.

This allegation that the belief in the verbal and plenary preservation of the Scriptures and the defense of the KJB is a “new doctrine” and a “new practice” has been very much the tactic of anti-VPPists, anti-TRists, and anti-KJBists to vilify the fundamental doctrine of the infallible preservation of the inspired Words of the Holy Scriptures to the last jot and tittle as promised by our Lord Himself in Matthew 5:18, and the goodness of the KJB and its underlying Hebrew and Greek Texts, so that the unknowing populace would automatically shun the good old doctrine of VPP, the good old TR, and the good old KJB without consciously giving them a second thought. Some of the accusers even claim to be “preserving our godly paths” (Jer 6:16)! Can this be so?

New Attacks, New Terms, Not New Doctrines

David Cloud rightly says that such new attacks against KJB defenders “has increased in intensity in recent years and is finding a home even among those who claim to be Fundamentalists and Bible-believing

Baptists.” Cloud quoted from the Rev Dennis Gibson (a minister of the gospel who has served in Presbyterian and Baptist churches since 1958, and a regular contributor to the international devotional guide—*Read, Pray and Grow*. [He is also a DBS Executive Committee Member]) who in a letter to him dated April 19, 1995 wrote, “I see a real hostility that has been generated in the minds of some of the younger pastors. There does not seem to be, on their part, a serious interest in dealing with this issue . . . It is the hostility, however, that is troubling. Sides are forming and deep prejudices are evident. To be ‘a King James man’ is not a term of opprobrium. This opposition is within ‘so-called’ evangelicalism, not as in the past, from the liberal-modernist camp.”

Is it no wonder that the Trinitarian Bible Society, noting a significant change in theological climate in Christendom, felt compelled to issue a comprehensive statement (www.trinitarianbiblesociety.com/site/qr/qr571.pdf) in 2005 defining what it believes to be the Doctrine of Scripture? D. P. Rowland, the General Secretary of TBS wrote in the Society’s *Quarterly Record* (April-June 2005), “Today, as has been stated, things are very different. The doctrine of Scripture has been, and is being, assailed on every side; not least from within many branches (including those taking the name of ‘evangelical’ and ‘reformed’ and may I add ‘fundamentalist’) of the so-called ‘Christian Church’ of our day. The Committee, therefore, considers it necessary for the Society clearly and unambiguously to state where it stands on this most fundamental of all doctrines” (the underlined words are mine).

New assaults on the foundational and indispensable doctrine of the infallible preservation of the inerrantly inspired Words of Holy Scripture require updated statements and more definitive terms to affirm Christianity’s fundamental beliefs concerning the forever infallible and inerrant Scripture, hence our term—“Verbal Plenary Preservation”—as expressed in the Constitution of the Far Eastern Bible College, and True Life Bible-Presbyterian Church: “(1) We believe in the divine, Verbal Plenary Inspiration (Autographs) and Verbal Plenary Preservation (Apographs) of the Scriptures in the original languages, their consequent inerrancy and infallibility, and as the perfect Word of God, the Supreme and final authority in faith and life (2 Tim 3:16; 2 Pet 1:20-21; Ps 12:6-7; Matt 5:18, 24:35); (2) We believe the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament underlying the Authorised (King James) Version to be the very Word of God,

infallible and inerrant; (3) We uphold the Authorised (King James) Version to be the Word of God—the best, most faithful, most accurate, most beautiful translation of the Bible in the English language, and do employ it alone as our primary Scriptural text in the public reading, preaching, and teaching of the English Bible.”

What is the real problem today? Is it not the unequal yoking of “reformed” and “fundamentalist” theology with the textual-critical method of Westcott and Hort and the “inerrant autographs alone” view of Warfield, their resultant corrupt text and modern perversions? Why are “reformed” people agreeing with certain fundamental Baptists who castigate the doctrine of special providential preservation as a “new doctrine,” non-existent before 1648 and the Westminster Confession? Why are certain Biblical fundamentalists well-known for their Biblical conservatism and separatism speaking favorably of rationalistic methods of Biblical criticism, modernistic critical texts, and the ecumenical and neo-evangelical modern versions? Has there not been a downgrade today within reformed Christianity and historic fundamentalism? If so, is this not a backsliding away from the 16th and 20th century Reformation movements?

Prayer and Plea

Our sincere and earnest prayer is that Bible-believing and Bible-defending Christians would not just believe and defend the Verbal Plenary Inspiration (VPI) of Scripture, but also the Verbal Plenary Preservation (VPP) of Scripture. The Bible was not only infallible and inerrant in the past (in the Autographs), but also infallible and inerrant in the present (in the Apographs). These Apographs are the providentially and specially preserved Hebrew and Greek manuscripts and Words underlying the Reformation Bibles best represented by the KJB.

The Texts Underlying the KJB as Identified by the Trinitarian Bible Society

As a defender of the VPP of Scripture and the KJB, I praise the Lord for the Trinitarian Bible Society’s latest position statement on the Bible as published in its *Quarterly Record*, April-June 2005. The TBS identifies and describes the underlying texts of the KJB as follows: “The Trinitarian Bible Society Statement of Doctrine of the Holy Scripture” approved by the General Committee at its meeting held on 17th January 2005, and revised 25th February 2005 declares: The Constitution of the Trinitarian Bible Society specifies the textual families to be employed in the translations it circulates. The Masoretic Hebrew and the Greek Received Texts are the texts that the Constitution of the Trinitarian Bible Society

acknowledges to have been preserved by the special providence of God within Judaism and Christianity. Therefore these texts are definitive and the final point of reference in all the Society's work. These texts of Scripture reflect the qualities of God-breathed Scripture, including being authentic, holy, pure, true, infallible, trustworthy, excellent,

lead to the floodgate being opened for the inclusion of the heretical Gnostic gospels and perverted modern Bible versions.

The above TBS statement, similar to the Preamble I wrote in my booklet—*KJV: Questions and Answers*—published by Bible

employed to offer possible solutions, but calling such discrepancies "scribal errors" is not one. (8) I do not believe we need to improve on the TR underlying the KJV. I do not want to play textual critic, and be a judge of God's Word. I accept God's special hand in His providential work of Bible preservation during the Reformation.

May the Reformation cry that is based on

The Book You Can Trust—The King James Bible!

The Dean Burgon Society News

(#75)

Nov., 2005–March, 2006

Box 354
Collingswood, NJ 08108
Address Service Requested
www.DeanBurgonSociety.org

856-854-4452
Dr. D. A. Waite, Editor
Dr. H. D. Williams, Assistant Editor
Published As The Lord Provides

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage PAID
Permit #822
Bellmawr, NJ

self-authenticating, necessary, sufficient, perspicuous, self-interpreting, authoritative and inerrant (Psalm 19:7-9, Psalm 119). They are consequently to be received as the Word of God (Ezra 7:14; Nehemiah 8:8; Daniel 9:2; 2 Peter 1:19) and the correct reading at any point is to be sought within these texts. The Society accepts as the best edition of the Hebrew Masoretic text the one prepared in 1524–25 by Jacob ben Chayyim and known, after David Bomberg the publisher, as the Bomberg text. This text underlies the Old Testament in the Authorised Version. The Greek Received Text is the name given to a group of printed texts, the first of which was published by Desiderius Erasmus in 1516. The Society believes that the latest and best edition is the text reconstructed by F.H.A. Scrivener in 1894. This text was reconstructed from the Greek underlying the New Testament of the Authorised Version."

Amen! Can the accusers fault the TBS for letting us know which texts have been preserved by the special providence of God and used by the TBS as its final point of reference in all its work? If they find fault, it may be because they want to paint VPP as merely a theory with no specific texts that can be found or identified in practice (i.e. in the real world). If VPP is destroyed or undermined by them, the immediately underlying original Hebrew and Greek apographs become of no consequence and it would then not matter if Christians use perverted modern versions since such versions can also claim to be ultimately traceable to the unavailable autographs. VPI without VPP can

Witness Literature Ministry in 2003, is stricter and more definitive. The Preamble is reproduced in full: A Personal Affirmation of the 100% Inspiration and the 100% Preservation of the Original Language Scriptures Underlying the King James Version.

(1) I do believe in the divine, verbal and plenary inspiration of the Scriptures in the original languages, their consequent inerrancy and infallibility, and as the Word of God, the Supreme and final authority in faith and life. (2) I do affirm the biblical doctrine of providential preservation that the inspired Words of the Hebrew OT Scriptures and the Greek NT Scriptures are "kept pure in all ages" as taught by the Westminster Confession. (3) I do believe that the Texts which are purest and closest to the autographs of the Bible are the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text of the Old Testament, and the Traditional Greek Text for the New Testament underlying the King James Version. (4) I believe that the purity of God's Words has been faithfully maintained in the Traditional/Byzantine/Majority/Received Text, and fully represented in the Textus Receptus that underlies the KJV. Providential preservation is not static but dynamic. (5) I do believe that God's providential preservation of the Scriptures concerns not just the doctrines but also the very Words of Scripture to the jot and tittle (Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, 24:35, Mark 13:31, Luke 21:33, Rev 22:18-19). (6) I do not deny that other faithful Bible translations, including foreign language ones, that are based on other editions of the Textus Receptus can be deemed the Word of God. (7) I do believe that Scripture cannot contradict Scripture, and hence there can be no discrepancies in the Bible. All alleged discrepancies are only apparent and not actual. Principles of harmonisation should be

the *Reformation Bible* ring loud and clear today—not *Sola Autographa* but *Sola Scriptura*! "For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth" (2 Cor 13:8). Amen!

Fuller Essay Contest

Any young adult in High School can enter this *David Otis Fuller Memorial Essay Contest* which was named for a Pastor who was a Vice President of the Dean Burgon Society until his death. The theme this year is "*The Superiority of the King James Bible over the Today's New International Version.*" The essay should be from 1,000 to 2,000 words in length. The essay must be post marked by June 2, 2006 and received by June 10, 2006. A winner will be announced on June 23, 2006. You can visit the DBS Website at www.DeanBurgonSociety.org for help and also call the founder and organizer of the contest, Pastor J. Paul Reno (301-739-8585) to learn more about the topic, details, prizes and entry form. If you know any young person who might be interested, please give their name, address, and phone number to Pastor Reno.

Today's Leaders

Remember, "Today's leaders were yesterday's young adults!"