

WAITING FOR DR. WAITE

Before “launch[ing] out into the deep”, I would like to express my appreciation to several individuals who have helped me in my spiritual growth in the area of Bible texts and versions. If I have inadvertently overlooked someone, I ask your forgiveness in advance. I may have forgotten to name you, but this in no way diminishes the impact that you may have had on my life and ministry. Before I get to that list, however, there are two individuals that I have not mentioned in the list below. I would be remiss if I did not mention these two dear pastors: Pastor Bruce Stewart and Pastor Mike Hoover. These brethren have been some of my closest friends in the ministry for more than thirty years now, have always lent a listening ear to my various dilemmas, and have always offered biblical advice and counsel. Thank you, my brothers, for being there for me.

Though there is some overlap in the influence of the various individuals listed below, I wish to thank them in the approximate order in which the Lord Jesus Christ used them in my life and ministry since the day God saved me at the age of 18 on August 1, 1972. May all glory go to Him. First, for the influence of my first real pastor, Pastor John Fleck, whose expository preaching made a huge impact on my life as a young Christian. Second, for the impact of Dr. Thomas O. Figart, Bible and Theology professor at Lancaster Bible College, Lancaster, PA, in the mid-1970’s. Dr. Figart’s wise and mature suggestion to us preacher boys to diligently read *The Revision Revised* by Dean John William Burgon, was the actual start of my journey into the issue of Bible texts and versions. Dr. Figart is to be commended for this recommendation, and especially in light of the fact that he may be on the opposite side of the textual fence from Burgon. I shall never forget Dr. Figart’s famous words in the face of every theological challenge: “Book, chapter and verse, please!” May his tribe increase! Third, **for DR. D.A. WAITE**, whose books enabled me to quickly overcome five years of schooling in the mistaken theories of Westcott and Hort. Though I have now come to a stricter position than Dr. Waite on some issues, nevertheless the influence of his writings and his occasional personal conversations with me since the late 1970’s have given me much help in things textual. Fourth, for the wonderful fellowship and iron-sharpening sessions with Mr. Thomas Cline of Wellsville, NY. Brother Cline, whom I had the privilege of shepherding in two of the churches that I pastored, was faithful in always pointing out biblical cross-references to a particular subject under discussion. Brother Tom was bold and yet humble in insisting on the fact that the Bible is its own dictionary, and I fondly remember him hauling out an

enormous eight-inch thick English dictionary to point out the correctness of a particular word choice by the 54 (or more) learned men. Fifth, for Pastor Keith Sweitzer of Mt. Zion Baptist Church of Denver, PA. Pastor Sweitzer has continually challenged me, as well as the entire congregation of Mt. Zion Baptist, to be *thoroughly* biblical in all areas of life, including the area of Bible texts and versions. Sixth, for missionary Brent Logan (Brasov, Romania) whose biblical and theological acuity have encouraged me and challenged me to continue to diligently study the Bible and to determine *God's* interpretation of various matters, particularly the matters of Bible texts and versions. Seventh, for a group of more recently-made friends, too numerous to mention and whose numbers continue to grow, who have helped me to refine and to present more biblically and clearly my position regarding the King James Bible. These folks have continually humbled me by their appeal to and insistence upon the Divine and Final Authority of the word of God in English – The King James Bible. Glory be to God for the entire cadre of people who have helped this author in his desire to sanctify the Lord God in his heart and to “*be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh [him] a reason of the hope that is in [him] with meekness and fear.*”

Pete Heisey
Timisoara, Romania
June 2010

WAITING FOR DR. WAITE

By Pete Heisey

Church planting missionary among the ethnic Gypsies (Roma)
Timisoara, Romania

The author of this current work in no way wants to appear to be mean-spirited (and that truly is not the intent), however, he has decided to forego the usual political niceties that often accompany a polemic of this nature in favor of a direct and blunt approach. The author will attempt to refrain from being deliberately abrasive in his manner, although he recognizes that whenever “iron sharpeneth iron”, friction is created. Even given that situation, the author is firmly convinced that people can and should remain good cordial friends, and indeed also have good personal fellowship in the areas where there is agreement.

This work is not intended as some sort of vendetta against Dr. D.A. Waite; it is an appeal to Dr. Waite, and by implication the members of the Dean Burgon Society, to speak more precisely, consistently, and clearly regarding his positions on a couple of matters of textual importance in our day and age. Neither is this work intended as a promotion of any other persons, or their beliefs/positions, including Gail Riplinger and Peter Ruckman. The author is a follower of neither. If anyone wants to invoke any of those names or similar persons as reason to dismiss this work, then sadly, this author must consequently invoke the words of Manny Rodriguez in his response to the fallacious “Guilt-by-Association argument”: “Whatever floats your boat.” Manny Rodriguez in his work “Guilt-by-Association” also quotes Dr. Phil Stringer’s definition of a “Ruckmanite”. He said, “A Ruckmanite [or Riplingerite – POH] is what the opponents call you when they are losing the argument.”

As mentioned above, the current work is intended as an appeal to Dr. Waite to be more consistent, more clear, more precise, more logical, less contradictory, and last but not least, to be more biblical regarding what he believes.

To be blunt, the title of this work has probably already engendered a question in the mind of the reader: “Waiting for what?”, or “Waiting for Dr. Waite to do what?” To be direct: Waiting for Dr. Waite to give an honest, straightforward, unequivocal answer to two simple questions. The title of this work

actually came about because of Dr. Waite's refusal to give this author an answer to the following simple questions: "Does F.H.A. Scrivener's Greek text need to be corrected so as to match the exact readings underlying the King James Bible New Testament?" and, "Is the text of the King James Bible without error?" To date, this author has not received nor seen a direct, straightforward, consistent, well-explained, non-contradictory answer from Dr. Waite to these two questions. In fact, as will be shown below, Dr. Waite has contradicted himself on these issues as well as several others which are related to them. The word of God says in James 1:8, "A double minded man *is* unstable in all his ways." And in James 5:12b, "but let your yea be yea; and *your* nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation." Dr. Waite should obey these biblical exhortations and "tell us plainly" (John 10:24) what he really does believe.

This work will consist of the presentation of a series of writings by Dr. Waite, highlighting his inconsistent, illogical, contradictory, and sometimes downright untrue statements. Also highlighted will be his continued refusal to explain this confusing situation which he has presented. And to quote Dr. H.D. Williams (DBS eNews, Volume 1, Issue 96, p.8), "Hmmm. I wonder who is the author of confusion."

This author is hereby appealing to Dr. Waite to please clear up the confusion, even if he disagrees with this author's position on the matters involved, so that all may know Dr. Waite's exact convictions on these important issues.

PART I

Inconsistent and Contradictory statements by Dr. D.A. Waite regarding F.H.A. Scrivener's Greek text

What follows is a series of emails between this author and Dr. Waite which highlight the confusion created by Dr. Waite's contradictory statements. The author has put each set in its original order.

Set 1.

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Refutation of Riplinger on Scrivener

Date: Wed, 14 Apr 2010 11:32:17 +0300

From: poheisey gmail <poheisey@gmail.com>

To: <bft@BibleForToday.org>

Dr. Waite:

You and I have been "acquaintances" for a long time (since around 1978 if I'm not mistaken, but unfortunately I don't think we've ever met personally). I think I have a shelf full of your materials to which I return quite regularly. In light of the help you have given me over the years, I'd like to try to "return the favor" if you'll permit me. I'm not trying to stir up trouble here, I'm just asking for a little elucidation on something that jumped out at me as I read your refutation of Riplinger.

Having read the material, I can't honestly say that I agree with everything you brought out, but you made some good points. However, you made a statement on page 28 which at the very least contradicts the statements you made to me and others (via email cc) in the attached information (and which I personally believe to be in error). I raise the issue because numerous others received a copy of your comments (both from yourself and from me) and those comments are "out there" in the hands of many folks.

You said on page 28: The "Scrivener Greek New Testament" is not "slightly tainted." I believe the Words in this "Greek New Testament" to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words.

Now you and I have discussed this exact problem [emails from Fall 2008 – POH] and the conclusion was that there are indeed places (20 or so to this point) where Scrivener is NOT an "accurate [or authentic] copy of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words". I have highlighted your statements in the attached document to the contrary of your affirmation on p.28. [If the problem is your usage and understanding of the word "accurate" (i.e., not 100% the "accurate copies of") then it's logical that your position seems contradictory -- maybe you can explain further; especially in light of Webster 1828 = "In exact conformity to truth, or to a standard or rule, or to a model; free from failure, error, or defect;"]

As I, and you, noted: if Scrivener clearly does not use the underlying word that the KJB translators used, then one or the other is wrong. In your comments to me (and others via email cc) you indicated that Scrivener was wrong. Are you now saying that you were mistaken in making those comments?

If I could be direct for a moment (and I'd like a simple yes or no answer to the question): **Is Scrivener in error in those places? (Yes or no)** [It seems from your comments to me in the attached document that your answer is "Yes", (Scrivener is in error), despite the statement you made on p.28 of your refutation of Riplinger.]

Can you elucidate on what seems to me to be a direct contradiction in your statements?

Thank you in advance for your response.

Pete Heisey
Timisoara, Romania

P.S. One more question: Is the KJB translation in error in any spot? (Yes or no; i.e., not "I haven't found any", etc. Simply "yes" or "no".)

(NOTE BELOW THE LACK OF AN ANSWER TO THE ABOVE QUESTIONS.)

From: Pastor D. A. Waite <BFT@biblefortoday.org>
To: "Missionary Pete O. Heisey, Romania" <poheisey@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Apr 14, 2010 at 2:07 PM
Subject: [Fwd: Refutation of Riplinger on Scrivener]
mailed-by: biblefortoday.org

Dear Pete,

You are trying to get me to say the English translation is superior to the Greek. I do not believe that. This is part of your leaning towards or adherence to the Peter Ruckman and Gail Riplinger HERESY. I am sorry that we must part company on this. In Christ, Pastor D. A. Waite

(POH REPLY)

Dr. Waite:

I am not trying to get you to say any such thing about supposed "superiority". That is a mistaken assumption on your part. I happen to agree with your statement in your September 2008 email to me that the KJB and the exact Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words underlying it are to match. Here are your words (with which I agree): "I have always made it clear that MY TR is made up exclusively of the exact Words underlying the KJB. That settles it for me and should settle it for anyone. I would like for the English and Greek to be united exactly and precisely."

I am simply asking for a clarification of what seem to be contradictory statements on your part (p. 28 of your refutation of Riplinger vs. your indicating in our email correspondence of September 2008 that Scrivener's words were not always the correct ones in a few places. In parallel with this you stated on p. 52 that Scrivener is the closest to the KJB, thus indicating that Scrivener's text/words do not match or unite with the KJB in a few places. Based on your email statement to me, it would seem to me that you thought that Scrivener needed correction, so that the words would be exclusively the exact Words underlying the KJB).

Here's what I'd like clarified if you would please:

If on p. 28 of the refutation of Riplinger you say this: "I believe the Words in this [Scrivener] Greek New Testament to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words," then how can you say, "Pete, YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND" (i.e., and he was supposed to find the "TR [which] is made up exclusively of the exact Words underlying the KJB") The indication on your part regarding my being correct and about Scrivener being wrong occurred about 20 times in your email correspondence to me of September 2008.

I am asking you to help me understand what seems to be a contradiction (p. 28 of your refutation of Riplinger vs. your indicating in our email correspondence of September 2008 that Scrivener's words were not always the correct ones in a few places). The bottom line of what **I'm asking** clarification of is NOT whether the KJB is "superior" or "inferior" to anything, but rather **whether Scrivener needs a few corrections or not**. If he does need corrected in a few spots (as it seems you were saying in your email correspondence to me -- perhaps I misunderstood -- **let me know if this is the case**), then it is clear that the words of his text cannot be "copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words".

Which item expresses your position? Scrivener's text needs corrected, OR, the Words of Scrivener's text are "copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words".

Please don't misunderstand me. I am not trying to start an argument. I'm asking a very simple thing. I just would like a clarification on your exact position: **Does Scrivener need corrected or not? (Yes or no)**.

Pete Heisey
Timisoara, Romania

(TO DATE, NO REPLY HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THE ABOVE QUESTIONS NOR HAS ANY CLARIFICATION OF THE CONTRADICTIONS BEEN OFFERED.)

Set 2.

poheisey gmail wrote:

Dr. Waite:

I noted in the DBS news (nr. 90-"Scrivener's Annotated Greek NT \$17.50 This will be printed in leather in the future.") that Scrivener will be published with a leather cover. I have one from the previous leather run of a number of years ago. Will you be able to insert a page somewhere with the places found (so far, and I actually came across three more about a week ago) where Scrivener's readings do not match the exact readings underlying the KJB? There may be some other solution; I'm not too creative in that department. Just wondering if that'd be the time to make the "adjustment".

Pete Heisey
Timisoara, Romania

From: DAW <BFT@biblefortoday.org>
To: poheisey gmail <poheisey@gmail.com>
Cc: "Dr. H. D. and Patricia Williams" <TOP@theoldpathspublications.com>
Date: Sat, Oct 31, 2009 at 3:25 AM
Subject: Re: For Dr. Waite
mailed-by: biblefortoday.org

Dear Pete,

I'm not sure about leather. I think we may do this. As to any "corrections," this is up to the DBS leaders to discuss. He followed Beza's 5th edition, 1598 [*added comment: except for about 190 places which Dr. Waite acknowledges on p. 39 of the December 1996 edition of Defending the King James Bible – POH*] in hand, and "tried" to find the Greek text (in other editions if need be) that underlay the KJB. If he failed, he failed. It is HIS edition and we should be thankful he did so well as he did. I wonder about the wisdom of CHANGING the Scrivener edition since it is HIS edition, not that of the DBS. In Christ, Pastor D. A. Waite

Copy to: Dr. H. D. Williams, DBS Vice President

Reply Reply to all Forward
10/31/09

poheisey gmail wrote:

Dr. Waite:

Good point about "Scrivener's" edition being his. Nevertheless, a page stuck at the end might work as was done with other DBS and BFT publications. For the specific verses you can recheck our correspondence from about a year ago or so, although the 3 (or more) recent ones aren't on that list. As I noted there, Scrivener's mistake was in trying to find the underlying text using ONLY printed(!) Greek editions and thus he missed a few. Only a word by word collation with the KJB could bring to light all the places where Scrivener departs from the exact readings underlying the KJB.

Pete

10/31/09

Dear Pete,

The extra page might work. We'll take it into consideration. ...

(THIS IS AN ADMISSION, HERE IN THIS PLACE ANYWAY, BY DR. WAITE THAT SCRIVENER DOES INDEED NEED CORRECTION, A CONTRADICTION TO WHAT HE WROTE ON P.28 OF A WARNING!!)

This author, for one, is “waiting for Dr. Waite” to directly answer the above-mentioned questions (an honest “yes” or “no” is all that is desired), but especially and particularly the question which relates specifically to this current work, “Does Scrivener’s text need corrected/adjusted?” For those who may be wondering about this author’s position on the matter, this author believes that, “Yes, Scrivener’s text needs to be corrected.” More will be brought out on that matter later in this limited polemic.

PART II

Dr. Waite’s direct statements to this author regarding the need for correcting F.H.A. Scrivener’s Greek text to exactly unite with or precisley match the exact texts/readings underlying the King James Bible

This section reproduces an email regarding places where Dr. Waite agreed that Scrivener’s text needs to be corrected. The logical conclusion, so as to be consistent and not contradictory, is that Dr. Waite should *not* say that Scrivener’s text is “copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek words.” [p.28 of *A WARNING!!*] This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to explain this contradiction.

December 20, 2008.

I have redone the Scrivener “corrections” list. In doing this, I have exercised as much mercy and grace on him as I can. I have taken into consideration the comments by Dr. Waite and numerous others in arriving at the bare-bones minimum correction list. At the end I included items from Scrivener’s text that can probably be left alone for now, though my original comments could still be valid and Scrivener could still need to be corrected in those places. I’d guess that only a word by word collation between the KJB and Scrivener

would reveal any other places where Scrivener departs from the actual and exact Greek readings underlying the KJB.

I believe that Dr. Waite put it well when he said to me (in a September 2008 email), “I have always made it clear that MY TR is made up exclusively of the exact Words underlying the KJB. That settles it for me and should settle it for anyone. I would like for the English and Greek to be united [matched] exactly and precisely.” Well said!

I submit the following for your perusal, and comments are always welcome.
POH

Here’s my [POH] calculation of the situation after “refuting” the “objections” to my “corrections” of Scrivener and after exercising mercy and grace on Scrivener:

Scrivener needs to be CORRECTED – 24 places
Scrivener can probably be left alone for now – 13 places
TOTAL = 37

A LIST OF SCRIVENER’S TEXTUAL DEPARTURES FROM THE TEXT UNDERLYING THE KJB

By: Pete Heisey
church planting among the ethnic Roma (Gypsies)
Timisoara, Romania

One of the oft met with accusations in the whole Bible text and version debate is, “Which TR is or has the preserved words of God?” Generally Scrivener’s 1881 published Greek text is held up as that standard. On the main, that is true. However, as will be shown in this treatise, Scrivener needs to be corrected so that one will be able to see the all the exact words and readings which underlie our King James Bible.

In remarking about his Greek text of 1891, Scrivener declares that the text of Beza 1598 has been left unchanged except in certain instances (p.655). Scrivener also places an asterisk * where, in his text, he puts what he claims are the non-Beza readings which he alleges were used by the KJB translators (p.648). **Yet** in at least

nine passages he rejected the Beza readings chosen or left by the KJB translators: Mark 9:42; John 8:6; 16:25; Acts 7:16; Acts 27:12; 1Corinthians 14:10; Revelation 9:19; 19:14, 18. On that point, Scrivener lacks integrity. Even Scrivener himself in his Appendix shows the Beza support for the readings chosen by the KJB translators in these passages. Nevertheless, those readings are NOT the ones which Scrivener put in his text. Again, Scrivener is deceptive here. Furthermore, on page 656, Scrivener lists some 62 instances where he claims the KJB translators followed the Latin Vulgate in preference to Beza. Though the translators may not have followed Beza in all these cases, it is not necessarily true that the KJB translators followed the Vulgate. There is Greek support for these references as well. Scrivener is clearly mistaken based upon the Greek evidence he himself gives. In fact Scrivener himself kept at least nine of these alleged “Vulgate” readings in his text matching the KJV (Luke 1:25; 20:35; John 7:9; Acts 10:20; 13:1; 13:15; 17:30; Colossians 1:4; Colossians 1:24). However, it is beyond the scope of this work to enter into a study of all of the items in the foregoing paragraph.

The real problem with Scrivener’s text is that in certain instances he did not adjust his text to match the readings underlying the King James Bible (KJB), in spite of the fact that it was seemingly his intent and/or responsibility to do so. The evidence for his failure to do this will follow below.

Dear Pete,

9/16/08

I find that ITALICS in the KJB are a problem in some of these that you have listed, Scrivener put in the GREEK TEXT for the KJB italicized words. Technically this may be a mistake, but on the other hand they might have had SOME Greek text that caused them to at least include the word or words in italics. Apparently that is the Greek text Scrivener found. DAW

Maybe so. But the issue once again is the fact that it is NOT the Greek reading followed by the KJB guys. They evidently believed that the evidence for the reading they followed was better attested, and was the superior reading, and better represented (exactly represented?!!) the text of the original. Consequently, Scrivener should be corrected where he clearly departed from the reading chosen by the 54 learned men, as you yourself indicated by saying in a September 2008 email to me, “I have always made it clear that MY TR is made up exclusively of the exact Words underlying the KJB. That settles it for me and should settle

it for anyone. I would like for the English and Greek to be united exactly and precisely.”

1. Mark 2:15 – The text should indeed have **ihsou** (ieesou - “Jesus”) twice as in the KJB. Scrivener’s text has the word Jesus only once compared to the KJB’s two times. The KJB reading is supported by Spanish pre-1599 Bibles, the French 1599, the OLD Latin (i.e., pre-5th century), Tyndale 1526, Great Bible, Mathew’s Bible, Bishop Bible, and Geneva 1599. There is also a possible grammatical issue in that if “He/he” is used it could refer to “Levi” (from verse 14). In any case, Scrivener’s text did not follow the same reading as the KJV. **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. WHAT GREEK TEXT HAS WHAT THE KJB TRANSLATORS FOLLOWED?**

[NOTE: I repeat, NOTE: The issue of “what Greek text” is not really the issue. The translators may not have followed an extant GREEK text or manuscript. The evidence they had for the reading they chose and followed evidently (for all we know) came from lectionaries, quotes in the church fathers, confirmation from vernacular versions, etc. Thus the “Greek text” which the KJB guys believed they were following was, in fact, the original Greek text, and here I do mean THE original Greek text reading (as represented in the lectionaries, quotes, versions, etc. in contradistinction to extant Greek texts or manuscripts).]

2. Mark 9:42 – The text should in fact read just **mikrwn** (mikroon - “these little ones”) and **NOT** **mikrwn toutwn** (mikroon toutoon - “these little ones”). The KJB translators followed Beza, Stephanus 1550, and the Plantin (Antwerp) Polyglot while Scrivener mistakenly followed the Complutensian Polyglot and the Latin Vulgate here. The KJB translators’ use of *italics* seems to confirm the fact that **toutwn** does not belong in the text. The majority text reading also has just **mikrwn** and not **mikrwn toutwn**. **YOU ARE PARTLY CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. KJB FOLLOWED STEPHENS 1550. HE FOLLOWED THE GREEK OF THE W/H & THE C.T. BUT HE MIGHT HAVE PUT “THESE” (TOUTON) IN ITALICS IN GREEK IF POSSIBLE.**

[Well, now, that's a bit of "conjectural emendation" – HA! Smile!] All kidding aside, it's really weak reasoning to guess at what Scrivener "might" have done and to propose that as reason to allow Scrivener to remain as he has it. Especially is this so given the fact that italic typeface was available to Scrivener / the printer as is evidenced by the fact that Scrivener used it in his notes. The known fact is that the conclusion of the 54 learned men was that "toutoon" was NOT in the original Greek text and they believed that the reading from Stephanus best represented that original text reading. Thus in following the KJB translators I am in fact correct here and Scrivener is still decidedly wrong in going against the reading chosen/followed by the 54 learned men.

3. Mark 14:43 – The text should **NOT** have the word *wn* (oon - "being"). Neither Tyndale nor the KJB have it. Scrivener mistakenly has *wn* (oon - "being") in the text. **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THE KJB FOLLOWED THE GREEK OF THE W/H & C.T., HE FOLLOWED STEPHENS 1550.**

4. John 8:6 – The text should **NOT** have the phrase *mh prospoioujmenos* (mee prospoioumenos - "as though he heard them not") in the text. Here, the KJB translators followed Stephanus 1550 and perhaps Beza and the Elzevirs as well. The generally recognized "authoritative edition" of the KJB (1769) has the phrase in *italics* indicating that Blayney's research led to the conclusion that the translators did not consider the Greek phrase "mee prospoioumenos" as being part of the original text. **YOU ARE PARTLY CORRECT HERE. THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. HE MIGHT HAVE PUT *ME PROSPOIOUJMENOS* IN ITALICS AS THE KJB MEN DID. WHAT TEXT DID THE KJB FOLLOW HERE? IT COULD HAVE BEEN W/H OR STEPHENS 1550.**

It's really weak reasoning to guess at what Scrivener "might" have done. Especially is this so given the fact that italic typeface was available to Scrivener / the printer as is evidenced by the fact that Scrivener used it in his notes. The known fact is that the conclusion of the 54 learned men was that Stephanus' reading was the best attested evidence of the original text reading and thus they followed Stephens. The upshot of this is that Scrivener is still decidedly wrong for putting the wording IN THE TEXT.

5. John 16:25 – The text should indeed have **all’ ercetai** (all’ erchetai; “alla” = “but”) rather than Scrivener’s mere ercetai (“erchetai” without all’, i.e., without “but”). The KJB followed Beza’s 2, 3, 4, 5 editions, Stephanus, and the Complutensian Polyglot. The majority text reading has **all’ ercetai** as well. **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. BUT THE LOGOS SCRIVENER’S DOES HAVE THE ALL’ EVEN THOUGH THE PRINTED ONE DOES NOT.**

[The fact is that most of the electronic Bibles are really a mess and very inconsistent in representing the underlying Greek text (including in interlinear forms of the electronic Bibles). Power Bible has problems, that’s for sure.]

6. Acts 7:26 – The text should read **sunhllassen** (suneellassen - “would have set them”; imperfect – see Dana & Mantey p. 189). Scrivener mistakenly uses sunhlasen (suneelasen - “set them”; aorist, active, indicative). The KJB translators followed C, D, Latin, and Tyndale here as having the better attested reading. Furthermore, the aorist is not ever used, as far as is known, for the imperfect idea (cf. Dana & Mantey, p. 199). **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THEY SHOULD HAVE FOLLOWED THE GREEK OF THE W/H C.T. HERE.**
7. Acts 19:20 – The text should read **qeou** (theou - “God”) not kuriou (kuriou - “Lord”). Scrivener mistakenly has kuriou (kuriou - “Lord”) instead of qeou (theou - “God” with KJB). The KJB translators followed the Old Itala, D, E, it[d], it[w], Syriac, syr[p], Armenian Bible (300’s), Beza’s Codex Cantabrigiensis. Theologically speaking, the word “God” here (as distinct from Lord) could be important regarding the Deity of Christ and His/God’s Word (cf. Acts 19:10, “word of the Lord Jesus”). **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND.**
8. Acts 26:6 – The text should read **pateras hmwn** (pateras heemoon - “our fathers”) rather than Scrivener’s mere pateras (pateras - “fathers”). Tyndale also reads correctly here (“our fathers”). **YOU ARE CORRECT,**

THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THE KJB PROBABLY FOLLOWED THE GREEK OF THE W/H AND C.T.

9. Acts 27:17 – The text should read **surthn** (surteen - “quicksands”/sandbanks; plural) rather than Scrivener’s **surtin** (surtin - (“quicksand”/sandbank; singular). The KJB translators believed that the reading **surthn** (surteen - “quicksands”; plural) from Stephanus 1, Complutensian Polyglot, Erasmus, Aldus (1518), and Colinaeus (1534) was the better attested reading. The majority text reading also has **surthn** (plural, “quicksands”). **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THE KJB PROBABLY FOLLOWED THE GREEK OF STEPHENS AS YOU SAID.**

10. I Corinthians 14:10 – The text should read **ouden autwn** (ouden autoon - “none of them”) rather than Scrivener’s mere **ouden** (ouden - “none”). The KJB translators followed Stephanus 1550 and perhaps Beza here. Colinaeus also has “ouden autoon” (“none of them”). The majority text reading also has **ouden autwn**. **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THE KJB PROBABLY FOLLOWED THE GREEK OF STEPHENS AS YOU SAID.**

11. Galatians 4:15 – The text should read **pou** (pou - “where” [KJB]) rather than Scrivener’s mistaken **tis** (tis - usually, “what”). The KJB translators evidently believed that the better attested reading is “pou”. **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THE KJB PROBABLY FOLLOWED THE GREEK OF W/H AND C.T.**

12. Ephesians 6:24 – The text **should** read or **have amhn** (ameen - “Amen”). Unfortunately, Scrivener mistakenly omits this. The KJB translators followed Stephanus 1550 here. The majority text reading has **amhn** as well. **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THE KJB PROBABLY FOLLOWED THE GREEK OF STEPHENS OR MAJORITY AS YOU SAID.**

13. II Timothy 1:18 – The text should read **dihkoneese moi** (dieekoneese moi - “ministered to me”) rather than just **dihkoneese** (dieekoneese - “ministered”) as Scrivener has. **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. WHICH GREEK TEXT DID THEY USE?**
14. Revelation 9:16 – The text should have the definite article **twn** (toon - “of **the**”) before **strateumatwn** (strateumatoon - “army”). Scrivener wrongly omits the definite article here. The KJB translators evidently believed that the majority text reading is the better attested reading here in contrast to Scrivener. **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THE KJB PROBABLY FOLLOWED THE MAJORITY AND W/H & C.T. GREEK TEXTS.**
15. Revelation 10:8 – The text should indeed have the definite article **tou** (tou - “of **the**”) before **aggelou** (angelou - “angel”). Unfortunately, Scrivener wrongly omits the definite article here. The KJB translators followed the better attested reading (from the majority text manuscripts, the Complutensian Polyglot, and the Plantin Polyglot) which has the definite article **tou** (“of **the**”). **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THE KJB PROBABLY FOLLOWED THE “MAJORITY” AND W/W C.T. TEXTS WHICH HAVE THE ARTICLE.**
16. Revelation 19:14 – The text should NOT have **ta** (ta - “the ones which”) before **en tw ouranw** (en too ouranoo - “in heaven” / in [the] heaven[s]). Unfortunately, Scrivener wrongly adds the word “ta” (“the ones which”) here. The KJB translators evidently did not believe this was the best attested reading and therefore put “which were” in italics. The KJB translators followed Beza, Stephanus, Erasmus, Aldus, and Colineaus here as being better attested than what Scrivener has. **THE EXTRA “TA” FOLLOWS GREEK SYNTAX RULES. IT IS TRANSLATED IN THE KJB BY “WHICH” AND THEREFORE SCRIVENER IS CORRECT. THEY FOLLOWED THE MAJORITY AND W/H C.T. AND REJECTED STEPHENS.**

If it is a matter of Greek syntax, then why do Beza, Stephanus, Erasmus, Aldus, and Colinaeus all read without “ta”?! Did those guys all mess up the Greek syntax??

The proof that the text should NOT read as does Scrivener is the fact that the KJB translators put the word “which” IN ITALICS(!). In this they evidenced the fact that they followed Stephanus, Beza, Erasmus, Aldus, and Colinaeus as all having the better attested reading (i.e., without “ta”). It appears to me that Scrivener is still WRONG here and should be fixed.

17. Revelation 19:18 – The text should NOT have τε (te - “both”) after eleuqerwn (eleutheroon - “free”). Unfortunately, Scrivener mistakenly has it in his text here. The KJB translators evidently did not believe it was the best attested reading and therefore put “both” in italics. The KJB translators followed Stephanus, Beza, Erasmus, Aldus, and Colinaeus here as being better attested than what Scrivener has. **IT APPEARS TO ME THAT THE “TE KAI” TRANSLATES “BOTH” AND IS PROPER. WITHOUT THE “TE” YOU WOULD JUST HAVE AN “AND.” I THINK SCRIVENER IS CORRECT HERE. THE KJB HAS FOLLOWED THE MAJORITY AND W/H C.T.**

The proof that the text should NOT read as does Scrivener is the fact that the KJB translators put the word “both” in italics (in following Stephanus, Beza, Erasmus, Aldus, and Colinaeus as all having the better attested reading). It appears to me that Scrivener is still WRONG here and should be fixed.

18. Revelation 21:8 – The text should indeed have the definite article τοῖς de deilois (tois de delios - “but **the** fearful”) and not just deilois de (delios de - “but fearful [ones]”). Unfortunately, Scrivener omits it from his text. The KJB translators followed the majority text and Complutensian Polyglot reading here as being better attested than what Scrivener has. *It is true that articulated and anarthrous construction issues could enter in here (cf. Dana & Mantey).* **TO BE THE UNDERLYING GREEK TEXT FOR THE KJB, SCRIVENER SHOULD HAVE THE ARTICLE “TOIS.” YOU ARE CORRECT HERE. THE KJB FOLLOWED STEPHENS RATHER THAN MAJORITY OR W/H C.T.**

The following passages (among others possibly) are noted due to the bearing that Matthew 4:4, Matthew 5:17-18, and Galatians 3:16 have on the matter of spelling and especially where it might or could or would make a difference in exegesis, preaching, or teaching (and pronunciation).

- 19-24. Matthew 12:24, 12:27; Mark 3:22; Luke 11:15, 18, 19 – The passages should have Beelzebub (“Beelzebub”). However in Scrivener, all have Beelzeboul (“Beelzebul”) instead of the KJB Beelzebub. The KJB follows Tyndale and, says Scrivener, the Latin Vulgate. The KJB translators believed that the best attested reading from all sources is Beelzebub as evidenced by Tyndale’s use of it and so with Tyndale used Beelzebub. Compare Matthew 10:25. **YOU ARE CORRECT. SCRIVENER SHOULD HAVE “BEELZEBUB” AND FIND A GREEK TEXT TO READ IT THIS WAY. IF HE CANNOT FIND THE TEXT, HE SHOULD CHANGE HIS TEXT TO “BEELZEBOUL.”**

Actually, Scrivener should change his text to Beelzebub (with the KJB, II Ki. 1:2,3; etc.) unless he, as only one man, wishes to go up against the 54 learned men. As to finding a Greek text which reads Beelzebub, this is not so necessary or significant as is supposed. Once again, the issue of “a Greek text” is not really the issue. The best attested reading, or best reading representative (for as much as we can tell) of the original, is really the issue. The weight of evidence may be from sources other than “a Greek text”. The evidence for the reading chosen and followed by the KJV translators may have come from lectionaries, quotes in the church fathers, confirmation from old vernacular versions, etc., and from the KJV translators’ point of view, the reading they chose best represented the reading of the autographs.

The following items (in my mercy and grace – HA!) are in the “Scrivener should probably be left alone for now” category. I’m not saying that they shouldn’t be corrected, but just that I’ve found a way to let them alone.

- *1. Acts 6:3 – The text should read **katasthswmen** (katasteesoomen - “we may appoint”; subjunctive) rather than Scrivener’s mistaken **katasthsomen** (katasteesomen - “we will appoint”; future, active,

indicative). The KJB translators evidently believed that the better attested reading from examining all sources available was “katasteesoomen” (“we may appoint”). In this they followed Tyndale. The majority text reading also has **katasthswmen**. **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. AS YOU SAY, THEY MIGHT HAVE FOLLOWED THE GREEK UNDER THE “MAJORITY” TEXT.**

I have moved this to the “probably leave Scrivener alone for now” category because after further research it is remotely possible that the future active indicative can express purpose when used with the relative (cf. Dana & Mantey, bottom p. 284).

- *2. Acts 27:12 – The text should read **kata liba kai cwron** (kata liba kai chooron - “toward the southwest and northwest”) rather than Scrivener’s kata liba kai kata cwron (kata liba kai kata chooron - “toward the southwest and the northwest”). The KJB translators followed Beza 3, 4, 5 here in considering that reading to be the better attested one. *It is perhaps theoretically possible that the translation of Scrivener into English could come out as in the KJB.* **YOU MIGHT BE CORRECT, BUT I DON’T THINK THE EXTRA “KATA” CHANGES THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION VERY MUCH IF AT ALL I WOULD LEAVE THIS ONE ALONE.**

I agree that it does not have to make a difference in the English translation. However the problem with that reasoning is that the difference might indeed make a difference in a translation into a language other than English. Thus the underlying word(s) do become, or at the very least could become, quite critical, i.e., if Scrivener is not “fixed”, then this could have an effect on translation into some other language than English. I still think Scrivener may be wrong here given the fact that Beza 3, 4, 5 were followed by the KJB translators as representing the best attested reading. An additional question to be dealt with in these kinds of situations is why Scrivener should be granted “final” authority in distinction from or over the KJB translators. I am in no way putting those men on an unwarranted pedestal, but I am not convinced that Scrivener’s capabilities would match the combined abilities of the KJB translators.

- *3. I Thessalonians 2:12 – The text should read **kalesantos** (kalesantos - “hath called”; aorist active indicative, i.e., past tense) rather than Scrivener’s erroneous **kalountos** (kalountos - “calls”; present tense). **YOU MIGHT BE CORRECT, BUT REMEMBER THAT THE SPECIAL USES OF THE PRESENT TENSE (SEE DANA & MANTEY) INCLUDES THE AORISTIC PRESENT OR THE PAST TENSE USE OF THE PRESENT. NONE OF THE 4 GREEK TEXTS THAT I HAVE, HAVE THE AORIST ACTIVE. WHICH GREEK TEXT HAS THE AORIST THAT THE KJB MEN MIGHT HAVE USED? IF YOU CAN FIND ONE, YOU MIGHT BE CORRECT?**

A point well taken. From a translational perspective a case could be made for the past tense “meaning” of a present tense verb. This one could be put on hold for the moment or could perhaps be kept as Scrivener has it.

As to “which Greek text”, once again the issue of best attested reading is what needs to be dealt with – whether that best attested reading comes from extant Greek texts or from the weight of evidence found in other sources. The issue of “what Greek text” is not really the issue. The translators may not have followed an extant [to Scrivener at the very least] GREEK text or manuscript. The evidence they had for the reading they chose, and followed, evidently (for all we know) came from lectionaries, quotes in the church fathers, confirmation from vernacular versions, etc., and from their point of view best represented the reading of the original Greek text reading.

- *4. I Timothy 4:15 – The text should **NOT** have **en** (en – “in”, “in all things”) as Scrivener has. The KJB translators felt that the better attested reading was without **en** (en; i.e., “to all”). **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THE KJB PROBABLY FOLLOWED THE GREEK OF W/H & C.T. DANA & MANTEY DOESN’T LIST “INTO” EXCEPT VERY RARELY. W/H & C.T. DOES HAVE TE WHICH IS “TO.”**

It is possible that no translational difference would be made if one of the more remote meanings of “en” (“to” as in I Corinthians 7:15) were involved here and thus Scrivener could possibly be left alone.

- *5. I Peter 2:13 – The text should **NOT** have **oun** (oun - “then”, “therefore”) at the beginning of the verse. Scrivener is mistaken here and that “oun” should

NOT be in the text. The KJB translators believed that the best attested reading did not have “oun” here. Cf. Tyndale (and the Latin). **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THE KJB PROBABLY FOLLOWED ALL 4 OF THE GREEK TEXTS I HAVE, INCLUDING THE W/H & C.T.**

I have moved this one as well to the “probably leave Scrivener alone for now” category due to the fact that it is possible that the KJV translators simply left this untranslated here (into English).

- *6. I John 3:20 – Scrivener **wrongly** adds a second οτι (hoti - “for”, “that”, “indeed”) at the beginning of the second phrase. The second “hoti” should **NOT** be in the text. The KJB translators believed that the best attested reading did not have the second “hoti”. Cf. Tyndale (and the Latin). **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THE KJB PROBABLY FOLLOWED ALL THE OTHER 3 OF THE GREEK TEXTS I HAVE, INCLUDING THE W/H & C.T. IS THERE ANY GREEK TEXT THAT OMITTS THE 2ND “HOTI”?**

I have moved this one as well to the “probably leave Scrivener alone for now” category due to the fact that it is possible that the KJV translators simply left this untranslated here (into English).

- *7. II John 3 – The text should read **estw** (estoo - “be”; imperative) and NOT as Scrivener’s mistaken **estai** (estai - “shall be”; future). The KJB translators evidently believed that the best attested reading was **estw** (estoo - “be”; imperative) as was evidenced in Tyndale (and the Latin). **YOU MIGHT BE CORRECT, HOWEVER, I DON’T KNOW IF YOU CAN FIND A GREEK TEXT THAT THEY FOLLOWED THAT HAS AN IMPERATIVE, WHAT IS IT? OTHERWISE, REMEMBER THAT DANA & MANTEY HAVE A SPECIAL USE OF THE FUTURE AS AN “IMPERATIVE FUTURE” WHICH THE KJB MEN MIGHT HAVE USED HERE. ALL 4 OF THE GREEK TEXTS I HAVE USE THE FUTURE TENSE.**

This one could be put on hold as well pending further investigation or could perhaps be kept as Scrivener has it. The imperative future is a valid point.

[As to “which Greek text”, once again the issue of best attested reading is what needs to be dealt with – whether that best attested reading comes from extant Greek texts or from the weight of evidence found in other sources. The issue of “what Greek text” is not really the issue. The translators may not have followed an extant GREEK text or manuscript. The evidence they had for the reading they chose, and followed, evidently (for all we know) came from lectionaries, quotes in the church fathers, confirmation from vernacular versions, etc., and from their point of view best represented the reading of the original Greek text reading.]

- *8. Revelation 6:14 – The text should have the definite article ο (o - “the”) before ouranos (ouranos - “heaven”). Unfortunately, Scrivener omits it here. The KJB translators followed the Complutensian Polyglot and the Plantin Polyglot as the better attested reading. **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THE KJB PROBABLY FOLLOWED THE MAJORITY AND THE W/H & C.T. GREEK TEXTS DO YOU KNOW OF A GREEK TEXT THAT OMITTS THE ARTICLE?**

[Scrivener lists Erasmus’ Complutensian Polyglot and Plantin’s (Antwerp) Polyglot.]

I have moved this to the “probably leave Scrivener alone for now” category because the anarthrous construction could be involved here placing emphasis on something other than identity or mere identity. (cf. Dana & Mantey pp. 138, 149, 150, 151)

- *9. Revelation 9:19 – The text should read **ai gar** (hai gar - “for their”; plural). Scrivener has the singular **h gar** (hee gar - “for the” [power of them ...]). The KJB translators followed Stephanus, Beza, Erasmus, Aldus (1518), Colinaeus (1534). *It is possible that no translational difference would be involved here.* **SCRIVENER IS CORRECT HERE AND YOU ARE NOT CORRECT. SINCE “EXOUSIA” IS SINGULAR, THE ARTICLE (HE) MUST ALSO BE SINGULAR. IT IS “THE POWER OF THEM” OR “THEIR POWER.” STEPHENS HAS “POWERS” SO “HAI” PLURAL IS FITTING THERE.**

Though this could also be put on hold or even perhaps kept as Scrivener has it, I do have an answer to the “objection”. **The KJB translators could have**

used Stephanus here and still translated as singular. There are numerous examples of this in the N.T. but some that quickly comes to mind is in Matthew 14:28 and 14:29 where the plural (hudata) is translated as the singular “water”. I believe that Robertson’s comments on p. 408 are valid here. Additionally the word for “heaven(s)” is usually plural in the phrase “kingdom of heaven” [translated singular]. **THUS IT IS STILL POSSIBLE THAT SCRIVENER IS WRONG HERE AND I AM IN FACT CORRECT AFTER ALL.**

- *10. Revelation 10:7 – Unfortunately Scrivener wrongly has/adds kai (kai – “and”) before telesqh (telesthee - “should be finished”). The KJB followed a reading from the Complutensian Polyglot and the Plantin Polyglot which did not have kai before telesqh believing that it was the best attested reading. **YOU ARE CORRECT, THE SCRIVENER GREEK IS NOT THE ONE FOLLOWED BY THE KJB AS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO FIND. THE KJB PROBABLY FOLLOWED ALL 4 OF THE TEXTS I HAVE WHICH HAVE THE “KAI.” (SCRIVENER, MAJORITY, STEPHENS, & W/H C.T.) DO YOU KNOW OF ANY GREEK TEXT THAT OMITTS THE “KAI”?**

Scrivener indicates in his notes that the KJB translators followed Erasmus here (Complutensian) and the Plantin (Antwerp) Polyglot. [As to “a Greek text which omits the ‘kai’”, once again the issue of best attested reading is what needs to be dealt with – whether that best attested reading comes from extant Greek texts or from the weight of evidence found in other sources. The issue of “what Greek text” is not really the issue. The translators may not have followed an extant GREEK text or manuscript. The evidence they had for the reading they chose, and followed, evidently (for all we know) came from lectionaries, quotes in the church fathers, vernacular versions, etc., and from their point of view best represented the reading of the original Greek text reading.]

However, I have moved this to the “probably leave Scrivener alone for now” category because it is possible that the KJV translators simply left this untranslated here (into English).

- *11. Revelation 11:8 – The text should indeed have the definite article **ths** (tees - “the”) before polews (poleos - “city”). Unfortunately, Scrivener mistakenly omits the definite article here. The KJB followed the majority text reading as being the better attested. **IN THE KJB, THERE ARE**

ONLY TWO “THE” ARTICLES AND SO IN THE SCRIVENER’S TEXT. FROM THIS, IT WOULD APPEAR THAT (REGARDLESS OF PROPER GREEK SYNTAX) SCRIVENER IS CORRECT. THEY REJECTED THE MAJORITY AND W/H C.T. READINGS AND FOLLOWED STEPHENS. I DON’T THINK THE TRANSLATION WOULD BE AFFECTED.

This can probably be left as Scrivener has it, though I’m not ready to grant that Scrivener is definitely correct here. The fact that the translation into ENGLISH is not affected may not mean that a translation into another language would not be affected.

- *12. Revelation 13:8 – The text should indeed have the definite article **του** (tou - “the” [the slain one / the one slain]) before **εσφαγμενου** (esphagmenou - “slain”). Unfortunately, Scrivener wrongly omits the definite article here. The KJB followed the majority text reading, the Complutensian Polyglot, and the Plantin Polyglot. *It is possible that the translation into English would come out the same.* **IN THE KJB, THERE IS ONLY ONE “THE” ARTICLE AND SO IN THE SCRIVENER’S TEXT. FROM THIS, IT WOULD APPEAR THAT (REGARDLESS OF PROPER GREEK SYNTAX) SCRIVENER IS CORRECT. THEY REJECTED THE MAJORITY AND W/H C.T. READINGS AND FOLLOWED STEPHENS. I DON’T THINK THE TRANSLATION WOULD BE AFFECTED.**

This can possibly be left as Scrivener has it, though I’m not ready to grant that Scrivener is definitely correct here. The fact that the translation into ENGLISH is not affected may not mean that a translation into another language would not be affected.

- *13. John 10:16b – The KJB has “one fold” (with the Vulgate and some other versions as being better attested in the opinion of the 54 learned men) while Scrivener has “one flock”. The definition for **ποιμνη** does indeed include the possibility of “fold” so this may be translational rather than textual although there may indeed be a textual issue here. **LET SCRIVENER BE CORRECT HERE. I THINK THIS CAN BE LEFT ALONE. AS YOU SAY, IT MAY BE TRANSLATIONAL RATHER THAN TEXTUAL.**

No problem; though I reiterate that the 54 learned men may have followed a reading which the Latin matched here as being the better attested and best representative reading overall [of the “Original”].

PART III

Summary of Dr. Waite’s Inconsistent, and Contradictory Statements Regarding F. H. A. Scrivener’s Greek Text

As of July 4, 2010, Dr. Waite has still refused to answer this author’s email pointing out the following inconsistencies and contradictions in his [Dr. Waite’s] position. He has also refused to give this author an honest, direct answer to two simple “yes” or “no” questions: 1.) “Does Scrivener’s Greek text need corrected?” And, 2.) “Is the King James Bible without error?” Dr. Waite has said, “I have never charged the KJB with error.” (*A WARNING!!* p.52). Perhaps Dr. Waite has not “charged the KJB with error” in so many words or in those exact words [yet see Addendum 4]. But on the other hand, neither has Dr. Waite come out boldly and directly and said, “The KJB is without error” or, “The KJB is inerrant.” This is something he refuses to do, probably because he does not believe the KJB is without mistake. He has indicated that it is wrong to use the word “inerrant” of the KJB. What other conclusion can be drawn but that Dr. Waite actually believes there are indeed errors in the KJB? He has said, “There need not be any errors in the translation of the KJB.” [email to this author of November 9, 2009]. Of course there “need not be”, but that is not the point. Again, the second question noted earlier which Dr. Waite needs to answer with either “yes” or “no” is, “Are there any errors in the text of the AV1611 King James Bible? He has said, “I haven’t found any.” [Dr. Waite’s response to Bob Barnett at a DBS meeting] Yet He has also said on p.2 of *A WARNING!!*, “I do not believe anyone should use these seven adjectives (in their strictest definitions) for any translations in any language in the world.” Included in this list is the word “inerrant.” Dr. Waite is, of course, including the KJB in his statement. In refusing to use the term “inerrant” even in some “non-strict” way, the only *logical* conclusion is that Dr. Waite implies and indicates that the KJB is not inerrant, and thus has errors. But as has been shown, and will be shown below, logic is something which has clearly escaped Dr. Waite on these matters. Once again he attempts to straddle the fence and have things both ways, a rather unbecoming attitude and approach for an avowed fundamentalist. Nevertheless, either the KJB is without error (error-less, inerrant, accurate, reliable, pure, true, etc.) or it has errors. And Dr. Waite should declare his answer to the question: “Is the KJB without error?” Furthermore he should answer with a definite “yes” or a definite “no”. He should answer with something *other* than the

following dodges: “I have never charged the KJB with error” or, “I haven’t found any errors.” or “I don’t like to use the word ‘inerrant’ of any English or other language translation of the Bible because the word ‘inerrant’ is implied [not really the case, because something can be inerrant without being “God-breathed” – POH] from the Greek word, *theopneustos* (2 Timothy 3:16) which means literally, ‘God-breathed’.” As an aside, he should also remember to answer the first question noted earlier with either “yes” or “no”, “Is Scrivener’s text without error?” Or to put it another way, “Does Scrivener’s text need corrected?” This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to honestly and unequivocally declare his position on the above-mentioned questions.

Maybe Dr. Waite should take the same attitude his wife took some years back: In the *BFT Monthly Newsreport* for July 31, 1986, Dr. Waite’s wife, Yvonne Waite, wrote the following: It was worth the trip just to hear Dr. David Otis Fuller say once again, “There’s not a single mistake in the King James Version; there may be problems, but there is an answer to every one of them. [Emphasis added.] Bolder still would be for Dr. Waite to conclude with David Otis Fuller, whose books Dr. Waite promotes: “There are two objects of Faith I have held for well over fifty years which I find so many scholars, and laymen too, just do not have. **I believe I have the true, pure, inerrant Word of God found in the KJV** which this Sovereign God has kept and used and honored and blessed for the past 375 years. THAT tells me HE expects ME to do the same as long as He gives me breath on planet Earth. **I also believe I worship a God Who KEEPS HIS WORD intact and PURE through the ages**. True, He kept them so in the originals but they are lost forever centuries ago, but I am quite sure He has kept them in the English as well as Greek and Hebrew, God being the original linguist [and] demonstrating so at the Tower of Babel.” [Emphases added.] <<http://www.christianbeliefs.org/kjv/fullerkjv.html>>

Would to God that Dr. Waite would believe and make those same bold statements about the KJB that Dr. D.O. Fuller did.

Dr. Waite’s set of contradictory and inconsistent statements is presented below in chronological order and the contradictory portions are highlighted.

1. December 1999 – Dr. Waite’s Position: Scrivener’s text is the closest to the original words of the original New Testament books.

Publisher’s Forward to The Dean Burgon Society Press edition of Scrivener’s Annotated Greek Text (second to last paragraph): “We believe

that Scrivener's Greek Text which underlies our King James Bible is the closest to the original New Testament."

Dr. Waite is probably correct for saying here that Scrivener's Greek Text "is the closest" to the original New Testament. However, Dr. Waite also knows, based on his use of the word "closest" and based on email correspondence with this author in the Fall of 2008, that he should have said, "... Scrivener's Greek Text, which on the main but not in all cases is the readings which underlie our King James Bible, ...".

2. September 2008 – Dr. Waite's Position: **Scrivener's text is the closest to the original words of the original New Testament books and should be adjusted/corrected so as to match the exact Greek readings underlying the KJB (which are the true T.R. according to Dr. Waite as of the date of September 2008).**

From a September 2008 email to this author: "I have always made it clear that MY TR is made up exclusively of the Words underlying the KJB. That settles it for me and should settle it for anyone. I would like for the English and Greek to be united exactly and precisely." [Emphasis in the original email.]

In the context of the email correspondence, Dr. Waite is indicating that Scrivener's text should be corrected so as to match the exact Greek readings underlying the KJB.

3. April 2010 – Dr. Waite's Position: **Scrivener's text is not at all tainted, is free from error, and is an exact copy of the original words of the original New Testament books.**

From p.28 of Dr. Waite's *A WARNING!! On Gail Riplinger's KJB and Multiple Inspiration Heresy*: "The *Scrivener Greek New Testament* is *not slightly tainted*. I believe the Words in this "*Greek New Testament*" to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words."

This seems to be in direct contradiction to what Dr. Waite indicated that he believed as late as December of 2008, although statements made in Dr. Waite's earlier book, "Defending the King James Bible," also evidence this contradiction. Furthermore, Dr. Waite, in saying that Scrivener's text is an "accurate" and "authentic" copy of the "Words" of the original New Testament, contradicts his earlier stated belief that Scrivener is merely "the closest" to the true T.R. (i.e., the closest to the exact readings underlying the KJB), given that the words "accurate" and "authentic" both mean or imply "inerrant". Webster's 1828 dictionary definition of "accurate" = In exact conformity to truth, or to a standard or rule, or to a model; free from failure, error, or defect. [Emphases added.] Webster's 1828 dictionary definition of "authentic" = Having a genuine original authority, in opposition to that which is false, fictitious, or counterfeit; being what it purports to be; genuine; true; Genuineness; the quality of being of the genuine original; as the authenticity of the scriptures.

4. April 2010 – Dr. Waite's Position: Scrivener's text does NOT match the exact texts/readings underlying the KJB, i.e., it is the closest.

From p.52 of A WARNING!! On Gail Riplinger's KJB and Multiple Inspiration Heresy: "F. H. A. Scrivener's Greek Textus Receptus printed by the Trinitarian Bible Society, **is the closest to the KJB.**" And, "It is true that Scrivener's Greek Text is the closest to the KJB." [Emphasis in the original.]

[From email correspondence with Dr. Waite from the Fall of 2008, he indicated that Scrivener should be corrected to match the readings underlying the KJB, i.e., the true ("MY" – D.A.W.) T.R.]

5. April 2010 – Dr. Waite's Position: Scrivener's text/readings are the exact preserved words of the original Greek New Testament books.

From p.66 of Dr. Waite's A WARNING!! On Gail Riplinger's KJB and Multiple Inspiration Heresy: "I don't '*unwisely*' use Scrivener's Greek New Testament. I believe those [*the words of Scrivener's text – POH*] are the preserved Words of the original New Testament."

[Yet in email correspondence with Dr. Waite from the Fall of 2008, he indicated that Scrivener should be corrected to match the readings underlying the KJB, i.e., the true (“MY” – D.A.W.) T.R.]

6. April 2010 – Dr. Waite’s Position: In **Scrivener’s text** and in the Hebrew text that he [Waite] uses, Waite believes that he has the exact words of the original manuscripts.

From p.52 of A WARNING!! On Gail Riplinger’s KJB and Multiple Inspiration Heresy: “I firmly believe that I have the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”

In context, it seems that Dr. Waite is referring (at least as far as the Greek text is concerned) to Scrivener’s text. If this is not the case, Dr. Waite should say just WHERE those “original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God”, that he has, can be obtained so that Christians can grow as they should (1 Peter 2:2; Matthew 4:4; Luke 4:4).

7. April 2010 – Dr. Waite’s Position: The particular words underlying the KJB are the ones given by plenary verbal inspiration, i.e., **Scrivener’s text is the closest**.

From p.64 of A WARNING!! On Gail Riplinger’s KJB and Multiple Inspiration Heresy: “It is the GRAPHE, (Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words) underlying the King James Bible that were given by plenary verbal inspiration and were Godbreathed (THEOPNEUSTOS).”

Of course that is a true statement, though this author does not necessarily limit the phrase “is given by inspiration of God” to just those original words as originally given in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. There are biblical instances (mentioned later in this work) where some other language was in fact the “original” source language and that language was translated into Hebrew (for example). Yet the words which underlie the KJB are not exactly what Scrivener’s text has and Dr. Waite has DIRECTLY admitted this MORE THAN FIFTEEN TIMES in a Fall 2008 email to this author. Once again, the question which remains to be answered in unequivocal fashion by Dr. Waite is still: Is Scrivener merely

the “closest” or is Scrivener the “accurate” [Webster’s definition of “accurate” = “inerrant” – POH], copy of the inspired, inerrant, infallible original God-breathed Greek words? To put it another way, this author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to answer honestly and directly, with “yes” or “no”: Does Scrivener’s text need corrected in some places?

- 8. April 2010 – Dr. Waite’s Position: Scrivener’s text is the precise readings that underlie[s] the KJB.**

From p.70 of A WARNING!! *Gail Riplinger’s KJB and Multiple Inspiration Heresy*: “He [Scrivener] merely discovered what ‘Greek text’ underlay the King James Bible.”

This is simply not true and Dr. Waite knows it. In emails from the Fall of 2008 and other documentation on file, here are some examples of Dr. Waite contradicting what he said above on p.70 of “A WARNING!!”: Pete, “You are correct. The Scrivener Greek text is not the one followed by the KJB as he was supposed to find.” (14 times) “To be the underlying Greek Text for the KJB, Scrivener should have the article ‘tois’. [Pete]You are correct here.” [i.e., Scrivener is wrong.]

- 9. April 2010 – Dr. Waite’s Position: Dr. Waite [in contradiction to what he said under number 4 above] believes that the readings underlying the KJB are merely the closest to the original words of the New Testament.**

From p.71 of A WARNING!! *On Gail Riplinger’s KJB and Multiple Inspiration Heresy*: “We hold to the Greek text that underlies our King James Bible. We believe it is the closest to the original Words of the New Testament.”

In an email to this author in September of 2008, Dr. Waite said that the correct TR [“MY TR” were his exact words, emphasis his] is the exact readings underlying the KJB. Now he says that the readings underlying the KJB are merely “the closest to the original Words of the New Testament.” Once again, he contradicts himself. It could be that Dr. Waite has not spoken precisely or clearly and that he is in fact referring to Scrivener’s text (as being “closest”). Nevertheless that, too, is still inconsistent with his statement that Scrivener’s text is a copy of the

original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, God-breathed words (and not merely the “closest”).

The consequence of Dr. Waite’s various positions in these points (among other places) is that he is inconsistent, illogical, contradictory, and ultimately, so as not to say “fundamentally”, unbiblical. A comparison of numbers 1, 2, 4, and 7 above with numbers 3, 5, and 6 above brings this out clearly. Especially is this inconsistency, illogic, and contradiction glaring in light of what he wrote to this author in a September 2008 email declaring that the correct TR is the exact readings underlying the KJB. Dr. Waite further admits that in more than fifteen places Scrivener’s text is *not* those readings. Dr. Waite’s problem is that he indicates in certain places that Scrivener’s text is merely the closest and yet in other places he indicates that Scrivener’s text is the accurate [exact], untainted copy of the original Greek words of the New Testament. To this author, those two positions seem mutually exclusive and contradictory. Despite attempts to get Dr. Waite to clarify his position, he has so far refused. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to give a direct “yes” or “no” answer to the two questions mentioned previously, and particularly as to whether or not Scrivener’s text needs corrected. Dr. Waite needs to give an honest and unequivocal answer to the following question, “Is Scrivener’s text an exact copy of the words of the New Testament, or does Scrivener’s text need corrected?” This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to give a clear, honest, direct answer to this question.

Some believe that The Holy Bible in English is the KJB. Dr. Waite does not (although he does call it “the Bible”). He says that the only true/real Holy Bible is the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words that God caused to be written initially. According to Dr. Waite, the true/real Holy Bible is not, and cannot be, a translation in English or in any other language. (*A WARNING!!* p.25) He says, “My Holy Bible is the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments that God Himself breathed out and inspired.” (*A WARNING!!* p.32) Here indeed is the crux of the matter. The fact is that there is no HOLY [i.e., inerrant] BIBLE [“biblos”/ book] in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek available today which has all of the exact texts, readings, words, wording, which underlie the KJB gathered together in one place. Of course if Dr. Waite now says that Scrivener’s text is that Bible (New Testament), contrary to statements he made in the Fall of 2008 to this author, then he must conclude that there are errors in the KJB (because the KJB does not follow Scrivener’s text in some 40 or so places discovered so far by this author, 30 of which have already been communicated to Dr. Waite). So which is it? Scrivener’s text or the exact textual readings/wording that underlies the KJB? Dr. Waite well knows that Scrivener’s text and the readings underlying the KJB do not

match. Which then, pray tell, needs corrected: Scrivener's text, or the KJB? Dr. Waite has so far refused to answer. This author is still "waiting for Dr. Waite" to give a clear, honest, direct and unequivocal answer to that question.

Dr. Waite and this author have discussed this exact problem and the conclusion was that there are about twenty places found so far where Scrivener is **NOT** an "accurate copy of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words". Here are some examples: Pete, "You are correct. The Scrivener Greek text is not the one followed by the KJB as he was supposed to find." (14 times) "To be the underlying Greek Text for the KJB, Scrivener should have the article 'tois' – Rev. 21:8. (Pete)You are correct here."] As I, and Dr. Waite, noted: if Scrivener clearly does not use the underlying word that the KJB translators used, then one or the other is wrong. In Dr. Waite's comments to this author, and to others via email cc, Dr. Waite indicated that Scrivener's text was wrong. Is Dr. Waite now saying that he was mistaken in making those comments? This author is "still waiting for Dr. Waite" to honestly and unequivocally state whether Scrivener's text needs corrected or not.

Dr. Waite's email to this author (see Part II of this work) indicated that he realized that Scrivener's words were not exactly the words which underlie the KJB in about 20 places. This is confirmed by his saying that Scrivener's text is the "closest" (*A WARNING!!* p.52). But he also says that the words of Scrivener's text are "copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words." (*A WARNING!!* p.28). **THIS IS DOUBLE TALK!** If Scrivener's text needs corrected, as Dr. Waite indicated in his September 2008 email to this author, then Scrivener's text is **NOT** "copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words." If on the other hand Scrivener's text is indeed "copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words," then Dr. Waite should retract his statements to this author and others where he said that Scrivener's text is not correct in some places. Dr. Waite should therefore also retract his statements that Scrivener's text is merely "the closest". The proverbial "monkey wrench" (contradiction!) in all this is that Dr. Waite also told this author that the correct, "TR is made up exclusively of the exact Words underlying the KJB. That settles it for me and should settle it for anyone. I would like for the English and the Greek to be united exactly and precisely." But of course Dr. Waite can't have it both ways. Scrivener's text does not precisely and exactly match the readings underlying the KJB. So either Scrivener's text is right and the KJB wrong (in error), or the KJB is right and Scrivener's text is wrong (in error and not an exact copy of the original words of the Greek New Testament). Scrivener's text cannot be merely "closest" and at the same time be an accurate copy of that which

is/was inerrant. This author is “still waiting for Dr. Waite” to clearly answer the question as to whether or not there are errors in Scrivener’s text.

As a professed fundamentalist, Dr. Waite ought to respond clearly, honestly, directly, sincerely, and unequivocally to the following two questions:

- 1. DOES SCRIVENER’S TEXT NEED CORRECTED TO MATCH THE EXACT READINGS UNDERLYING THE KJB? (YES OR NO)**
- 2. DOES THE KJB NEED CORRECTED TO MATCH SCRIVENER’S TEXT? (YES OR NO)**

This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to respond honestly and unequivocally to the above two questions with a “yes” or “no” answer to each.

PART IV

An Examination of Dr. Waite’s Confused, Inconsistent, and Contradictory Statements Regarding F. H. A. Scrivener’s Greek Text in *Defending the King James Bible* [1996 edition]

p.xii of *Defending the King James Bible* – In his list of differences between the *TEXTUS RECEPTUS* and the W/H text, a helpful list in any case for the purposes of *general* comparison, Dr. Waite says that there are 140,521 Greek words in the *TR*. Dr. Jack Moorman, with whom Dr. Waite agrees on the following matter and whom he cites, says that there are a total of 2,886 WORDS which have been eliminated from the *Received Text* that underlies the KING JAMES NEW TESTAMENT by the Revised Text of *Nestle-Aland* Edition which follows The ‘B/ALEPH’ (VATICAN/SINAI manuscripts) [*Defending the King James Bible*, p.184].

Here, both Dr. Waite and Dr. Moorman should specify WHICH “Received Text” they are referring to. This author assumes Scrivener’s text is in view. If that is the case then they both must realize that Scrivener’s text differs from the exact text underlying the KJB in at least forty places noted so far by this author. Thus the numbers mentioned by both Drs. Waite and Moorman are only approximate (a close approximation, but only that).

For Dr. Waite to be thoroughly honest, clear, and precise here, he should mention WHICH TR he is referring to. If he is referring to Scrivener’s text, then

that should be mentioned. In any case, as has been shown previously in this work, the exact number of words in the true TR (the exact readings underlying the KJB) will be different from the number of words in Scrivener's text. Which number, in fact, would be the correct number of words in THE TR (the exact readings underlying the KJB)? This is especially pertinent since Scrivener himself has eliminated or changed a number of words "from the [true] Received Text that underlies the King James New Testament".

p.39 – Dr. Waite says, "The KING JAMES BIBLE used a text (which the Trinitarian Bible Society has reprinted) called *HE KainE DiathEkE* (The New Covenant or Testament). This was copied from the Greek text produced by Dr. Frederick H. A. Scrivener and published by the Cambridge University Press in 1894, originally. This Textus Receptus that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE New Testament ..." "This Greek text [of Scrivener's – POH] is the exact text which underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE. I don't believe it needs any revising." [Underlining added]

Now Dr. Waite knows full well that Scrivener's text is NOT the exact text which underlies the KJB as was shown in PARTS II and III above and this author is still "waiting for Dr. Waite" to explain himself clearly and honestly on the matter.

p.39-40 – Dr. Waite says, "It [in context he is referring to Scrivener's text – POH] is the best, and the only foundation as far as I can see, to use to translate the New Testament from the Greek language into English or any other language."

There is a real problem here with regard to Dr. Waite's affirmations. If Scrivener's text is "the only foundation" to use for translation work, then the translation which results will not match the King James Bible. This is so because Scrivener's text does NOT match the exact text (readings) underlying the King James Bible. The consequence of this problem is that there will be two "Bibles" ("Words of God") which will not only not match, but may be contradictory or teach two entirely different things. What, exactly, should a translator do in this situation according to Dr. Waite? Follow Scrivener's text, or follow the exact text underlying the KJB? "Tell us plainly", Dr. Waite. If "follow Scrivener's text" [which would contradict what Dr. Waite has said in PART II above], then Dr. Waite must admit that there are errors in the KJB, and he can no longer say, "I have not found any translation errors in the KING JAMES BIBLE." (Defending the King James Bible, p.240) In any case, this latter statement is a "dodge" given the fact that Dr. Waite ought to be able to answer "yes" or "no" to a simple question: "Are there any errors in the KJB?" This author is still "waiting for Dr. Waite" to honestly and unequivocally answer that question with

a “yes” or “no” answer. If the answer to the translating question is to “follow the exact text underlying the KJB”, then Dr. Waite is going to have to retract his statements that “the Words in this ‘Greek New Testament’ [Scrivener’s text – POH]” are a copy “of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Words” of the Greek New Testament. Dr. Waite in fact contradicted this latter statement in PART II above by saying that Scrivener needed corrected – unless of course Dr. Waite wishes to say that the “original Words” need corrected, something this author highly doubts Dr. Waite would believe. Once again, this author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to clarify these contradictory statements. As an aside, Dr. Waite also forgets the words of Dr. Phil Stringer, Pastor of Ravenswood Baptist Church of Chicago, IL. Dr. Stringer says, “The Scriptures never tell us that translation must be done from the original languages. To teach that as a doctrine is to add to the Word of God.” Now THAT is a good “WARNING!!” about what is evidently a real “HERESY”, and not just a straw-man “heresy” such as Dr. Waite lays to the charge of Riplinger.

p.48 – Dr. Waite says, “... the WORDS of the Received Greek and Masoretic Hebrew texts that underlie the KING JAMES BIBLE are the very WORDS which God has PRESERVED down through the centuries, being the exact WORDS of the ORIGINALS themselves.

Due to Dr. Waite’s equivocating on the matter, the question must be asked, “WHERE, precisely, can one get a copy of those exact ‘WORDS’ of the Received Greek and Masoretic Hebrew texts that underlie the KJB?” At times, it seems as if Dr. Waite would answer, “Scrivener’s text” (which he of course knows is not the case), while at other times he simply does not declare anything which might enable one to know just WHERE such a thing exists. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to declare unequivocally and precisely just WHERE one can obtain said “PRESERVED WORDS”.

p.48 – “As such [i.e., as the exact preserved words of the originals – POH], I believe they are **INSPIRED WORDS.**” And on p.240, “...the HEBREW/ARAMAIC and GREEK TEXTS that underlie the KING JAMES BIBLE have been PRESERVED by God Himself so that these texts [and only these “original language texts” according to Dr. Waite – POH] can properly be called ‘**INERRANT**’ as well as being the very ‘**INSPIRED and INFALLIBLE WORDS OF GOD**’!! I think that INERRANCY has to do [only – POH] with God’s words in the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek.” [Emphases are Dr. Waite’s]

Here Dr. Waite seems to be saying that the exact copies of the original words of the original New Testament books are inspired. This seems to contradict what he has affirmed elsewhere in saying, “The only proper

“inspiration” of Scriptures was a one-time miracle, never to be repeated, when God Himself caused to be written down the Words of the Bible in Hebrew, a little Aramaic, and Greek.” (A WARNING!! p.38, emphases added) If “inspiration” or being “God-breathed” “was” a “one-time, never to be repeated” event/act that took place only in the first century “when” a book of the New Testament was first written, then how can mere [exact] later copies of the original words be “inspired”, or “given by inspiration of God”, or “God-breathed” (Dr. Waite’s synonym for “inspired” and for “given by inspiration of God”). This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to explain this apparent (at the very least) contradiction.

Interestingly enough, Dr. Bob Barnett has stated, “Any exact copy of the Words of the original manuscripts is as much the inspired and inerrant Word of God as were the original manuscripts.” (Paper presented to the 22nd annual meeting of the DBS in 2000; emphases are Dr. Barnett’s)

p.61 – Dr. Waite says that the Greek New Testament which underlies our KING JAMES BIBLE is “absolutely worthy of being trusted and believed by us today or in any future age!”

This is a true statement, at least for those in the “us” group who are fluent in [Hebrew, Aramaic, and] Greek. However, one problem which Dr. Waite has here is that said “Greek New Testament” does not exist in published form. Scrivener’s text is not the exact text which underlies our King James Bible as has been proven earlier (despite Dr. Waite’s equivocation and contradictory statements on the matter). Another problem is how can one tell the exact text (readings) which underlie our King James Bible without using the King James Bible to ultimately determine those readings? This is something to which Dr. Waite has strongly reacted (in a negative way) by saying things like, “You are trying to get me to say the English translation is superior to the Greek. I do not believe that.” Yet practically speaking, absent the originals, Dr. Waite has no other choice but to proceed in that fashion if he wants the exact readings underlying the KJB (which he says is “MY TR” [Emphasis is Dr. Waite’s]). Again, the confusion which is left in the wake of Dr. Waite’s statements has never been explained as far as this author knows, nor has Dr. Waite explained how his statements can be reconciled. Furthermore, Dr. Waite has not shown why this same statement (“absolutely worthy of being trusted and believed by us today or in any future age”) cannot be applied to the King James Bible, that is to say that the KJB is inerrant. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” on the above-mentioned matters.

p.218 – Dr. Waite refers numerous times to “the *Textus Receptus*” and “the *Received Text*”.

In context, one must conclude that Dr. Waite is referring to Scrivener’s text since he refers to various schools which use “the Received Text”. If Dr. Waite is referring to Scrivener’s text, and it seems that he is, then he has contradicted what he said in a series of emails to this author in 2008 which were reproduced above. In those emails he said, “MY TR is made up exclusively of the exact Words underlying the KJB.” In this statement Dr. Waite is implying that THE Received Text is the exact readings underlying the KJB. And he has also acknowledged that Scrivener’s text is not those exact readings. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite”, to answer honestly and directly the question of whether Scrivener’s text needs corrected or not (a simple “yes” or “no” response is what Dr. Waite ought to give).

PART V

An Examination of Dr. Waite’s Inconsistent and Contradictory Procedure in Using Certain Terms with Reference to the KJB in his book, A WARNING!!

Based on this author’s own background, he can fully appreciate Dr. Waite’s hesitancy in using the word “inspired”, “inspired by/of God”, “God-breathed”, and terms related to those expressions, of the KJB – *a mistaken hesitancy* as far as this author is concerned. Nevertheless it does not follow biblically nor logically that Dr. Waite should ban a number of other terms to describe the KJB – terms which biblically, logically, and consistency-wise can correctly be used of the KJB. One possibility (among several) is that Dr. Waite does not understand the meanings and implications of those various terms. This problem will be addressed shortly. Another possibility is that he has not realized that his inconsistent and contradictory procedure on the matters involved is actually evidence of unbiblical thinking. That possibility will be addressed later in this work.

Dr. Waite says:

“I stand for the King James Bible as the Word of God in English,” (A *WARNING!!* p.33)

“I do not believe anyone should use these seven adjectives [preserved, original, **inspired**, inerrant, infallible, perfect, pure – for the moment note the inclusion of the word “pure” in this list – POH] (in their strictest definitions) for any translations in any language of the world.” (A *WARNING!!* p.2)

A small taste of the issue here is that since Dr. Waite seemingly has no problem calling the KJB “the Word of God in English” [emphasis added], he should consequently and logically have no problem saying that the KJB is pure (Psalm 119:140 – “thy word *is* very pure;”). This would be the biblically consistent position if he is going to use the phrase “the Word of God” with reference to the KJB (Proverbs 30:5 – “every word of God *is* pure:”). Yet Dr. Waite insists that the word “pure” should never be used of any Bible translation. The general problem of inconsistency and contradiction which Dr. Waite exhibits is that he quotes from and refers to the KJB, indicating that it is “the Word of God” (etc.), “Scripture”, “the Scriptures” and other similar terms, and yet does not apply the same terms/descriptions that the Bible uses to describe or characterize “the word of God” or “scripture”. These dichotomous, inconsistent, and contradictory expressions by Dr. Waite remain unreconciled and unexplained. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to explain how he can reconcile his position and affirmations with the scriptural statements.

The first set of terms below are terms that Dr. Waite says are acceptable to use with regard to the KJB. But as will be seen, in their definitions they either mean or imply the same things as the second set of terms which Dr. Waite says cannot and should not be used of the KJB or any other Bible translation. For the specific purposes of this work, the particular issue of whether the KJB can be considered “inspired” or “is given by inspiration of God” will not be addressed in any detailed way, although it seems to this author that even a cursory understanding of the above terms would lead to the conclusion that the KJB can be considered the “inspired word(s) of God” in English.

Set 1 – Dr. Waite’s acceptable terms to use regarding the KJB

“**accurate**” - In exact conformity to truth, or to a standard or rule, or to a model; free from failure, error, or defect; (Webster’s 1828 Dictionary) Though Dr. Waite indicates that it is acceptable to use the word “accurate” of the KJB, nevertheless he says that one should not describe the KJB as being “free from error”, i.e., inerrant. This is double-speak (a violation of James 5:12). The word “accurate” means “free from error” or “inerrant” and thus, logically and biblically speaking, either both words can legitimately be used of the KJB or neither should be used of the KJB. Dr. Waite should be logically and biblically consistent in this matter.

“**true**” - Genuine; pure; real; not counterfeit, adulterated or false; (Webster’s 1828 Dictionary) Though Dr. Waite indicates that it is acceptable to use the word “true” of the KJB, nevertheless he says that one should not describe

the KJB as being “pure”. Again this is double-speak (a violation of James 5:12). The word “true” means “pure” and thus, logically and biblically speaking, either both words can legitimately be used of the KJB or neither should be used of the KJB. Dr. Waite should be logically and biblically consistent in this matter.

“**reliable**” - suitable or fit to be relied on : **DEPENDABLE**

< <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reliable> > In the case of the Word of God (the Bible, the KJB), the question Dr. Waite should honestly and unequivocally answer is whether the KJB can be **COMPLETELY** relied on in every place and in every word. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to answer this question.

“**kept**” - preserved; keep = to preserve (Webster’s 1828 Dictionary) “to preserve” (Hebrew parallelism in Psalm 12:7) Though Dr. Waite indicates that it is acceptable to use the word “kept” of the KJB, nevertheless he says that one should not describe the KJB as being the “preserved” word(s) of God. The word “kept” or “keep” means to “preserve” and thus, logically and biblically speaking, either both words can legitimately be used of the KJB or neither should be used of the KJB. Dr. Waite should be logically and biblically consistent in this matter.

“**intact**” - integral: constituting the undiminished entirety; lacking nothing essential; especially not damaged.

<<http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn>>

The very definition of “intact” argues for the concept of the KJB being without mistake (if Dr. Waite wishes to use the word “intact” with reference to the KJB). Thus “intact” and “inerrant” in this context can both be used of the KJB. However Dr. Waite refuses to be biblically and logically consistent in this matter by agreeing that it is acceptable to use the word “intact” but not the word “inerrant” regarding the KJB.

“**faithful**” - True; exact; in conformity to the letter and spirit; Conformable to truth; True (see above = “pure”); worthy of belief. “Faithful” and “true”/“pure” are essentially synonyms and both can thus be used of the KJB. Dr. Waite’s banning of the word “pure” with reference to the KJB evidences, biblically speaking, an inconsistency and a lack of logic in this matter.

[worthy of] “**confidence**” - A trusting, or reliance; an assurance of mind or firm belief in the integrity, stability or veracity of another, or in the truth and reality of a fact. All three of the underlined words point to the fact that the object of confidence is “pure”. Yet Dr. Waite, in his inconsistency and illogic, bans the word “pure” from being used of the KJB while allowing the use of the phrase “worthy of confidence”. Without inerrancy, Dr. Waite

makes the KJB into a kind of “unfaithful man” which is for practical purposes like a “broken tooth and a foot out of joint” in which one should NOT put “confidence” (Proverbs 25:19).

“God’s Word” (etc.) - Bible: the sacred writings of the Christian religions; < wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn > A message from God; the Scriptures; the Bible < en.wiktionary.org/wiki/word_of_God > The word “sacred” according to Webster’s 1828 dictionary means, “Holy; pertaining to God or to his worship; Proceeding from God and containing religious precepts; as the sacred books of the Old and New Testament. 3. Narrating or writing facts respecting God and holy things; Inviolable”. These words all point to the concept of inerrancy, so that if Dr. Waite truly wishes to be consistent, biblically speaking, he will either have to allow the use of the word “inerrant” and “holy” to be used of the KJB, or he will have to quit using the terms “Word of God”, “God’s Word”, and similar, of the KJB. The concern that this author has is that Dr. Waite, in practice, appears to be engaging in neo-orthodox methodology here by changing the “locus” of the “Word of God” from the very words, to meaning that the “message” of the KJB is the “Word of God”, but that the KJB is not really the [inerrant] “words” of God.

“Scripture(s)” - the books of the Old and New Testament; the Bible. The word is used either in the singular or plural number, to denote the sacred writings or divine oracles, called sacred or holy, as proceeding from God. (Webster’s 1828 Dictionary) Given this definition, and given Dr. Waite’s calling of the KJB “Scripture”, to be consistent he should have not problem calling the KJB “inerrant” (Titus 1:2), “pure” (Psalm 119:140), “preserved” (Psalm 12:6-7), “infallible” (Genesis 18:25b; Titus 1:2), or “perfect” (James 1:25; Psalm 19:7; Matthew 5:48; Deuteronomy 32:4; 2 Samuel 22:31; Psalm 18:30). The fact that “proceeding from God” is a characteristic of “scripture”, may even argue for the acceptability of using the term “God-breathed” or “given by inspiration of God” for the KJB. To be biblically consistent and logical, Dr. Waite will either have to allow and grant the acceptability of using the above terms of the KJB, or he will have to quit using the term “Scripture” of the KJB.

Despite Dr. Bob Barnett’s “antics with semantics” in his presentations and papers to the DBS, and his double-talk with regard to words like “Scripture”, “God’s Word”, “authentic”, etc., (and the Bible itself doesn’t recognize such antics), nevertheless, with regard to the above set of terms, this author would like Dr.

Waite to apply Dr. Phil Stringer's conviction as described in his article, "The King James Only Baptist Civil War Over Inspiration", where he [Dr. Stringer] says, "Using a Biblical term in a non-Biblical way opens a new avenue of attack for the King James Bible." Specifically, Dr. Waite (and Dr. Barnett) uses the terms "Word(s) of God", "God's Word(s)", "Scripture(s)", and similar terms of the KJB. But he does not use them the way that the Bible uses them.

Set 2 – Dr. Waite's unacceptable terms to use regarding the KJB

"inspired" - (or "God-breathed" to use Dr. Waite's term, although the biblical term is that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God") Breathed in; inhaled; infused. Informed or directed by the Holy Spirit. The infusion of ideas into the mind by the Holy Spirit; the conveying into the minds of men, ideas, notices or monitions by extraordinary or supernatural influence; or the communication of the divine will to the understanding by suggestions or impressions on the mind, which leave no room to doubt the reality of their supernatural origin. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God. 2 Timothy 3. (Webster's 1828 Dictionary). Based on the above definitions, Dr. Waite really has no linguistic nor biblical reason for banning the use of this term ("inspired") of the King James Bible as the word(s) of God. The King James translators knew full well what the words meant in 2 Timothy 3:16, and they knew full well what they wrote in 2 Timothy 3:16, including "is given by inspiration" (and not "God-breathed"). In their preface, they also seem to have had no problems calling translations (including the KJB) "scripture".

"inerrant" - Latin *inerrant-*, *inerrans*, from *in-* + *errant-*, *errans*, present participle of *errare* to err : free from error

< <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/inerrant> >

1. Incapable of erring; infallible. **2.** Containing no errors. The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition copyright ©2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Updated in 2009. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company. This author is still "waiting for Dr. Waite" to address the fact that if the KJB is "God's Word" (a term Dr. Waite approves of), then there is no way it can have errors. It is thus inerrant, i.e., "contains no errors". Furthermore, Dr. Phil Stringer, Pastor of Ravenswood Baptist Church in Chicago, IL, in his article entitled, "The King James Only Baptist Civil War Over Inspiration", says, "I believe that the King James Bible is God's Word kept intact in English. [See, however, this author's (POH) comments on the words "kept" and "intact"] There is not one word in the King James Bible that I would change." If that is so, then the KJB must be

without mistake, without error, inerrant. And Dr. Stringer, contrary to Dr. Waite's ban, says, "I believe that the King James Bible is pure, perfect and inerrant!" [Emphases added]. Well said!

"preserved" - Saved from injury, destruction or decay; kept or defended from evil; To keep or defend from corruption ("incorrupt" = not defiled or depraved; pure; sound; untainted); (Webster's 1828 Dictionary) All of the underlined words call to mind words from Dr. Waite's "acceptable list of words to use regarding the KJB." Thus there is no logical reason for Dr. Waite to say that the word "preserved" should not be used of the KJB. Additionally, the logical consequence of Dr. Waite's position is that if he says "preserved" cannot be used of the KJB, then he must admit that the KJB is corrupt, not kept, impure, depraved, decaying, evil, and tainted.

"infallible" - 1. Not fallible; not capable of erring; entirely exempt from liability to mistake; applied to persons. No man is infallible; to be infallible is the prerogative of God only. 2. Not able to fail, or to deceive confidence; certain. This definition would mean that to be consistent, Dr. Waite will either have to allow the term "infallible" to be used of the KJB, or he will have to quit using the phrase "worthy of confidence" regarding the KJB. Furthermore, if he continues to ban the use of the word "infallible" of the KJB, then logically he ought not to call the KJB "GOD'S Word". Dr. Waite's "God" is too small and weak, yea fallible, if "He" cannot and/or will not give an infallible word to those who are not fluent in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. This author is still "waiting for Dr. Waite" to explain how an infallible God (the God of the Bible) can give "His Word" in the English KJB, but not have "His Word" to be infallible.

"pure" - Genuine; real; true; incorrupt; unadulterated. See comments on "true" above. Also, to be consistent biblically and logically, Dr. Waite will either have to allow the word "pure" to be used of the KJB as "the Word of God" (a phrase Dr. Waite uses to describe the KJB), per Psalm 119:140, or he will have to quit using the phrase "Word of God" and similar phrases regarding the KJB.

"perfect" - finished; complete; consummate; not defective; having all that is requisite to its nature and kind. (Webster's 1828 Dictionary) The question Dr. Waite should answer honestly and unequivocally is, "Does the KJB have ALL that is requisite to be called the word(s) of God?" If so (and Dr. Waite does call the KJB, "the Word of God"), then Dr. Waite should have no problem calling the KJB "perfect". Is the KJB without defect? If so, then there is no problem in calling it "perfect". In their Preface, even the KJB translators themselves spoke of "the perfection of Scripture" and in the

immediate context it seems that they were not referring to only the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek.

An additional fallacy to which Dr. Waite subscribes is that although he refuses to use the word “inspired”, “inspired of God”, “God-breathed”, etc., in describing the KJB, his conclusion does not follow that it is also wrong to use the word “inerrant” of the KJB. Even if one did not want to accept that the KJB is inspired as Dr. Waite understands the term, it could still be inerrant. A book, and particularly one which Dr. Waite refers to as “the Word of God in English,” [emphasis added] can be inerrant (Titus 1:2 – God cannot lie) without necessarily being “inspired by God” or “given by inspiration of God.” There is no necessary preclusion of inerrancy even if inspiration per se, as Dr. Waite understands the term, is not involved. This author is “still waiting for Dr. Waite” to unequivocally refute this inconsistency in his position.

If one did not want to accept that the KJB is inspired, it does not necessarily follow that the KJB is not the exact preserved words of God in English (for those who know English) or that one should not use the term “preserved” of the KJB. God would not necessarily have had to “breathe out” the words of the KJB (to use Dr. Waite’s expression) in order to sovereignly and providentially and exactly preserve them as His words in English. This author is “still waiting for Dr. Waite” to respond to this possibility.

If the words of the text of the KJB are indeed God’s preserved words, i.e., “the Word of God” (Psalm 12:7), and as mentioned, even Dr. Waite’s denial of their being inspired does not preclude this, then they would in fact be infallible (Titus 1:2). The text of the KJB cannot be mistaken if it is His words, and especially if it is His preserved words. Furthermore, even lacking “inspiration”, as Dr. Waite understands the term, the KJB must therefore be perfect (Psalm 19:7; James 1:23,25), in order to be called the Word of God (which Dr. Waite does). There is no necessary logical connection between something being perfect and being inspired (or “God-breathed”). This author is “still waiting for Dr. Waite” to explain this dichotomy in his thinking.

If one describes the KJB as the Word (or Words) of God, then biblically and logically speaking, the KJB must be considered pure (Psalm 119:140 – “Thy word *is* very pure”; Proverbs 30:5 – “Every word of God is pure:”; Psalm 12:6 – “The words of the LORD *are* pure words; *as* silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.”). Yet Dr. Waite denies that the KJB can be considered “pure”. This

author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to explain this inconsistency and contradiction in his terminology.

If one describes the KJB as the Word (or Words) of God, then biblically and logically speaking, the KJB must be considered perfect – James 1:25; Psalm 19:7. Yet Dr. Waite denies that the KJB can be considered “perfect”. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to explain this contradiction in his terminology.

If Dr. Waite is going to admit that the KJB is “the Word of God in English” and “Scripture” [emphases added], then to be biblically consistent, as well as logical, he must also agree to the KJB being “pure”, “inerrant”, “preserved”, “infallible”, and “perfect”. His only other consistent, non-contradictory, logical option is to quit saying that the KJB is “the Word of God” [in English].

PART VI

An Examination of Dr. Waite’s Inconsistent, and Contradictory Statements Regarding the KJB itself in *Defending the King James Bible* [1996 edition]

p. v – Dr. Waite quotes a poem about THE BIBLE. The poem was written by his mother-in-law, Gertrude Grace Barker Sanborn. Mrs. Sanborn uses the following pertinent words to describe “THE BIBLE”: “eternal”, “immutable”, “BOOK”, “Inspired”, “inerrant”, “complete”, “holy”, “verbally true”, “for profit”, “Infallible”, “the BIBLE”, “the exact WORD OF GOD”.

The real question in light of the equivocating of Dr. Waite with regard to the KJB is, “To what, exactly, was Mrs. Sanborn referring?” It seems as if she was referring to something she had in her hand (she repeats the word, “my,” six times) which means she was probably referring to the King James Bible. It is possible that Mrs. Sanborn was fluent in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek and that she knew the exact readings underlying the KJB (though absent the originals and the specific details from the KJB translators, she would have had to rely on the KJB itself to determine those readings), and thus “her” “BIBLE”, which had all those characteristics mentioned above, would not necessarily have been the KJB, but rather something between two covers which had all the exact words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to pronounce on exactly what Mrs. Sanborn was referring to, and on the specific words she used (of the KJB?).

p. xi – Dr. Waite says, “One vital question is: Which English Bible are we to read, study, memorize, preach from, and use today?”

An excellent question, but Dr. Waite has omitted perhaps the most telling item from that question: “Which English Bible are we to believe in its entirety as being fully and exactly correct (i.e., “inerrant” – see word definitions previously discussed)?” This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to show why the text of the KJB should not be believed in its entirety as well as in every detail. If Dr. Waite says that the text of the KJB should not be believed or cannot be believed in its entirety as well as in every detail, then he ought to be honest and say that there is error in the KJB. Furthermore, Dr. Waite should show why and where the KJB is not inerrant, i.e., he should show where its errors are.

p. xi – Dr. Waite says, “A second important question is: Which English Bible can we hold in our hands and say with great confidence, ‘This is the WORD OF GOD in English’?”

An extremely pertinent question, but Dr. Waite leaves unanswered at least two further directly related questions which are directly related to the issues involved. 1.) Which Bible can we hold in our hands and say with COMPLETE, ABSOLUTELY 100% confidence, “This is the WORD OF GOD in English?” 2.) Is this King James Bible which we can hold in our hands the very words of God that He wants us to have in English? This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to unequivocally answer those two questions. Furthermore, it is inconsistent and unbiblical for Dr. Waite to call the KJB “the Word of God in English”, and yet refuse to say that one should put COMPLETE, ABSOLUTELY 100% confidence in the text of the KJB. It is really dodging the issue, if not downright deceptive, to speak with “great confidence” about the KJB, but not say that one can/should have COMPLETE, ABSOLUTELY 100% confidence. What Dr. Waite leaves unsaid here (“Be careful not to put COMPLETE confidence in the KJB because the only real and firm foundation for our faith today is the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words.”), is actually deceptive on his part, even if unintentional.

p.xi – Notice how Dr. Waite dodges the answers to the above three more specific questions mentioned in the previous two items by saying that he answers “BOTH of the above [his] questions by pointing to THE KING JAMES BIBLE, proving its superiority ...” [Emphases are Dr. Waite’s].

The conclusion which must be drawn from this is that more than likely, Dr. Waite would say that the KJB is “superior” and therefore it should be “used” (but not necessarily believed in its entirety as being without mistake or error), and that the KJB is “superior” and therefore one can have “great” confidence in it (but not necessarily complete confidence in it as being the preserved, inerrant,

pure, perfect word/words of God in English). This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to unequivocally declare what he really believes on the matter.

p.1, 6, 7, 9, 20, 62, 216 – Dr. Waite says, or says words to the effect that, “we say the KING JAMES BIBLE is ‘GOD’S WORD KEPT INTACT,’” [“accurate”, “faithful”]

There are in fact three problems which Dr. Waite must face in making this statement.

The first problem is that he calls the King James Bible, “God’s Word”. Thus all of the terms mentioned above (biblical descriptions of the word of God), whose use regarding the KJB Dr. Waite wishes to ban and which he will not use of the KJB, must be able to be applied to the KJB if Dr. Waite wishes to be clear, unequivocal, consistent, logical, and biblical. Furthermore, to even use the term “GOD’S WORD” of the KJB contradicts Dr. Waite’s own statements that it is HERESY [Dr. Waite’s emphasis] to believe that the KJB is something other than the words of mere men. On p.51 of A WARNING!., he says, “... exalting the English King James Bible translation by men ... as superior over God’s own Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. This is pure HERESY!” [Underlining is this author’s; emphasis on “HERESY” is Dr. Waite’s]

In referring to Gail Riplinger’s belief that the words of the King James Bible are the scripture (in English) given by inspiration of God, Dr. Waite says, “Again she is exalting man’s English as being superior to God’s Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words. In effect, Gail Riplinger believes in a deification of man and his works as superior to Almighty God and His works. This is HERESY and blasphemy!” [Emphasis on “HERESY” is Dr. Waite’s and the other emphases are this author’s] Here, Dr. Waite PRESUMES, PRESUPPOSES, and ASSUMES that Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek are superior to English when from God’s perspective as the creator of languages there is no fundamental, logical, or biblical reason why this MUST be so.

And, says Dr. Waite, “She totally REPLACES the Old and New Testament original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of God, with the English King James translation which are the words of men. This REPLACEMENT is serious doctrinal HERESY!” [Underlining is this author’s; other emphases are Dr. Waite’s]

And also, “All translations are words chosen by the translators who are men, not words chosen and given by God.” Just how Dr. Waite KNOWS FOR SURE that there is no translation whose words were chosen by God (unproven by Dr. Waite), or more precisely just how he KNOWS FOR SURE that all translations are merely the words of men and not the words of God, remains unexplained at the moment.

Dr. Waite's problem is a presuppositional one. He presupposes that God could not or would not have a translation made that is, in fact, His words in that given language. Once again, Dr. Waite's "God" is too small and too weak. And here, it seems, Dr. Waite himself is the one who is implicitly deifying any man or men who have compiled the Hebrew, Aramaic, and/or Greek texts to which he refers. This author is still "waiting for Dr. Waite" to explain his equivocating mentality on these matters.

*The second problem is that Dr. Waite refers to the KJB as God's Word "kept" intact. The word "kept" means and implies "preserved". Webster's 1828 dictionary defines "kept" as: "to preserve; to retain; to preserve from falling or from danger; to protect; to guard or sustain; to preserve in any tenor or state." Given those definitions, it is inconsistent and contradictory for Dr. Waite to use the term "kept" [intact] of the KJB and yet refuse to use the word "preserved" of the KJB when he says, "I do not believe anyone should use these seven adjectives [preserved, original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, perfect, pure – here, note the inclusion of the word "preserved" in this list – POH] (in their strictest definitions) for any translations in any language of the world." (A WARNING!! p.2) Now the REALLY strange thing about this is that Dr. Waite himself goes against his own "ban" on using the word "preserved" words of God" of the KJB on p.115 of *Defending the King James Bible* when he says, "It is His WORDS that must be preserved and they have been [i.e., have been preserved – POH] in our KING JAMES BIBLE in the English language." This author is still "waiting for Dr. Waite" to explain this contradictory behavior. This author has several explanations to offer for this contradiction such as, Dr. Waite has a sin nature and a finite mind. And/or Dr. Waite is just plain wrong for suggesting his ban on using the word "preserved" words of God regarding the KJB.*

*The third problem which Dr. Waite must face is his use of the word "intact" regarding the King James Bible. The word "intact" means, "integral: constituting the undiminished entirety <
http://www.google.ro/url?q=http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn%3Fs%3Dintact&sa=X&ei=N2ggTJjAESP_OaElMwd&ved=0CBIOpAMoAA&usg=AFQjCNHibfuIefgpIiR1g7OIGcx6r1ebxQ >; untouched especially by anything that harms or diminishes : ENTIRE, UNINJURED." If Dr. Waite wishes to use the word "intact" of the KJB, then to be consist he must say that the KJB is the completely ("undiminished") preserved word(s) of God in English. This author is still "waiting for Dr. Waite" to resolve this inconsistency and to "tell us plainly", i.e., "yes" or "no", whether he believes the KJB is without mistake. Dr. Waite should check off which one of the following is indeed the case:*

- The text of the KJB is without mistake (is inerrant)*
- The text of the KJB has mistake(s) (has error[s])*

p.6 – Dr. Waite says, “GOD PROMISED BIBLE PRESERVATION”.

On this page as well as surrounding pages Dr. Waite correctly makes much of the doctrine of preservation. Dr. Waite is referring here to the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, though one must assume that Dr. Waite is equating “God’s word(s)” with “the Bible”, even though the “Bible”, as a “biblos”, never existed with all the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words of God in one place. Yet notably, Dr. Waite documents God’s promises of preservation from a non-preserved (according to Dr. Waite) text – the KJB. Logically, if he refuses to use the word “inerrant” of the KJB, then how does he KNOW FOR SURE that the verses he cites actually do say what he purports them to say. On his “say-so”? That, of course is “cardinalism” and “popishness” and a denial of the priesthood of every believer. Though this author would agree that those verses do indeed teach the doctrine of preservation, the only way to know that for sure is to accept that their source, the KJB, is without mistake. This of course begs the question of just WHERE are the preserved and certain words of truth to which Dr. Waite refers as being preserved. This problem arises on p.14 as well. An additional example of Dr. Waite’s double-speak occurs on p.17 where he says “I believe that God has carried forward Bible preservation in our English language through our KING JAMES BIBLE.” How is it “God’s preservation” if it is not inerrant? Furthermore, Dr. Waite himself indicated that it is wrong to use the word “preservation” of the KJB. This results in even more double-speak: “This is not to refer Bible preservation to the English translation in the absolute sense, but only in the sense that our KING JAMES BIBLE accurately [Dr. Waite again misuses the term if he does not mean “inerrant” – and he does not mean “inerrant” – POH] preserves the proper Hebrew and Greek Words in the English language ...” It seems that Dr. Waite is saying here that the KJB preserves the message of God for English speakers but not absolutely the all the exact words of God in English for English speakers are the preserved words of God. He indicates that the KJB “accurately translates those divinely preserved Words”. Once again, Dr. Waite misuses the term “accurately” if he does not believe that the KJB is without error. Dr. Waite’s meaning of “accurate” is not that of the dictionaries and standard English usage. Dr. Waite indicates that only “In this sense, we have a ‘preserving’ of God’s Words in English.” Here we see the deception of Dr. Waite (deliberate or not). He now puts “preserving” in quotation marks which indicates that he invests the term with his own meaning and not that of the scriptures or of standard dictionaries and usage. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to answer the question unequivocally with a “yes” or “no”: Are there any errors in the KJB?

p.7 – Dr. Waite says, “We are the ones who need it [His Word].” p.9 – “How can a man or woman live by every Word of God that proceeds out of the mouth of God unless God has preserved this Word to listen to? It is impossible.”

The real question here is, “How can a mere English speaker live by every Word of God that proceeds out of the mouth of God, unless God has preserved this Word in English?” Or put another way, “How can a mere English speaker live by every Word of God that proceeds out of the mouth of God, if those Words are only in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek?” In context, it is clear that Dr. Waite refers here to the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Word of God. The logical and consistent consequence of this for the needy ones in the “we” group who are not fluent in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek is that it will be impossible for them to live as they ought; unless of course the King James Bible in English is indeed every Word of God (without mistake – Titus 1:2) that proceeds out of the mouth of God. To this latter statement, Dr. Waite will not assent. He does admit that the King James Bible in English has been “accurately” translated for English speakers, but yet denies that it is preserved, inerrant, pure, etc., and thus 100% the words of God in English and thus profitable (2 Timothy 3:15-17; 1 Peter 2:2; Matthew 4:4; Luke 4:4) to live by.

p.48 – Dr. Waite says, “I believe so strongly that any valid translation MUST be based upon these original language texts [it seems that Dr. Waite is referring here to the exact texts/readings underlying the KJB – POH], and these alone.” [Emphasis is Dr. Waite’s].

This position of Dr. Waite’s thus precludes using the KJB as the basis for a non-English language translation. Practically speaking, if followed, this procedure would have prevented a number of language groups from having much (if any) of the word of God in their own language.

It even goes against some of the Bible societies’ early recommended procedure of setting aside the primacy of the original language texts.

If Dr. Waite’s suggestion is followed, it is this author’s opinion that many other language groups will have to wait a long time to have the word of God, or perhaps even a portion of it, in their own tongue.

Practically speaking, who among the Gabor dialect speakers of the Romanes (Gypsy) language has Dr. Waite’s position on texts and versions and is fluent [enough] in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek to do such a translation “accurately”?

Theologically speaking, Dr. Waite’s position assumes that someone has made sure that the Greek text used for the translation of the New Testament is the exact readings underlying the KJB and made this text generally available. To this author’s knowledge, that has not yet been done.

Additionally, Dr. Waite fails to take the advice of Dr. Phil Stringer, Pastor of Ravenswood Baptist Church in Chicago, IL. Dr. Stringer says in his article Why William Carey?: “The Scriptures never tell us that translation must be done from the original languages. To teach that as a doctrine is to add to the Word of God.”

p.114 – Dr. Waite says, “... we must have a Bible that preserves His WORDS like the KING JAMES BIBLE does.” And on p.115 Dr. Waite says, “The Lord’s WORDS are pure, not just His thoughts or concepts, but His WORDS. It is His WORDS that must be preserved and they have been in our KING JAMES BIBLE in the English language.” [Emphases are Dr. Waite’s]

Dr. Waite evidences at least two contradictions here. First of all, he has stated that “preserved” [words of God] is not a term that should be used of the King James Bible (A WARNING!! p.2), and yet he uses the term here of the King James Bible. Admittedly, he has indicated that this is not to be taken in any absolute, i.e., “inerrant”, sense. However if that is the case, he is making up his own definition for “preserved”. The second problem faced by Dr. Waite in making this statement is that he does not believe that the word “inerrant” (and a number of others) can be applied to the KJB. Thus, we have a book of God’s WORDS/words which has errors(!?!?!); and all that despite the fact that Titus 1:2 indicates that God cannot lie. Can the words of the KJB legitimately be called “God’s WORDS/words” or “His WORDS/words” if there are errors among them? [NO! – see Psalm 119:140] Can the KJB legitimately be called “the word of God” (as Dr. Waite calls it at times), and yet have errors in it, or even possibly have errors in it? [NO! – see Proverbs 30:5] This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to answer the question of whether the KJB has errors in it or not.

p.118,119 – Dr. Waite says, “The KING JAMES BIBLE is the only English Bible on the scene and in the foreseeable future that can fulfill ... reliability [which includes authoritativeness, p. 118 – POH].”

In indicating that the King James Bible is reliable or in using the word “reliable” as a characteristic of the KJB, Dr. Waite is really not being very clear since he believes that the word inerrant (i.e., 100% reliable) should never be used of the KJB. This is vague, nebulous, imprecise communication on Dr. Waite’s part. As for this author, he is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to answer the question as to whether the KJB is 100% reliable (i.e., without mistake).

p.227 – Dr. Waite says, “I would think the English language would be a good one to be able to say exactly what you mean and precisely what is in the Hebrew and Greek.”

This is an excellent statement by Dr. Waite and is just one more reason why there really is no problem with saying that the KJB is the pure, perfect, inerrant, preserved words of God in English, etc. Yet he contradicts himself by saying on p.240 of DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE that we “can’t always take over completely 100% what He has there [in the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek].” Again, Dr. Waite can’t have it both ways. And despite stating what he did above, Dr. Waite evidences a further inconsistency when he indicates that the KJB words are not as good as the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words, “people can go to the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible and gain information on the depth of meanings that lie within those Words that God Himself gave to us. ... these God-given Words are superior to any translation of them in any language of the world.” (A WARNING!! p.2) [Emphases added] And, “These “legs” are stronger than any translation in the world, including the King James Bible.” (A WARNING!! p.33) [Emphases added] And further, “believes the false and heretical doctrine that God’s Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek are not superior to man’s King James Bible translation, but, in fact, are inferior. This is a vicious and uncalled for attack on the God of Heaven and His Words.” (A WARNING!! p.34) [Emphases are Dr. Waite’s!]. First off, it is pure ASSUMPTION, PRESUPPOSITION, and PRESUMPTION that God’s English words, or the words of any other language, must be inferior to, or weaker than, the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words. Secondly, the contradiction here is that Dr. Waite indicates that the English language [the context is the English language of the KJB] is able to say and mean exactly and precisely what is in the Hebrew and Greek. If that is the case, then how is it that Dr. Waite then says those English words are “inferior” to the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words? If the first statement above is correct, how then are those Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words, somehow “stronger legs” than the English words? If Dr. Waite’s premise regarding the English language as stated initially above (p.227) is correct [and it is – POH], then his conclusion does not follow that the English words are somehow “inferior” and “weaker” than the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words. This is an especially relevant point given the fact that Dr. Waite calls both sets of words, “God’s Word(s)”. This author, for one, is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to explain how his illogical and inconsistent statements can be reconciled.

p.232 – Dr. Waite says that it is “important to bring to the people a firm confidence in what the Bible is.”

For Dr. Waite, ostensibly, “the Bible” is a term that can be used of the King James Bible because the King James Bible is “the Bible for today.” However in practice, Dr. Waite “judges” on exactly what the term “Bible” means or how “the Bible” may be described. Usually, the term, “the Bible”, is synonymous with “the Word of God” or “God’s Words”. Yet Dr. Waite bans the use of words like “inspired”, “inerrant”, “preserved”, “pure”, “perfect” from being used of the KJB. Thus, for Dr. Waite, it is possible that “the ‘Bible’” may not be inspired, inerrant, preserved, pure, perfect, etc.. This is truly a confusing situation created by Dr. Waite’s imprecise (mistaken?) statements and position. As for this author, he is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to speak plainly and unequivocally on exactly WHERE the Bible, the inerrant word of God, really is. If, at the end of the day and despite Dr. Waite’s contradictory statements regarding Scrivener’s text, Dr. Waite says that “THE BIBLE”, “the inerrant Word(s) of God” are the “exact texts, readings, words, wording underlying the KJB”, he would of course be correct (at least with respect to those who are fluent in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek). However he will have to retract some of the statements that he made concerning Scrivener’s text. He will also have to let speakers of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek know where that inerrant “Bible” can be obtained.

p.232 – Dr. Waite says, “You can believe all you want about the Bible [in context, he is referring here to something one can hold in one’s hand and seemingly would be referring to the KJB], ... its (“the Bible[’s]”) revelation, authority, inspiration, inerrancy, infallibility ...”

It seems that here, in this place, Dr. Waite is agreeing that these terms can be used of “the Bible” which he says he “has” and which “one can hold in one’s hand”. In context, it seems that he is referring to the KJB. Yet in other places he specifically says that any of them, or at least most of them, are never to be used of the KJB (which Dr. Waite also calls “the Bible” for today). This is more double speak from Dr. Waite. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to answer the following questions: WHICH Bible is the word and words of God and is thus revelation, authority, inspired, inerrant, and infallible? And WHERE can one obtain such a Bible?

p.232 – Dr. Waite says, “Where is our Bible TODAY? If you don’t have it in your hand, how are you going to have any confidence that anything you say is going to hit the heart of the sinner and cause him to see Jesus Christ as Savior?” [Emphases are Dr. Waite’s]

Here is another contradiction or inconsistency on Dr. Waite’s part. He indicates earlier on this page that the Bible is revelation, authority, inspired,

inerrant, infallible. Yet he denies that the King James BIBLE is to be described with any of those aforementioned terms. Thus, it seems that for Dr. Waite the only real Bible that is inerrant, inspired, preserved, perfect, pure, etc., would be one which is in Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek with the exact words/readings which underlie the King James Bible. Nevertheless, neither Dr. Waite nor anyone else in the world as far as this author knows has such a Bible in his hand. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to reveal just WHERE indeed is our Bible today (if not the KJB) that possesses the characteristics described by Dr. Waite of revelation, absolute authority, inspiration, inerrancy, and infallibility?

bot. p.232, top p.233 – Dr. Waite says, “How can you know confidently unless you have confidence in the Book you have in your hands that God says this, and this, and that.”

This is an excellent statement by Dr. Waite. Yet Dr. Waite never really applies this to the KJB in its entirety nor in its every word. Otherwise, he would have to conclude that the KJB is inerrant (something he is unwilling to do at this moment). This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to declare unequivocally WHAT and WHERE is that “Book you [can] have in your hands” in which you can have complete, 100% “confidence” and certainty that it is without error in what it claims regarding “God says this, and this, and that”. (As has been shown earlier in this work, Scrivener’s text is NOT that Book, not even according to Dr. Waite as of Fall 2008 [“Scrivener is not correct here”] and April 2010 [“Scrivener’s text is ‘the closest’”].)

p.233 – Dr. Waite says, “To me, the greatest assault the Devil has made in the 20th century is the assault on the Word of God. That assault started in the Garden of Eden – ‘Hath God said?’”

This author has no reservations about agreeing with Dr. Waite regarding the above statement. Dr. Waite’s problem, however, is that he implicitly and practically participates in the same “assault on the Word of God [a term he uses of the KJB]” by denying that it is correct to use the following terms (among others) of the KJB: “inspired”, “inerrant”, “preserved”, “infallible”, “pure”, “perfect”. Since Dr. Waite calls the KJB the Word of God, and yet refuses to use or acknowledge that any of those terms apply to the KJB, he consequently indeed and in fact assaults the Word of God, even his Word of God (the KJB in this case – which specifically uses “perfect”, “pure”, and “preserved”). This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to resolve this discrepancy in his thinking/position.

p.235 – Dr. Waite says, “All Scripture is God-breathed and profitable.” “It’s only that which God has breathed out that is His Word in Hebrew or Greek.”

Dr. Waite indicates here that the only inspired, God-breathed items/words that are “Scripture”, are what God gave in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. To reverse the order, only what God breathed out in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek [O.T. and N.T.] is “Scripture”. Dr. Waite evidences a weak and unbiblical presupposition here in assuming[!] that God cannot and/or would not have scripture given by inspiration of God in some other languages, at least by way of the inerrant, preserved words of God in another language via sovereignly guided translation.

However that presuppositional problem is not what the author wishes to address primarily here. Dr. Waite says, “All Scripture is God-breathed... .” “Scriptures Affecting Gail Riplinger’s Ministry” (A WARNING!! pp.5,6,11,113) BUT THEN USES VERSES FROM THE KING JAMES BIBLE (ENGLISH!!) as alleged proof that SCRIPTURE refutes Riplinger’s beliefs. Logically, Dr. Waite is calling the KJB “scripture” here, but then he turns around and refuses to acknowledge what that same “scripture” declares about “scripture” in 2 Timothy 3:16!

And not only that, if the KJB is not inspired Scripture (“inspired” is a term banned by Dr. Waite regarding the KJB, “Scripture” is not), then based on Dr. Waite’s statements, the KJB is “not profitable”, because he indicated that only what is inspired is profitable.

He further says, “Let’s take a look at some of the Scriptures” (A WARNING!! p.11). He then goes on to use the KJB to allegedly prove that Riplinger’s position is wrong.

After quoting I Timothy 3:1-2 FROM THE KING JAMES BIBLE, Dr. Waite says, “That’s the standard of the Scripture.” (p.15 A WARNING!!) Once again, Dr. Waite by implication indicates that the KJB is “Scripture”. Yet he is not consistent, logical, and biblical because he refuses to apply characteristics of “scripture” to the KJB (such as, inerrant, pure, preserved, etc.).

All the above double-speak by Dr. Waite is inconsistent, illogical, contradictory, confusing, and just plain unbiblical. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to clarify his position and to speak unequivocally on the matter of whether the KJB is “scripture” or not. If Waite says that it is, then biblically speaking he must admit that the KJB is inspired, inerrant, preserved, infallible, pure, and perfect (among other things), just like the copies (and perhaps even the translation[s]) that Timothy had. (It must be remembered that Timothy may not have been fluent in Hebrew given that he wasn’t even circumcised until later in life – a conclusion not unwarranted by the biblically-described circumstances of Timothy’s life). If Dr. Waite says that the KJB is not “scripture”, then he will have to publicly apologize for his practice of using the term “scripture” as an equivalent for the KJB, i.e., of quoting the KJB when he should have been

quoting the real or actual scriptures (the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words). This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to explain his inconsistency.

p.239, 240 (*DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE*) – Dr. Waite says, “... the word ‘inerrant’ is implied from the Greek Word ‘*theopneustos*’ (2 Timothy 3:16) which means literally, ‘**GOD-BREATHED**’.”

Several problems crop up here, not the least of which is Dr. Waite’s changing of the KJB term (something Dr. Waite and the Dean Burgon Society “resolved” that they would never do – DBS eNews, Volume 1, Issue 96, June 2010, p.6) “given by inspiration of God”. However, that issue is beyond the current scope of this work. Another problem for Dr. Waite here is to explain just HOW the word “inerrant” is implied in the word “theopneustos” (inspired, given by inspiration of God). Dr. Waite gives NO PROOF of how is it implied, where it is implied, dictionary or lexical definitions, etc. Though not omniscient, this author could not find even one place where “inerrant” is implied from the Greek Word “theopneustos”. Theologically, inerrancy can be DEDUCED from inspiration, but not NECESSARILY the other way ‘round, which is what Dr. Waite is attempting to do in saying that “inerrancy” is implied by the word “theopneustos”. Dr. Waite is trying to say that if one uses the term “inerrant” of the KJB, it must follow that said person is meaning that the KJB is “inspired”. This is simply not the case. Inerrancy is deduced from inspiration, not inspiration from inerrancy. As shown elsewhere in this work, a writing can be inerrant even though it is not necessarily “given by inspiration of God” or “God-breathed” (to use Dr. Waite’s term). So to this author, there is really no problem using terms like “inerrant”, “pure”, etc., even if one does not wish to use the terms, “inspired”, “inspired by/of God”, “given by inspiration of God”, or “God-breathed” of the KJB. Now if Dr. Waite wishes to propose that it is because GOD is the one who is doing this, and if Dr. Waite wishes to propose that such terms are only valid for GOD’S original words, then he will have to quit using the term “God’s word(s)”, or “word of God” for the KJB. For all practical purposes, Dr. Waite does this at times when he says the KJB is [only] a translation by [mere] men, of the [real/actual] Words of God using the words of [mere] men. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to produce proof that something which is inerrant MUST be inspired or to produce proof that calling the KJB inerrant necessarily implies that a person believes the KJB is inspired, or is given by inspiration of God, or is “God-breathed” (to use Dr. Waite’s term). This author is also “waiting for Dr. Waite” to explain his double speak in his use of the terms “the Bible”, “the Word of God”, “God’s Word”, and similar terms, regarding the KJB.

p.240 – Dr. Waite says, “God Himself did NOT ‘**BREATHE OUT**’ English, or German, or French, or Spanish, or Latin, or Italian. He DID ‘**BREATHE OUT**’ [only] Hebrew/Aramaic, and Greek.” [Emphases are Dr. Waite’s]

*Just how Dr. Waite knows this for sure, he does not say nor prove. Is he fluent enough in all languages of the world to determine that none of the translations available in those languages are inspired? Has Dr. Waite made a thorough investigation of all the available language translations to be able to pronounce definitively that they are not inspired? Dr. Waite’s premises and presuppositions remain without validation on Dr. Waite’s part. And thus his conclusion does not follow from the premises (another logical fallacy): “Therefore, **ONLY THE HEBREW/ARAMAIC AND GREEK CAN BE RIGHTLY TERMED ‘GOD-BREATHED’ OR ‘INERRANT’!!**” [Emphases are Dr. Waite’s]. One additional problem here is that without warrant, Dr. Waite drags in the word “inerrant” (more on that later).*

*Of course by changing the KJB term, “given by inspiration of God”, to “breathed out by God”, Dr. Waite invests the term with his own meaning, or with a meaning other than that implied in the KJB term. Thus he commits the logical fallacy of assuming what he is trying to prove. This author is not convinced on the mere “say so” of Dr. Waite that the terms “inspired” or “is scripture given by inspiration of God” or even “inerrant” should never be used of the KJB. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to show the errors of the KJB so as to **PROVE** that it shouldn’t be called “inerrant”.*

p.240 – Dr. Waite says, “... what they [the KJB translators] did pick was within the rules of both the Hebrew and Greek grammar and English grammar.”

If that is the case, then why is Dr. Waite unwilling to use the word “inerrant” or even “is scripture given by inspiration of God” of the KJB since he himself calls the KJB “Scripture”? If the KJB translators didn’t make a mistake, and particularly in light of their use of the English word “inspiration”, then what they produced, i.e., the text of the AV1611, is error-less/inerrant. Given the foregoing, this author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to answer the question of whether the KJB is inerrant or not. Furthermore, Dr. Waite’s “dodge” (“I haven’t found any errors”) is actually pointless and meaningless from the start if he is unwilling, from the start, to use the term “inerrant” or “error-free” or “without mistake” or some such term of the KJB.

p.235 – Dr. Waite says, “All Scripture is God-breathed and profitable. It follows that that which is not God-breathed is not profitable.”

The consequence of this statement would be that the KJB is not profitable, since according to Dr. Waite it is not God-breathed, inspired, given by

inspiration of God, inspired by/of God, inerrant, pure, etc. Dr. Waite is inconsistent, illogical, contradictory, and ultimately unbiblical when he says that the terms “God-breathed”, “inspired”, “given by inspiration of God”, or “inspired by/of God” (as well as a number of other similar terms) should not be used of the KJB, and yet would indicate that it is profitable to read the KJB, because if what is “not God-breathed is not profitable”, then the KJB is not profitable. That indeed is the logical consequence of Dr. Waite’s position. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to make up his mind regarding whether or not the KJB is without mistake.

PART VII

An Examination of Dr. Waite’s refusal to answer specific questions regarding his position on the King James Bible

(email continued from October 31, 2009)

Dear Pete,

(...)

Remember, it is not the words of the English King James Bible that are the foundation of our Christian faith (though an excellent translation), it is the Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic Words underlying it that are God's inerrant, infallible, perfect, pure, inspired Words. In Christ, Pastor D. A. Waite

Copy to: Dr. H. D. Williams, DBS Vice President

Reply Reply to all Forward

poheisey gmail wrote:

11/9/09

Dr. Waite:

Your email really stimulated my thinking and I'm wondering if you could give me a clarification on some items I've been mulling over recently. Answers can be simple, short and direct. I won't be offended nor will I cease to be your friend, for a friend loveth at all times. I have always appreciated your ministry and its impact on my own study, life, and ministry (goes back to the mid 1970's).

1. Perhaps I didn't quite understand your statement ["it is not the words of the English King James Bible that are the foundation of our Christian faith"]:
 - a. Did you mean that they are not the foundation of our [English speakers'] Christian faith today, i.e., in this day and age?
 - b. If someone today doesn't know Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic, does he or does he not have a completely trustworthy and firm foundation in the King James Bible for his Christian faith? (I refer here to English speakers.)

2. Again, perhaps I didn't quite understand what you were getting at, but the following questions came to mind based on what you wrote:
 - a. Are the words of the English King James Bible the completely trustworthy foundation of English speakers' Christian faith today?
 - b. Are there errors in the KJB somewhere which would negate or preclude it being the completely and 100% accurately preserved words of God in English without mistake?
 - c. Why aren't the "words of the English King James Bible" the completely secure foundation for our Christian faith today?

Your friend for Gypsy souls,
Pete Heisey
Timisoara, Romania

Reply |DAW to me 11/9/09
From: "DAW" <BFT@BibleForToday.org>
To: "poheisey gmail" <poheisey@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2009 3:19 PM
Subject: Re: For Dr. Waite

Dear Pete,

Good hearing from you.

I stand by my words, "it is not the words of the English King James Bible that are the foundation of our Christian faith".

The KJB is an excellent translation of that "FOUNDATION," but it is man's translation or interpretation of that "FOUNDATION" rather than God's own WORDS themselves. To make the KJB the "FOUNDATION," like Gail Riplinger and Peter Ruckman do, and to scuttle the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek genuine and REAL FOUNDATION, I believe is a sad and fast-growing theological heresy in our country and around the world.

b. If someone today doesn't know Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic, does he or does he not have a completely trustworthy and firm foundation in the King James Bible for his Christian faith? (I refer here to English speakers.)

He has a "firm foundation" in a SECONDARY WAY, but must NEVER think this is the REAL AND GENUINE "FOUNDATION."

There need not be any "errors" in translation of the KJB, or any translation, yet you must NEVER exalt ANY TRANSLATION (including the KJB) above God's own Words which He Himself has given to us and PRESERVED for us. That is the heresy I wish to oppose strongly against the Ruckman/Riplinger coalition and their followers. Perhaps you are one of their followers yourself. If so, I would strongly disagree with you on this point, though would agree with you on the accuracy, faithfulness, and excellent TRANSLATION of the KJB. The KJB is NOT "inspired," "inspired of God," "given by inspiration of God," "verbally inspired," or "God-breathed" as the HEBREW, ARAMAIC, AND GREEK WORDS that God Himself gave us. If you believe any of these 5 terms can be used for the KJB or any other translation, we must part as well.

I don't think it is profitable to continue our argument on these matters. I think you have made your position fairly clear and I have tried to make my position clear in this. In Christ, Pastor D. A. Waite

(NOTE THAT DR. WAITE HAS NOT SPECIFICALLY OR DIRECTLY ANSWERED ANY OF THE QUESTIONS UNDER NR. 2 ABOVE.)

Reply Forward

poheisey gmail wrote:

Dr. Waite:

Thank you for your quick reply. I truly wasn't trying to be involved in an "argument" with anyone. Just asking for your position on certain issues which I keep running into. And I do appreciate you using the word "perhaps" before your remark about possibly being a "follower" of Ruckman/Riplinger (which I am not, although it is amazing the wide variety of people who end up emailing me and with whom I have corresponded via email).

[POH added comment for this work: If this author came to a particular position first, with which Ruckman or Riplinger happen to agree, would that make them

followers of Pete Heisey? Dr. Waite also needs to define what he means by “follower.” And note that he still has not answered the question.]

p.239 (*DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE*) – In response to a DIRECT question (“Do you believe the KING JAMES BIBLE to be without translational errors?”), Dr. Waite refuses to answer directly. He says, “I would say regarding translation errors that I haven’t found any either in the Old Testament Hebrew or in the New Testament Greek.” And (p.240), “I have not found any translation errors in the KING JAMES BIBLE.”

THAT WASN’T THE QUESTION! The simple, direct question (which required nothing more than a direct “yes” or “no” response) is dodged by Dr. Waite and he goes on to talk about the Hebrew and Greek. This author suspects that Dr. Waite dodges this question because he [Dr. Waite] fears that one day he may find an error in the KJB. A second possibility is that Dr. Waite fears the repercussions for his ministry if he now comes out and says that there are errors in the KJB because it is wrong to use the word “inerrant” of the KJB. Now just how such a position is supposed to “build confidence in the Bible for Today, i.e., the KJB as “God’s Word(s)” or “Scripture”, is truly a leap of [il]logic. This author (and it is assumed as well of the individual who asked the question) is “waiting for Dr. Waite” to directly, honestly, and unequivocally answer the question as to whether there are errors in the KJB or not (or alternatively, whether he believes that there are errors or that there are not errors).

p.239 (*DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE*) – Dr. Waite says, “I don’t like to use the word ‘inerrant’ of any English (or other language) translation ...”

In other places, Dr. Waite actually says that it is wrong to use the word “inerrant” of the King James Bible or any other translation. The issue is not whether Dr. Waite “like[s] to use the word ‘inerrant’ of any English translation”, which would of course include the KJB, “or any other language translation” or not. The issue is whether or not the KJB is in fact inerrant. To this point, Dr. Waite has refused to declare unequivocally that the KJB is without error (an evidence of a weak position on the matter on the part of Dr. Waite). Is Dr. Waite afraid to declare the truth? Is he afraid of what people might say? If the text of the KJB is indeed without error or without mistake, why is it a problem to use the term “inerrant” of the KJB? Is Dr. Waite’s refusal to use that term of the KJB an indication of his lack of COMPLETE, 100% confidence in the KJB? If he refuses to use the term “inerrant” of the KJB, is that not implying that Dr. Waite believes that there are indeed errors in the KJB or at the very least that there could be errors in the text of the KJB? This author is still “waiting for

Dr. Waite” to clearly answer the question (posed as early as 1992 based on the question in “Defending the King James Bible”): “Do you believe that the King James Bible is without translational error?”

PART VIII

An evaluation of the DBS eNews, Volume 1, Issue 96, June 2010 – DBS resolution of 2010, the DBS article of faith on the Bible, and email thoughts on inspiration (Dr. Waite is president of the DBS)

DBS resolution of 2010 – “... will never even contemplate (1) to change, add to, or subtract from the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible”

This, of course, is a fine statement. But Dr. D. A. Waite, the president of DBS, engages in some inconsistency on this matter by at times claiming that F. H. A. Scrivener’s text, which differs in a number of places from the “Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible”, is “not ‘slightly tainted.’ I believe the Words in this ‘Greek New Testament’ to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words.” If that is what Dr. Waite believes, i.e., that Scrivener’s text is “not tainted”, then he has indeed “changed,” “add[ed] to,” and “subtract[ed] from” the text/words/wording/readings underlying the KJB. Yet in essentially the same breath he subscribes to the DBS resolution saying that he will not change any of the words underlying the KJB. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite to resolve this inconsistency.

DBS resolution of 2010 – “... will never even contemplate ... (2) to change, add to, or subtract from the most accurate and faithful English translation ... the King James Bible.”

Yet the president of DBS, Dr. Waite himself, engages in changing the words of the King James Bible when he exchanges the phrase all scripture “is given by inspiration of God” for “God-breathed”. Though Dr. Waite might say that he is not “changing” the KJB word but merely defining it, the practical outworking of his understanding of the word leads to an unbiblical position – i.e., there is some “scripture” (a word which Dr. Waite uses of the KJB) which is not “inerrant” or “inspired” (despite the direct statement of 2 Timothy 3:16 – “ALL scripture”).

DBS article of faith on the Bible – “... the King James Version is a true, faithful, and accurate translation of these two providentially preserved Texts ...”

Since Dr. Waite, president of DBS, is unwilling to grant “inerrancy” to the KJB, he should revise the DBS article of faith to eliminate the words “true”, “faithful”, and “accurate”, since all three either mean or imply “inerrant” (as noted earlier). What term or terms he might use in their stead is another sticky problem for Dr. Waite. [“almost altogether true?” “nearly inerrant”? “mostly faithful”? “fairly accurate”?] This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to explain his dichotomous thinking here in saying that certain words are acceptable to use of the KJB, while synonyms of them are not.

DBS article of faith on the Bible – “... we can without apology hold up the Authorized Version of 1611 and say, ‘This is the WORD OF GOD!’...”

That being so, why does Dr. Waite refuse to agree with what that same “WORD OF GOD” (the AV1611) says about itself (the “WORD OF GOD”): “Thy word is pure.” (Psalm 119:140); “perfect” (James 1:25; Psalm 19:7); etc. [Emphasis added] This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to stop his double-speak and “tell us plainly” whether or not there are errors in the KJB (and especially given that he calls the KJB “scripture” and “the Word of God” and similar terms).

DBS article of faith on the Bible – “... we must go back to the underlying original language Texts for complete clarity ...” [Emphases added]

Here is a blatant denial of the priesthood of every believer and a denial of the power of the Holy Spirit to illuminate the believer. Dr. Waite, as president of DBS, is implicitly indicating that only those with sufficient (complete?) fluency in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek can REALLY, or “completely”, or with “complete clarity” understand the word of God. This smacks of “cardinalism” and “popishness” in indicating that those who only know the English King James Bible somehow cannot have “complete” clarity in understanding the word(s) of God.

Dr. Waite ought to heed the following advice given to DBS in an extended series of quotes from Dr. Gary LaMore in,

THE WORD OF GOD AND THE TURNING OF THE TIDES: FROM CLOTHES TO FASHIONS (A Paper Presented to The 18th Annual Meeting of the DEAN BURGON SOCIETY)

< http://www.gracembc.org/images/The_Word_of_God_and_the_Turning_of_the_Tides.pdf >

“Baptists would be quick to condemn the Roman Catholics for their 'tradition' and 'church authority' in matters of doctrine. [They] vilify the popes for their claim to speaking 'ex cathedra' and yet some would make the preacher or the scholar the final authority rather than God in [via – POH] His Word!” P. 65

“Or would they replace the King James Bible with 'king preacher' or 'king Greek scholar'? Shall the Protestants Vine, Vincent, Thayer, etc., or the universal church 'Baptist,' (A.T. Robertson) speak 'ex cathedra' for them today? The words of Protestant Louis Berkhof come to mind when one think[s] of those who pretend to great scholarship by going to the 'Greek.' He wrote, 'It is necessary to bear in mind that the Lexicons are not absolutely reliable, and that they are least so, when they descend to particulars. They merely embody those results of the exegetical labours of various interpreters that commended themselves to the discriminating judgment of the lexicographer, and often reveal a difference of opinion. It is quite possible, and in some cases perfectly evident, that the choice of a meaning was determined by dogmatical bias....’” (Principles of Biblical Interpretation, Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1950, pp. 68, 69). P.66 (Emphasis, GEL)

“The author [Dr. Gary LaMore – POH] of this paper gives the following quote from Isaac Backus: If we cannot know certainly that the Bible is true without understanding Hebrew, Greek, and Latin then alas, alas, we are in a woeful case indeed. This quote is taken from William G. McLoughlin's New England Dissent, 1630-1833: The Baptists and the Separation of Church and State, Volume 1, 338. This two volume work was published by Harvard University Press in 1971.” (Emphasis, GEL) The author [Dr. Gary LaMore – POH] has Dr. James H. Sightler, M.D., to thank for this quote. P.66,67

“The worldly wise biblical scholar does not believe in the King James Version of the Bible. It is really quite absurd to them. The worldly wise biblical scholar does not investigate such silliness. They do not believe [presuppositionally – POH] that God could preserve His divinely inspired Word in one version and one version only.” P.68 [Underlining added by POH]

“The world of modern biblical scholarship dismisses the true biblical Christian as a fool. They are declared to be fools for holding to the King James Version as the only preserved Word of God in the English language today.” P.68 [Underlining added by POH]

DBS article of faith on the Bible – “... we urge the student to return directly to the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text ...”

The problem here is WHICH Masoretic Hebrew text is the one the student should return to. There is some doubt as to whether any currently published Masoretic Hebrew text precisely and exactly matches the exact readings underlying the KJB. The commonly available ones do not match in anywhere from six to ten places that are currently known to this author. Only a full word by word collation with the KJB would reveal if there are any additional ones. Dr. Waite has so far refused to do this collation and consequently this author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to tell us exactly WHERE that correct Masoretic Hebrew text (the exact Hebrew and Aramaic readings underlying the KJB Old Testament) may be found.

DBS article of faith on the Bible – “... we urge the student to return directly to ... the Traditional Received Greek Text ... for help.”

Dr. Waite says elsewhere that the true Received Greek Text is the exact readings/wordings underlying the KJB. Yet he well knows that those exact readings have not been published in a New Testament Greek Text. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to demonstrate how the student should “return directly” to a text that doesn’t even exist all in one place (at least not as of the writing of this work).

Thoughts on inspiration email #1 – Dr. Waite’s reply to an email question. Dr. Waite says, “The first part of 2 Timothy 3:16 in the King James Bible contains **eight** English words The Greek text has only **three** words.”

Dr. Waite MAY be correct in saying that there are only three Greek words in “the” Greek text. However, to be clear and honest, Dr. Waite should have said, “Scrivener’s Greek text has only three words.” Just how does Dr. Waite KNOW FOR SURE that “the” Greek text has/had “only three words”? Was he there when the KJB translators translated the text before them so that Dr. Waite can say for sure that the text before them had/has “only three words” here? The answer to that question is obvious. It is to be noted that the word “given” in the KJB is NOT in italics which may indicate that the text used by the KJB translators did indeed have a word for “given” in this place (thus negating Dr. Waite’s comment that there are/were “only three words”). This author, for one, is not ready to grant Dr. Waite omniscience and infallibility on this matter.

Thoughts on inspiration email #1 – Dr. Waite’s reply to an email question. Dr. Waite says, “These three Words [at the beginning of 2 Timothy 3:16] refer exclusively to God’s miraculous action of His original breathing out of His

Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and the New Testaments. This miracle occurred one time only and will never and can never be repeated.”

Given that Dr. Waite uses the word “exclusively” and the words “original breathing out”, and the words “one time only and will never and can never be repeated” to refer to what can be “inspired”, then to be consistent and non-contradictory, Dr. Waite should never use the word “inspired” even of [exact] copies of those words. Perhaps he actually does not, but he comes “dangerously” [for him] close to saying so on p. 28 of A WARNING!!, where he says, “The ‘Scrivener Greek New Testament’ is not ‘slightly tainted.’ I believe the Words in this “Greek New Testament” to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words.” And, “My ‘Holy Bible’ is God’s fully ‘inspired’ original Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, ...” And on p.32, “My ‘Holy Bible’ is the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments that God Himself breathed-out and inspired.” The fact that Dr. Waite uses the present tense, as well as his usage of the word “my” (i.e., he has it in his hand or by him), indicates that either Dr. Waite indeed has the originals (not true, of course) or that he is attributing the word “inspired” to some copy of the originals. Thus he contradicts his usage of the word “exclusively” and his usage of the words “original breathing out”, and his usage of the words “one time only and will never and can never be repeated”. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to resolve this contradiction.

Thoughts on inspiration email #1 – Dr. Waite’s reply to an email question. Dr. Waite says, “These three Words [at the beginning of 2 Timothy 3:16] refer exclusively to God’s miraculous action of His original breathing out of His Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and the New Testaments. This miracle occurred one time only and will never and can never be repeated.”

The truth is that 2 Timothy 3:16 does not even refer to any “original” “breathing out” of the words of God. Based on the context, Timothy had copies of the words of God, and what he had was not the exclusive, one time only, miraculous action of God’s original breathing out (to use Dr. Waite’s words). Dr. Waite’s misuse and misinterpretation of this passage in taking it out of its context has resulted in many contradictory statements on Dr. Waite’s part as noted above. The truth is that what Timothy DID have was “scripture given by inspiration of God”, even though what he had was “only” exact copies of the originally given words. It is also possible that Timothy also had translations (this author is not referring to the items mentioned by Dr. Gipp) which were “scripture given by inspiration of God” given that he may not have even known Hebrew fluently (he wasn’t even circumcised until the apostle Paul came along).

Thoughts on inspiration email #1 – Dr. Waite’s reply to an email question. Dr. Waite says, “In the Greek text, there is no verb that links these three Words together.”

To be clear and honest, Dr. Waite should have said, “In Scrivener’s Greek text, there is no verb that links these three Words together.” Dr. Waite is neither omniscient enough, nor old enough, to KNOW FOR SURE whether or not the text used by the KJB translators had a verb that links these three words together. Especially is that pertinent given that the KJB translators did not put the word “given” in italics. It would be pure supposition on Dr. Waite to insist that they didn’t use italics because “given” is part of the Greek word. If that is Dr. Waite’s reasoning, then consistency will require him to abandon and renounce his use of the term “God-breathed” for the Greek phrase.

Thoughts on inspiration email #1 – Dr. Waite’s reply to an email question. Dr. Waite says, “All of this GRAPHE has been once and for all THEOPNEUSTOS (God-breathed) and never will God repeat this miracle “breathing out” in any form or in any way.” And, “It was a unique “breathing out” which God has never repeated, nor will He ever repeat.”

If what Dr. Waite says here is really true, then the copies that Timothy had were not scripture given by inspiration of God, and what God has declared in 2 Timothy 3:15-17, about copies in Greek or in KJB English, is a lie. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to resolve this dilemma.

Thoughts on inspiration email #1 – Dr. Waite’s reply to an email question. Dr. Waite says, “God did not “breathe out” or “inspire” any other words in any language of the world.”

First of all, it is the height of pompous (popish?) arrogance for a mere man, practically speaking to assert such “omniscience” and make such a pronouncement as Dr. Waite makes. There is no way he can KNOW FOR SURE that God did not “breathe out” or “inspire” a translation somewhere in the world [the Biblical idea is to make a translation that is scripture given by inspiration of God]. This author with just as much vehemence and validity can say (see Gipp’s research), “God does provide inerrant, ‘God-breathed’, ‘inspired’, ‘given by inspiration of God’ scripture in giving the text of the translation known as the AV1611 or the King James Bible. Second of all, Dr. Waite again ignores the Biblical research of Dr. Sam Gipp. Contrary to Dr Waite’s assertion, there is scriptural proof that a translation of “God’s Words” can be “inspired.” There is even scriptural proof of more-than-once inspiration of ‘the originals.’ Dr. Sam Gipp [The Answer Book by Dr. Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D., Bible & Literature

Missionary Foundation, 1989, Questions 1, 29, 30, <http://samgipp.com/answerbook/>] has summarised these proofs. “Inspired” translations of “God’s Words” may be found in:

1. Joseph’s reunion with his brothers, Genesis 42-45, and especially Genesis 42:43. **“And they knew not that Joseph understood them; for he spake unto them by an interpreter.”**
2. Moses’ encounters with Pharaoh, Exodus 4-14. **“Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians”** (Acts 7:22) and would have spoken to Pharaoh in Egyptian but he recorded the conversations in Hebrew.
3. Paul addresses the Jews in Acts 22 **“in the Hebrew tongue”** (Acts 21:40) but Luke records the address in Greek. Dr. Waite may insist that a translation can be *“inspired”* if the translation takes place from one *“inspired”* language (Hebrew) to another (Greek). However, he would then be conceding that *“double inspiration”* is scriptural, when he has declared it is heresy. Worse still, he would be contradicting the very title of his book, which purports to be a warning against the *“Multiple Inspiration Heresy,”* because if a translation into what was *essentially* a contemporary *lingua franca* could be *“inspired,”* why couldn’t the same be true for translation into a later *lingua franca*, e.g. Latin, Syriac, Gothic, German and even AV1611 English? Dr. Waite provides no proof to the contrary.

Additional examples follow.

4. John 19:19, 20 state that **“Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the cross. And the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS...and it was written in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin.”** The scripture gives no indication that the writing in Latin was any less *“inspired of God”* than it was in Hebrew or Greek, which writings were *“inspired of God,”* according to Dr. Waite.
5. Acts 14:11 states that **“And when the people saw what Paul had done, they lifted up their voices, saying in the speech of Lycaonia, The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men.”** Here is a ‘verbal, plenary, inspired, original autograph’ that didn’t even ‘originate’ in one of the (according to Dr Waite) *“inspired”* languages (Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek). *It actually had to be translated in order to become “inspired,”* like the ‘original’ words of Joseph and Moses in Genesis 42-45 and Exodus 4-14 respectively (according to Dr. Waite).

Thoughts on inspiration email #2 – Dr. H. D. Williams’ response to an email question. Dr. Williams says, “[Inspiration] is a miracle “once delivered.”

Notably absent from Dr. Williams' affirmation is a Bible reference for such a declaration. Despite the biblical evidence elucidated in numerous KJB defenders' books to the contrary, Dr. Williams continues to propagate this lie.

Thoughts on inspiration email #2 – Dr. H. D. Williams' response to an email question. Dr. Williams says, "Translations are not inspired or given by inspiration."

Once again, notably absent from Dr. Williams' affirmation is a Bible reference for such a declaration. Despite the biblical evidence elucidated in numerous KJB defenders' books to the contrary, Dr. Williams continues to propagate his unbiblical PRESUPPOSITION that translations cannot be inspired. This author, for one, will not accept a mere affirmation on the part of Dr. Williams, or Dr. D.A. Waite for that matter, as proof that the thing is so.

Thoughts on inspiration email #2 – Dr. H. D. Williams' response to an email question. "When an 'inspired' apple is made into apple sauce, it has been changed. It will never be the 'inspired' apple (which was made by God, if you will) again."

Dr. Williams' logical fallacy here is that he compares "apples" with "apple sauce" when he should be comparing apples with apples. In terms of "all scripture", the better analogy is to compare an original "inspired" apple with a cloned apple (or at worst, an apple of a different variety). The cloned apple is not the original, but it retains ALL the characteristics of the original. This is exactly what God did in the copies that resulted in the exact words which underlie the KJB. The analogy is just as valid as Dr. Williams' thinks his is, even when the analogy of a cloned apple is applied to translations. They are the cloned "apple" in another language, retaining ALL of the characteristics of the "original" that make it an "apple" (the inerrant, inspired, exact preserved word[s] of God for that language). Even if the "different variety" (language) analogy is used, the different variety (language) remains an "apple" (the inerrant word[s] of God) and retains ALL the characteristics (pure, without mistake, inspired, preserved, etc.) of the original "apple" that make it an apple (the inerrancy and inspiration of the original words of the original manuscripts is preserved) because God has sovereignly guided/preserved the transformation (translation) into another [perfect] variety of "apple". Of course even attacking this author's analogy, which probably breaks down somewhere, does not disprove the truth that God preserves inerrancy (as well as inspiration) in the KJB.

Thoughts on inspiration email #2 – Dr. H. D. Williams' response to an email question. Dr. Williams says, "Who sets himself up as GOD and decides which [translations] are "inspired"?"

This author would reply with just as much validity and vehemence, “Who sets himself up as GOD and decides which translations are not inspired?” Or put another way, “Who sets himself up as God and decides omnisciently that NO translations are inspired and that NO translations can ever be inspired?”

Thoughts on inspiration email #2 – Dr. H. D. Williams’ response to an email question. Dr. Williams says, “God-breathed Words are given once,” [Emphasis is Dr. Williams]

This contradicts Jeremiah 36 and a number of other passages as well. The scripture reveals not only “a “second inspiration”” but a third inspiration, as Dr. Gipp shows in his Answer Book.

“Just how much value does God put on the originals? To get the answer we must explore several chapters in the book of Jeremiah beginning with the famous passage in chapter 36 concerning the roll that Jeremiah had written. In verse 21 the roll is brought before King Jehoiakim and read by his servant Jehudi. According to verse 23 Jehudi read three or four leaves and King Jehoiakim cut it up with a penknife and cast it into the fire on the hearth until it was destroyed. Thus ends ORIGINAL #1!

“Then the Lord moved Jeremiah to rewrite the roll adding some words to it. (Jeremiah 36:32). Thus ORIGINAL #2 is born. We are shown the text of this second original in Jeremiah 45-51 where it is reproduced for our benefit. Jeremiah told Seraiah to read this roll when he came into Babylon. (Jeremiah 51:59-61). Then Jeremiah instructed Seraiah, after he finished reading the roll, to bind a stone to it and cast it into the Euphrates river (Jeremiah 51:63)! Thus ends ORIGINAL #2!

“But wait! We have a copy of the text of the roll in chapters 45-51. Where did it come from? It came from a copy of original #2 which we can only call ORIGINAL #3! So there are two very big problems for those who overemphasize the “originals”, [i.e., for those who like Dr. Waite and Dr. Williams insist that inspiration happened only “once” or was a “one-time miraculous event” – POH] Every Bible ever printed with a copy of Jeremiah in it has a text in chapters 45-51 which is translated from a copy of the “second” original, or ORIGINAL #3.”

Clearly God can perform a second inspiration or even a third inspiration.

Thoughts on inspiration email #2 – Dr. H. D. Williams’ response to an email question. Dr. Williams says, “... their [translation] work [is] a work of a man or men, ...”

Dr. Williams forgets that the work of a copyist and/or compiler, even of the exact words underlying the KJB (something which has not yet been done, and Dr. Williams was cc'd on the emails between this author and Dr. Waite regarding the problems with Scrivener's text), is the "work of a man or men," and thus Dr. Williams is in at least as much trouble with the original language texts (based on his position, anyway) as someone who would say that the KJB is inerrant and inspired.

Thoughts on inspiration email #2 – Dr. H. D. Williams' response to an email question. Dr. Williams says, "their [translators'] words are not God-breathed or recorded in Heaven for ever as a 'foundation'."

This statement by Dr. Williams begs the question of just how does he KNOW for sure that the words of a translation are NOT God-breathed or are NOT recorded in Heaven for ever as a "foundation". Has Dr. Williams been to Heaven to check this out? Has he examined every translation in the world so that he can somehow come to the conclusion that NONE are God-breathed? How would he determine that NONE are God-breathed if he didn't assume what he was trying to prove – that no translation even CAN be inspired? How could he come to any other conclusion than he does, given his unbiblical presupposition that God could not or would not have a translation to be inerrant and inspired? This author, for one, is not ready to grant such omniscience to Dr. Williams.

Thoughts on inspiration email #3 – Dr. Steve Zeinner (with whom this author has had enjoyable communication) commits a bit of a logical gaffe when he says, "I have heard sermons preached on how 'the KJB is the inspired Word of God; and how that if it is not, then please tell us where is the inspired Word of God?' My question to them would be that if it did not exist in the Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew, then where was it before the KJB?"

Dr. Zeinner really misses the point and sets up a straw man here at which he then huffs and puffs in an attempt to destroy it. The point is NOT that it "did not" or "does not" exist in the exact "Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew", but rather that it DOES exist in the KJB.

Thoughts on inspiration email #4 – Response by Dr. Williams to an email inquiry. Dr. Williams says that inspiration happened "once".

As was shown above, Dr. Williams' statement simply isn't true biblically speaking. Dr. Williams also fails to demonstrate with book, chapter, and verse how the word "once" is tied to inspiration anywhere in the Bible.

Thoughts on inspiration email #4 – Response by Dr. Williams to an email inquiry. Dr. Williams says, “Proper translations may carry the **authority** of the Words given by inspiration ...” [Emphasis is Dr. Williams’]

Dr. Williams, whom this author would suppose does not use the term “inerrant” of the KJB based on comments in his book, Word-for-Word Translating, forgets that authority, and the subject under discussion here is Divine, final authority, stands or falls with inerrancy (and perhaps with inspiration). Dr. Williams cannot logically claim full authority for the KJB if he is unwilling to admit that the KJB is inerrant (and perhaps even inspired).

Thoughts on inspiration email #4 – Response by Dr. Williams to an email inquiry. Dr. Williams says, “Using ‘inspired’ or ‘given by inspiration of God’ for translations confuses the issue.”

Just HOW this is so is not explained biblically by Dr. Williams. This author, for one, is not ready to accept such a thing just on Dr. Williams’ “say so”. Indeed it is Drs Williams and Waite who “confuse the issue” by using the terms “Word of God”, “Scripture”, and similar terms of the KJB, but then refusing to use the terms which that “Word of God” or “Scripture, i.e., the KJB, uses to describe those two concepts.

Thoughts on inspiration email #4 – Response by Dr. Williams to an email inquiry. Dr. Williams says, “... proper translations ... are not equal to the Words of God given by “inspiration” “once”.

Just HOW and WHY this is so is not demonstrated biblically by Dr. Williams. Just WHY this COULD NOT be so is also not demonstrated biblically by Dr. Williams. Furthermore, Dr. Williams does not show where in the Bible is it mentioned that the “Words of God are given by ‘inspiration’ [just] ‘once’.”? Again, this author for one is not ready to accept such pontifications merely on Dr. Williams’ “say so”.

Thoughts on inspiration email #4 – Response by Dr. Williams to an email inquiry. Dr. Williams says, “This [on the Words of God given by inspiration only once, i.e., the original words originally given in/on the original writings of the original New Testament books] is where **we** need to rest.” [Emphasis added]

Dr. Williams indicates here that even those who do not fluently know Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek [“we”, today] need(!) to rest in and on something that does not even exist in one place today. Even if Dr. Williams is referring to the exact words underlying the KJB, “we” still have no place to rest since all these exact words are not gathered together in a Bible. Practically speaking, Dr. Williams’ position is a denial of the priesthood of every believer. This is true

confusion. “Hmmm. I wonder who is the author of confusion!” (Quote of Dr. H. D. Williams from email #2) This author, for one, is not ready to accept the affirmations of Dr. Williams that “we” “need” to rest in and on something that doesn’t exist (at least at the moment) nor on something that [mere] English speakers cannot even read.

Thoughts on inspiration email #4 – Response by Dr. Williams to an email inquiry. Dr. Williams indicates that resting on the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek “Words of God given by inspiration once”, “will encourage proper translating based upon the original God-breathed Words ...”

Is Dr. Williams referring to Scrivener’s text for the New Testament here? (Yes or no, Dr. Williams). Or is Dr. Williams referring to the exact words/readings underlying the KJB? (Yes or no, Dr. Williams). Dr. Williams well knows that Scrivener’s text does not match the exact words/readings underlying the KJB since he was cc’d on many of the emails that this author wrote to and received from Dr. D. A. Waite. Furthermore, if Dr. Williams would agree that he is referring to the exact words/wording/readings underlying the KJB, then how will he know exactly what and where those words are (unless he determines them FROM the KJB – an uninspired, errant [or possibly errant] translation)?

Thoughts on inspiration email #4 – Response by Dr. Williams to an email inquiry. Dr. Williams says, “The moment we call a translation inspired, the Biblical use of the word is subverted ...”

Now just HOW and WHY this is so is not explained in any “Biblical” fashion. As Dr. Gipp has shown, it is in fact Dr. Williams who subverts the Biblical use of the word and thus, for believers today, “the word loses its importance, whether intentional or unintentional;”

Thoughts on inspiration email #4 – Response by Dr. Williams to an email inquiry. Dr. Williams says, “Apple sauce [i.e., any and all translations] is not the original [apple] and we would look foolish trying to make a case that it is.”

First of all, this is a straw man set up by Dr. Williams because in proposing his analogy, he actually assumes what he is trying to prove. The true analogy, as mentioned elsewhere in the present work, is between an original apple and a cloned apple; or between an original apple and a different variety of apple. Secondly, just why someone would “look foolish” trying to show that the KJB could be inspired and/or inerrant (or IS inspired and inerrant) is not explained biblically by Dr. Williams. This author for one would just as vehemently and with just as much validity assert that “we would NOT look

foolish” for believing the KJB to be inerrant (or inspired and inerrant). There is no reason for granting infallibility to Dr. Williams in these statements.

PART IX

For Dr. Waite, Just WHERE is the Word of God?

Dr. Waite says, “Scripture, [is] that which is [was? – POH] written down in the Old or New Testament originals.” (A WARNING!! p.24).

Thus, based on this statement, the word of God/scripture is only the words written down in [on?] the original manuscripts when they were originally given. Thus, following Dr. Waite’s logic to it’s conclusion, there can be no real or actual “scripture” today since the originals no longer exist.

Dr. Waite says, “I believe that God inspired and breathed-out the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments. I believe this miraculous event **happened only once and was never repeated. Especially was this inspiration never repeated in any translation in the past, in the present, or in the future.** I believe **2 Timothy 3:16** refers to this once-for-all inspiration by God of those original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. The Greek Words in the first part of that verse are: PASA (“each, every, or all” GRAPHE (“Scripture” referring to the Old Testament, and, by extension to the New Testament) THEOPNEUSTOS (THEO refers to “God,”) PNEUSTOS (comes from “PNEO” “to breathe.”) that is, “God-breathed” or “breathed-out by God.” In other words, God “breathed-out” His original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. I believe these Words have been preserved in the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible.” (A WARNING!! p.2) [Underlining added]

If this is a “once” and “never repeated” miraculous event, then according to Dr. Waite, Paul would have lied to Timothy in saying that what Timothy had in his hands was “scripture”, “given by inspiration of God”, “profitable”, etc., because what Timothy had in his hands was NOT “this once-for-all inspiration of God of those original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words”, but rather COPIES of those words. Dr. Waite does use the word “preserved” of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words, but here, for all practical purposes, he would refuse to apply the scriptural term, “given by inspiration of God” to the COPIES that Timothy had. Thus it is Dr. Waite who is the liar here, and not the apostle Paul, nor the translators of the KJB, nor the Author of the passage (Titus 1:2).

2 Timothy 3:16 ... refers to God's breathing-out His Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words in the original Old and New Testaments. (A WARNING!! p.88) [Emphasis added]

Dr. Waite indicates here that only what God breathed out in the original Old and New Testament books can be considered inspired or given by inspiration of God or scripture given by inspiration of God. Thus he calls the writer of this passage (the apostle Paul) as well as its Author (God Himself), a liar since the passage under consideration is NOT speaking of the "Words in the original Old and New Testaments", but rather to COPIES of those words in something OTHER THAN those original Old and New Testaments.

The Scripture in 2 Timothy 3:16, PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" This literally means "all Scripture is God-breathed." GRAPHE refers to the Old Testament Hebrew and Aramaic Words (and, by extension, the New Testament Greek Words). This word has nothing whatsoever to do with any translation, whether in English, Spanish, Italian or any other language. (A WARNING!! p.59)

Dr. Waite ignores several important issues here. 1.) "Literally" the word "is" is not in the Greek text. Dr. Waite should speak more precisely here. Indeed, the word "is" belongs in the English text and is part of the meaning of the adjective here (describes the "product", not the "process"). 2.) How does he KNOW FOR SURE that the word for "given" was not in the text/reading used by the KJB translators? The word "given" is not in italics in the KJB and Dr. Waite agrees with a Dean Burgon Society resolution published in the DBS e-News, Volume 1, Issue 96, June 2010, p.6, which indicates that he will not "change, add to, or subtract from" even "the italicized words". By implication, Dr. Waite should apply this to non-italicized words as well, especially given that the general procedure of the KJB translators was to supply ITALICIZED words if there was no underlying Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek word in the reading they used. He also ought to realize that he violates this resolution by changing the KJB words "given by inspiration of God" to "God-breathed". 3.) He ignores the fact that there is a significant amount of "translation" going on within the Scriptures themselves, so in fact "God-breathed" (Dr. Waite's word) has PLENTY "to do with" translation into some other language.

Dr. Waite says, "Gail Riplinger has not and cannot prove that the King James Bible was [sic – "is"] inspired by God." (A WARNING!! p.32)

Of course neither has Dr. Waite given biblical proof that the KJB is NOT inspired by God.

Dr. Waite says, “There is no scriptural proof that any translation of God’s Words is inspired of God.” (A WARNING!! p.32)

Of course Dr. Waite ignores here the extensive work of Dr. Sam Gipp, which shows that there is plenty of scriptural proof that translation itself is no hindrance to inspiration (nor inerrancy). Contrary to Dr. Waite’s assertion, there is scriptural proof that a translation of “God’s Words” can be “inspired.” There is even scriptural proof of more-than-once inspiration of ‘the originals.’ Dr. Sam Gipp has summarised these proofs. [The Answer Book by Dr. Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D., Bible & Literature Missionary Foundation, 1989, Questions 1, 29, 30, <http://samgipp.com/answerbook/>]

“Inspired” translations of “God’s Words” may be found in:

Joseph’s reunion with his brothers, Genesis 42-45, especially Genesis 42:43.

“And they knew not that Joseph understood them; for he spake unto them by an interpreter.”

1. Moses’ encounters with Pharaoh, Exodus 4-14. *“Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians”* (Acts 7:22) and would have spoken to Pharaoh in Egyptian but he recorded the conversations in Hebrew.
2. Paul addresses the Jews in Acts 22 *“in the Hebrew tongue”* (Acts 21:40) but Luke records the address in Greek. Dr. Waite may insist that a translation can be *“inspired”* if the translation takes place from one *“inspired”* language (Hebrew) to another (Greek). However, he would then be conceding that *“double inspiration”* is scriptural, when he has declared it is heresy. Worse still, he would be contradicting the very title of his book, which purports to be a warning against the *“Multiple Inspiration Heresy,”* because if a translation into what was *essentially* a contemporary *lingua franca* could be *“inspired,”* why couldn’t the same be true for translation into a later *lingua franca*, e.g. Latin, Syriac, Gothic, German and even AV1611 English? Dr. Waite provides no proof to the contrary.

Additional examples follow.

3. John 19:19, 20 state that *“Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the cross. And the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS...and it was written in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin.”* The scripture gives no indication that the writing in Latin was any less *“inspired of God”* than it was in Hebrew or Greek, which writings were *“inspired of God,”* according to Dr. Waite.
4. Acts 14:11 states that *“And when the people saw what Paul had done, they lifted up their voices, saying in the speech of Lycaonia, The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men.”* Here is a ‘verbal, plenary, inspired,

original autograph' that didn't even 'originate' in one of the (according to Dr Waite) "*inspired*" languages (Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek). *It actually had to be translated in order to become "inspired,"* like the 'original' words of Joseph and Moses in Genesis 42-45 and Exodus 4-14 respectively (according to Dr. Waite).

CONCLUSION

The following comments by Manny Rodriguez, missionary to Puerto Rico and a DBS Advisory Council member are from an article entitled, "Guilt-by-Association Arguments and the KJV". They are pertinent to Dr. Waite's unbiblical position, contradictory procedures, presupposed platitudes, and inconsistent pontifications.

"Many of our opponents try to invalidate our position ... by trying to connect us to highly controversial and questionable individuals. This tactic is known as guilt-by-association."

(...)

"The trick is to somehow connect the opponent to controversial figures [such as Ruckman and Riplinger – POH]. This is an effort to shame the opponent. It is an effort to intimidate the opponent. It is also a fear tactic – an effort to discourage others from [even] considering their opponents' position."

(...)

"I like Dr. Phil Stringer's definition of a 'Ruckmanite' [or 'Riplingerite' – POH]. He said, 'A Ruckmanite is what the opponents call you when they are losing the argument'." [Dr. Waite should take note of this in his attempts to demean this author (POH) by calling him a "follower of Ruckman/Riplinger."]

(...)

"I guess if ownership and referencing or material [or any kind of contact – POH] defines a person, I could be labeled all sorts of things." [Something forgotten or ignored by Dr. Waite in accusing this author (POH) of leaning towards being a "follower of Ruckman/Riplinger."]

(...)

"Does sharing a similar view with someone concerning the Bible text issue necessarily make them one and the same? Absolutely not. You would have to be pretty shallow-minded to make such conclusions." [Dr. Waite should apply this in his communications with others.]

(...)

“Labels are many times meant to deliberately distort the truth about an individual or a group of people.” [See above comment.]

(...)

“This is what this business of labeling KJV defenders as ‘Ruckmanites’ [or ‘Riplingerites’ – POH] is all about.”

Manny Rodriguez then goes on to quote several individuals from the past (pre-Ruckman, pre-Riplinger, pre-Waite) who believed in the inerrancy and infallibility of the KJB. In context, it seems that Manny Rodriguez agrees with the position that the KJV is inerrant and infallible. Yet he was sitting on the advisory council of an organization which denies that the KJV is inerrant and infallible, or at the very least denies that it can be said to be inerrant and infallible. This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to explain that inconsistency and confusion.

This author wishes to present his conclusions regarding Dr. D. A. Waite’s contradictory, inconsistent, illogical, and ultimately unbiblical positions by using an article from *The Burning Bush*, January 2007, as modified by this author but well within the spirit of the original article.

What then are the implications of Dr. Waite’s position?

First, given Dr. Waite’s position on it being wrong to use the terms, “inerrant”, “preserved”, “pure”, etc., of the English words of the text of the KJB, the implication would be that the KJB would not be scripture/scriptures/“Scripture”/“Scriptures” (even though Dr. Waite continues to use that term of the KJB).

If the KJB is scripture (Dr. Waite’s term), and if all scripture **is** given by inspiration of God and **is** profitable (2 Timothy 3:15-17), then the KJB, logically (and biblically) can be considered scripture given by inspiration of God. However, for Dr. Waite, the KJB is uninspired scripture, i.e., he calls the KJB “Scripture”, but says it cannot and should not be called “inspired” (a contradiction in terms, biblically speaking – 2 Timothy 3:15-17).

Furthermore, when Dr. Waite quotes verses from the KJB (which he does not consider inspired nor inerrant nor pure), he is not really quoting scripture or scripture given by inspiration of God. When he uses what he considers to be the uninspired English words of the KJB, he is not really using scripture, because all scripture is given by inspiration of God. It is inconsistent, confusing, and contradictory for Dr. Waite to use the term “scripture” or “God’s word” of the KJB

if he is unwilling to call it inerrant. Perhaps the closest one can get is that he is reading uninspired scripture (again, a contradiction in terms biblically speaking), since those words in the KJB are not inspired or given by inspiration of God.

Are we to believe that only scriptures in the original languages from the preserved apographs are inspired scripture or scripture given by inspiration of God? According to Dr. Waite, the answer seems to be “yes”. But just why Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek are the only languages where the inspired Scriptures can reside has not been proven by Dr. Waite. Neither has some reason been given as to why languages other than Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek **CAN never** accommodate inspired scriptures.

What Dr. Waite is ultimately saying, when his affirmations are followed to their logical conclusion, is that unless Christians fluently learn Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic, they have no hope of ever reading inerrant, inspired scripture. “Mere” English speaking Christians have no hope of ever quoting the inerrant scripture/word of God, let alone the inspired scripture/word of God. Is the real sword of the Spirit only available in Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek from the preserved apographs? Dr. Waite has **not proven** that this is so. If Dr. Waite is serious about defending the inerrant, inspired words of God as being in the original languages, i.e., from the preserved apographs, why isn’t he more vehemently inviting poor English-speaking-only Christians to learn Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic fluently so that they might all read, study, and quote real inerrant, yea, inspired scripture? Why doesn’t he lobby for teaching every Christian fluent Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic from the moment that person gets saved (See Matthew 4:4, Luke 4:4, and 1 Peter 2:2 for the implications of this). Isn’t reading and studying inerrant, inspired scripture extremely important? And shouldn’t we be doing all this on all mission fields and in all tribal situations?

Why aren’t [the actual inspired inerrant] scriptures, “the real foundation for our faith”, read in the worship services of Dr. Waite’s church? Why doesn’t he insist that everyone buy a copy of those inspired, inerrant apographs for study and worship? [Actually the answer to this question is that they are not even published all in one place and are therefore unavailable.] If the apographs are not being used for scripture reading and quoting, then Dr. Waite must be using uninspired, errant [or possibly errant] “scripture”. And of course the concept of Christian scripture being UNinspired is UNbiblical (2 Timothy 2:15-17). **Just what is the real problem of acknowledging that the God of creation and languages can indeed give His inspired words, His exact inerrant words, in any languages that He chooses, at any time in history?** Telling Christians that God has preserved His

words in the apographs, but that exactly those words in their entirety are not available, and especially are they not available to those who are not fluent in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek, is one of the greatest scams in Christendom. What is the point of Dr. Waite coming up with his position (the KJB is not inspired and cannot be said to be inerrant and pure), and at the end of the day, ordinary [mere] English speaking Christians still have no “given-by-inspiration-of-God” scripture and no inerrant scripture to study and to read? Dr. Waite and company have, at best, inspired scriptures in apographs, somewhere, which are quite useless to ordinary English-speaking Christians.

If Dr. Waite were truly forthright in his position, he should invoke a disclaimer whenever he uses the terms “scripture”, “God’s word”, “the word of God”, etc. of the KJB. He should also invoke said disclaimer when reading or quoting the KJB by noting for all present that the words he speaks or reads come from uninspired, possibly errant “scriptures” and cannot necessarily be taken as the pure words of the living God; and that readers and hearers should always refer to the apographa where the inerrant, inspired, preserved, pure, and perfect word(s) of God can really be found, and which are the real spiritual foundation for their lives, and from which they can be completely fed and grow completely as they should. The implication of Dr. Waite’s position leaves “mere” English-speaking Christians in the lurch and without the means to fulfill God’s commands to live “by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.”

This author, in agreement with Dr. David Otis Fuller, will continue to put forth the question as regards the most important issue by far which is facing fundamentalists today: Do we have NOW the true, pure, inerrant, inspired, word(s) of God in the text of the AV1611/King James Bible? (Dr. Waite would probably say, “Shame on you Dr. Fuller for even using such words [with Dr. Waite’s illogical exception of “true”] of the King James Version. You shall never be part of nor speak at a Dean Burgon Society meeting if you use those words of the KJV.”)

This author is still “waiting for Dr. Waite” to honestly, directly, specifically, and unequivocally answer the following two questions: 1.) Does Scrivener’s Greek text need corrected? (Yes or no, Dr. Waite.) and 2.) Are there (or do you believe that there are) any errors in the text of the King James Bible? (Yes or no, Dr. Waite.). King James Bible believers await your answer, Dr. Waite.

ADDENDUM 1

An Analysis of Dr. Robert Barnett's, Possessing An Infallible Bible, a message presented at the Dean Burgon Society's 1994 Annual Meeting

Possessing An Infallible Bible

The Dean Burgon Society's 1994 Annual Meeting

Dr Robert Barnett, Vice President of the Dean Burgon Society
Copyright 1999 by the author, reproduction and distribution rights assigned to the Dean Burgon Society.

Introduction

- I. His Infallibly Inspired Bible will be preserved to all generations
- II. Canonicity Confirms our faith that we possess an infallible Bible
- III. Continuity Confirms the Received Text as our infallible Bible
- IV. Coherence in interpretation requires faith in the entire body of God's infallibly inspired truth

Introduction

Just days before his Lord called him home, our beloved, Dr. David Otis Fuller in his last letter to me, dated February 5, 1988, sealed his life testimony with these words of conviction: "I am convinced beyond all doubt or question, THE MAIN AND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE BY FAR, FACING FUNDAMENTALISTS TODAY IS SUMMED UP IN TWO QUESTIONS:

1. "Do we have NOW (NOT in the originals which have been lost for centuries and in my book is one of the worst cop-outs anyone ever uttered). I repeat, do we have NOW the true, pure, inerrant, inspired, Word of God as found in the King James Version?"

[Note that Dr. David Otis Fuller indicates here that he believes that the King James Version, which we hold in our hands NOW, is the true, pure, inerrant, inspired, Word of God. Would to God that Dr. D. A. Waite, president of the DBS, would say the same thing! – POH]

2. "What kind of a God do we worship? If He cannot or will not KEEP HIS WORD pure and true down through the ages right up to 1988, then we have one option left. "let us eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die and go to hell."

D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D., *The King James Bible's Superiority*, Pages 41-45.

Dr. Waite followed the above historical evidence with the following position of faith: "In fact, it is my own personal conviction and belief, after studying this subject since 1971, that the words of the Received Greek and Massoretic Hebrew texts that underlie the

KING JAMES BIBLE are the very WORDS which God has PRESERVED down through the centuries, being the exact WORDS of the ORIGINALS themselves.

[This statement would lead one to think that Dr. Waite would prefer the KJB (underlying) reading over the reading of Scrivener's text. However Dr. Waite equivocates on the matter by indicating that Scrivener's text is not tainted and is a copy "of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved original Greek Words." Dr. Waite indicates that Scrivener's text is an "authentic cop[y] of the original New Testament Words." Yet in other places, Dr. Waite indicates that Scrivener is merely "the closest" to the exact, correct TR (i.e, the "Words underlying the KJB"). – POH]

[Dr. Waite continues] As such, I believe they are *INSPIRED* WORDS. I believe they are *PRESERVED* WORDS. I believe they *[in context Dr. Waite is referring to the exact words/texts/readings underlying the KJB – POH]* are *INERRANT* WORDS. I believe they are *INFALLIBLE* WORDS. This is why I believe so strongly that any valid translation *MUST* be based upon these original language texts, and these alone!" I concur 100% with this statement. One must either place faith in the operation of the Holy Spirit through the people of God in the churches down through the centuries, or trust the conflicting opinions of critical scholars of the 19th and 20th centuries.

[The problem here is that Dr. Waite actually dodges the issue of the character of the KJB via his references to the Greek and Hebrew texts, when in fact Dr. D. O. Fuller was referring specifically to the KJB as being "the true, pure, inerrant, inspired, Word of God." With the illogical exception of "true", Dr. Waite would take Dr. Fuller to task for using such "confusing", "heretical", terms like "inspired", "pure", "inerrant" of the KJB. – POH]

Receiving infallible truth from our authorized King James Bible comes not as much from boring holes into the underlying Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek as from comparing scripture with scripture under the leading of the Holy Spirit. While even unsaved linguists and modernists can do the former, only a born-again believer can do the latter.
[Emphases added – POH]

[Note that Dr. Barnett seems to say that the KJB is "infallible". If he really believes this term applies to the KJB, a term that Dr. Waite is unwilling to apply to the KJB, then even within the DBS there is inconsistency and contradiction. However, it is likely that Dr. Barnett only believes that the KJB contains infallible truth, not that it IS infallible truth. This is neo-orthodox thinking. – POH]

Listen again to our forefathers:

Article #9 "The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched **by other places** that speak more clearly."
(Bold print added for emphasis)

Therefore, we must still possess the infallible rule of Scripture interpretation which comes by searching and studying the Holy Scriptures alone as self-instructing and interpreting.

[If this latter comment is Dr. Barnett's, then in context he (or at the very least the comment of "our forefathers") is actually referring to the KJB as "Holy Scriptures". If the latter comment is the "forefathers", and in context it seems they were NOT referring to the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek, then Dr. Barnett must recognize that not only do we receive "infallible truth from the KJB", but that the KJB, as the "Holy Scriptures", IS infallible truth.]

A. We must believe in the infallible Inspired original autographs as the foundation from which the apographs came. But we cannot claim infallibility for just the original autographs since no such Bible ever existed in one copy at one time on planet earth.

"Let us look at some undisputed facts about the originals. First: there never was a book of the 66 originals of the Bible. Second: there never was a book of the 39 originals of the old Testament. Third: There never was a book of the 27 originals of the New Testament. Fourth: no one living or dead ever saw the 66, 39 or 27 originals. Fifth: each of the originals were lost, worn out, destroyed or gone within 100 to 150 years of their writing. Sixth: the originals were written over a period of about 1600 years from the first book Job to the last one Revelation. Seventh: the originals were written a distance of 1500 to 2000 miles apart from each other. Eighth: the originals were written in at least three different languages. Ninth: the originals were written on any number of kinds of material, with any number of kinds of writing fluid. Tenth: the originals under God's will and guidance incorporate many kinds of culture and background. Eleventh: no version in existence today was or is translated from any original. Twelfth: no one living today would know or recognize any one of the 66 originals if they saw one. And on and on and on. Therefore, in the light of the above to flee to the supposed sanctuary of the originals is unreal, hypocrisy, a fetish, and worse than the proverbial ostrich hiding its head in the sand and thinking it is covered and out of sight." -Dr. Ralph I. Yarnell, A Fresh Look At The King James Bible, page 33,34.

B. God never intended His people to place their faith in the originals alone. The first originals of the law were broken and destroyed by Moses. (**Exodus 32:19**) It was through the second tables hewed by Moses that God restored His words. The Jews never possessed the originals in the ark of the covenant. These were apographs or copies of the originals.

EXO 34:1 And the LORD said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first: and I will write upon [these] tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest.

C. The book of Jeremiah was never available for a completed canon of scriptures. **JER 36:23** And it came to pass, [that] when Jehudi had read three or four leaves, he cut it with the penknife, and cast [it] into the fire that [was] on the hearth, until all the roll was

consumed in the fire that [was] on the hearth. **JER 36:28** Take thee again another roll, and write in it all the former words that were in the first roll, which Jehoiakim the king of Judah hath burned.

One cannot deny or ignore the infallibility of the original autographs or the centuries of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek apographs underlying the authorized King James Bible, and honestly claim infallibility for any other tangible Bible today. While it is essential that we defend the historical canon and continuity of our Bible as found in the original autographs and accurate apographs, it is equally essential that we defend the coherence of the entire body of infallible truth from the originals, through the apographs, into our own authorized King James Bible. To discredit the originals, apographs, or the KJB is to undermine God's infallible authority to the English speaking world. *[Emphases added – POH]*

[Dr. Barnett, seemingly contrary to Dr. D. A. Waite's position, apparently has no problem using the word "infallible" in referring to the KJB in its "entire(ity)".]

By faith I believe like the late Dr. David Otis Fuller that, "we have NOW the true, pure, inerrant, inspired, Word of God as found in the King James Version!".

[Now here Dr. Barnett SEEMS (see below) to be saying that the KJB is the "true", "pure", "inerrant", "inspired", "Word of God". However, Dr. Barnett "fudges" on the matter in a way that Dr. Fuller did not (see below).]

I do not believe the KJB translators were inspired, ...

[The issue of whether the KJB translators were inspired or not, is not what is at stake here. What is at stake is whether the KJB can be called "inspired". – POH]

neither were the English words they used.

[Here, Dr. Barnett's approach to the KJB is that of neo-orthodoxy in saying that the locus of the "true, pure, inerrant, inspired Word of God" is not the "words", but rather the ??? (message??). From what this author has read from Dr. Fuller and about Dr. Fuller, Dr. Fuller himself would take issue with the position of Dr. Barnett.]

I do believe by faith that the KJB derives its inspiration, its inerrancy in doctrine ...

[Dr. Barnett is still using the neo-orthodox approach here in changing the locus of inspiration and inerrancy (regarding the text of the KJB) to just its "doctrine" or teaching. He is using a crafty "dodge" to move from the issue of the words to the matter of the message. The implication logically (consciously or unconsciously on Dr. Barnett's part) is that the KJB is neither scripture ("all scripture is given by inspiration of God" – the text does not say "all scripture given by inspiration of God ..."), nor inerrant. Dr. Waite also engages in this

logical implication and both men, in practice, end up appearing to accept the ASV rendering of 2 Timothy 3:16. So just who will determine what is “errant” in the KJB and what is not? Or just who will determine what is “scripture [which] is given by inspiration of God” and which “Scripture” or “Word(s) of God” are not given by inspiration of God? Dr. Barnett? Dr. Waite? DBS? (These are just mere fallible men, and if they are to decide, does this not smack of “cardinalism” and popishness?) Just what is the problem with calling the KJB inerrant if it is without error? Just why is there so much hesitancy to submit to the final, Divine, inerrant authority of the KJB? (Rebellious sin nature? – POH) Furthermore, neither Dr. D. O. Fuller nor any of the forefathers who mentioned the fact that they believed the KJB was inspired ever equivocated or qualified what they believed with words like “derived” inspiration or “virtual” inspiration. Dr. Barnett is “fudging” here by even using the term “virtual”. Webster’s 1828 dictionary on “virtual” says, “being in essence or effect, not in fact; as the virtual presence of a man in his agent or substitute”. (Emphases added – POH) Dr. Barnett ought not to seem to be siding with Dr. Fuller on the matter when his position differs from Dr. Fuller’s, but should instead be forthright and honest and say, “The KJB is ‘not in fact’ inspired” at all. He should also be forthright enough to say that the KJB is not completely inerrant in its translation/wording if he believes that it is only inerrant in its doctrine.]

... and its infallible body of authority ...

[Note please: not “its infallible words of authority”, but rather in some vague, general, nebulous, message-only, doctrine-only, teaching-only sense, “its (the KJB’s) infallible body of authority”. (Emphases added – POH)]

... from the accurately translated apographs of the original autographs of Holy Scriptures which underlie the KJB.

[According to Webster’s 1828 dictionary, “accuracy” means “free from error”, so Dr. Barnett actually should not have a problem saying “inerrant in words/translation” rather than merely “inerran[t] in doctrine” – POH]

The KJB is inspired, not directly, but derivatively.

[If this author would be obligated to attach a qualifier to the word “inspired”, the better word would probably be “resultant” inspiration. That is, as a result of God’s work, the KJB (the “result”, the “product”) IS scripture given by inspiration of God. As it stands, the KJB is “scripture [which] is given by inspiration of God.” It is also noteworthy that, in distinction from Dr. Barnett, none of the forefathers (including Dr. D. O. Fuller) implied or attached any caveats or qualifiers to the word “inspired” when they used it of the KJB. – POH]

That is, the English words received God's breath from the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words. The KJB is inspired, not perfectly, but practically.

[What does this really mean? Can something “receive God’s breath” or be “inspired” [by God] either directly or “derivatively”, and be something other than “perfect”? Dr. Barnett needs to explain just HOW it can be something other than “perfect”.

It is inspired in the "logos", but not the "rhema".

[What Dr. Barnett is in fact indicating here is that it is merely the message/ “doctrine” of the KJB which is “inspired” but not the “words” of the KJB. This is actually a neo-orthodox approach to the KJB and leaves the English speaker with no final, Divine, inerrant authority or “every word of God” Bible by which to live and grow (See Matthew 4:4 and Luke 4:4). – POH]

Because of language differences verbatim inspiration is sometimes limited,

[This is a presupposition on Dr. Barnett’s part and is not necessarily the case given that God is omnipotent (Luke 1:37). God can have a translation to be inspired and inerrant in its very words (the “rhema” as well as the “logos”) if he so desires, and to this author He has done so in the KJB. God can certainly give His “verbatim” scripture that He wants a particular language group to have which will say, teach, and preach, in inerrant, inspired, non-Greek and non-Hebrew/Aramaic words, exactly and just as completely as what the originals say, teach and preach. Furthermore, just what, pray tell, is “limited verbatim inspiration”?]

the translators added italicized words to help compensate for this difference.

It is more accurate to say the KJB possesses virtual inspiration rather than verbatim inspiration.

[Dr. Barnett does not say just WHY this is the case, even if all the words are correct (“accurate”). This is especially pertinent since the use of “virtual” would imply that the KJB is not inspired, period. – POH]

Again we are not referring to the English letters and words as inspired, but rather the eternal truth or logos communicated by these words into the English language as the inspired, living, breathing truth of God.

[Actually this is a neo-orthodox position regarding the KJB, i.e., the message is inspired, but not the words. Yet Dr. Barnett fails to realize here that the “eternal truth” or “logos” or message can only be communicated in “words”. If at some places those words have errors or are not scripture (and all scripture is “given by inspiration of God”/ inspired), just who determines those places is not revealed by Dr. Barnett. Consequently, how can one be SURE that even the “logos” or “eternal truth” or message has been communicated “truly”? Furthermore, Dr. Barnett does not reveal just why the English words are not, or could not be,

inspired. Since God is omnipotent, He can certainly see to it that His words in English are inerrant, yea, inspired. – POH]

Therefore, we believe by faith **this same infallibly inspired truth has continued** from the original God-breathed Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek **into our authorized King James Bible**, thereby empowering it as God's infallible truth to the English speaking world. **This resulted in an infallible canon of truth [i.e., the English KJB – POH]**, through which the infallible Spirit of Truth **can lead the ENGLISH speaking Bible-believers unto ALL truth.** *[Emphases added – POH]*

*It seems to this author that Dr. Barnett is saying that the KJB is infallible truth, although he [the author] recognizes that Dr. Barnett equivocates on the matter below. It also seems as if Dr. Barnett, by indicating that English speaking Bible believers can be led into ALL(!) truth just from the KJB, is implying that Dr. D. A. Waite and DBS are mistaken in saying that “we MUST go back to the underlying original language Texts for COMPLETE clarity ...” (DBS articles of faith on the Bible) *[Emphases added to the quote – POH]* Yet Dr. Bob Barnett in his paper presented to the 22nd annual DBS meeting in 2000 contradicts Dr. Waite when he *[Dr. Barnett]* says, “God has preserved these Scriptures not only in the original languages, but also in accurate translations made of them. Must one learn Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic to be able to read God's truth? Did God intend that the whole world be taught Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic before the gospel could be preached to them? Must Pastors be Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic scholars in order that they may teach people the Holy Word of God? Certainly not. On the day of Pentecost, as recorded in Acts 2:5-11, “there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven” (verse 5). As the Apostles spoke, they were all amazed and asked, “How hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?” This supernatural witness of the church at Jerusalem showed the Word of God going out to all the nations of the world in their own individual languages. God's Word went out with equal authority in all those languages to all those nations on the day of Pentecost. God Intended That His Word be Translated Accurately in All Languages. Without question, God intended that His Word be translated accurately into all languages to fulfill the Great Commission to preach the gospel to every creature (Mark 16:15). This is further substantiated by Paul's version of the Great Commission to the Gentiles which is found in Romans 16:25-26, “But now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith.” First comes the preaching of the gospel to the peoples of all the nations in verse 25, and then comes the circulation of the Scriptures in their own languages in verse 26. God is commanding that the Scriptures must be made known to all nations for their obedience to the faith. *[Emphases are Dr. Barnett's]**

I do not believe a strong faith in the divine accuracy and authority of the authorized KJB can be built up among people in the pews where its authority is discredited or denied from the pulpit.

[And authority, particularly “divine accuracy”/ [divine] authority”, stands of falls with inerrancy! Would Dr. Barnett say, and believe, and mean, that the KJB is inerrant? – POH]

Within the above context, **I believe we have every right to call the KJB GOD’S INSPIRED English Scriptures.** *[Emphases added – POH]*

[This author recognizes that Dr. Barnett does equivocate on the matter, i.e., “the KJB possesses virtual inspiration rather than verbatim inspiration” and “the KJB derives its inspiration” and “the KJB is not directly inspired but rather derivatively inspired”. Nevertheless, it is evident from things that Dr. Waite has written that he (Dr. Waite, as well as the DBS) cannot abide even the above statement by Dr. Barnett. – POH]

Today, the English language is respected in business and science internationally as a universal or global language. By combining God’s original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek into the highest form of this universal English language, the authorized KJB is without question the most precise and powerful single book upon planet earth today!

[Dr. Barnett’s problem here is that by “the above context” is meant that Dr. Barnett is not referring to the actual English words as inspired, but rather to the “eternal truth” or “logos” communicated by these words into the English language. This neo-orthodox approach regarding the message being inspired, but not the words, is unbecoming of a fundamentalist. Had he simply made the statement, without qualifying it to mean the message rather than the words, he would have made a profound statement. The illogic of his position here is that it is the very words which communicate the “logos” or the “eternal truth” or the “body of authority”. Without inerrancy (yea, “inspiration”?), there is no guarantee that the “logos” is communicated truly or that the “eternal truth” can actually be definitively determined.

This is the only infallible rule of interpretation which can protect our English speaking churches from doctrinal misinterpretations of the original languages. As the apostle Paul said: **ACS 17:11** These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.

This coherent rule of translation was first observed in Acts 2 as the Holy Spirit enabled every man to hear God's word in his own language:

ACS 2:8 And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?

ACS 2:9 Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judaea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia,

ACS 2:10 Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes,

ACS 2:11 Cretes and Arabians, we do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God.

This principle of Bible translation is clearly extended to all nations in the great commission to the gentiles in **Romans 16:25,26**. Verse 25 reminds us first of the preaching of the gospel, and then verse 26 commands us to make the scriptures available to "...all nations for the obedience of faith". Bible translations are an urgent part of God's plan and program for reaching the world.

ROM 16:25 Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, **ROM 16:26** But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith:

Our English forefathers believed their authorized King James Bible was **infallible**. Theodore P. Letis in his book, *THE MAJORITY TEXT; Essays and Reviews in the Continuing Debate*, quoted Woodbridge and Balmer as admitting: "It is true that in the seventeenth century a good number of Christians esteemed that the Bibles they had in their hands were infallible." It was not until the advent of naturalistic textual criticism that men began to seriously question the infallibility of the Bibles **[in context, this may have included translations – POH]** they **held in their hands**. **[Emphases added – POH]**

[It is truly unfortunate that Dr. D. A. Waite, the president of DBS, does not take to heart this message, which was delivered at DBS' 1994 annual meeting. He denies that the word "infallible" should ever be used of the KJB (and can never be used of any other translation either).]

Let us listen to this last Bible Conference testimony by the prince of preachers, C. H. Spurgeon in his *Final Manifesto*, printed in April, 1891. (He died in January, 1892). "If this book **[and in context, Spurgeon was referring to the KJB – POH]** be not infallible, where shall we find infallibility? We have given up the Pope, for he has blundered often and terrible; but we shall not set up instead of him a horde of little popelings fresh from college. Are these correctors of Scripture infallible? Is it certain that our Bibles are not right, but that the critics must be so?" While we cannot read the mind of C.H. Spurgeon, we know he was preaching from the authorized King James Bible, and we know his listeners possessed authorized King James Bibles.

[It is sad that Dr. D. A. Waite, president of the Dean Burgon Society, refuses to believe what many of our English forefathers believed: "The King James Bible is infallible." If Theodore P. Letis is correct, for all practical purposes today Dr. Waite has actually sided with naturalistic textual criticism in even questioning the

infallibility of the KJB, let alone denying it entirely. One wonders if even Dr. Barnett has been taken in by using words that were not used by our forefathers such as, “virtual inspiration” and “derived [its] inspiration”, but not “verbatim inspiration” [“verbal”? – POH]. It is a sad day indeed when “a horde of little popelings”, sets itself up as the final arbiter of truth. – POH]

ADDENDUM 2

REFUTING PORTIONS OF DR. D. A. WAITE’S BOOK, “A WARNING!!” (The book, “A WARNING!!” is a response to Gail Riplinger’s publishing of statements which evidence Dr. Waite’s attitude of “cardinalism” and “popishness” regarding Bible texts and the King James Bible)

By Peter Heisey

(This is a brief review as distinct from a detailed review. Quotes from Dr. Waite’s material first, followed by author’s comments in all caps.)

1. I believe the King James Bible can be described as the only true, reliable, and accurate English **translation** of the preserved, original, **inspired**, inerrant, infallible, perfect, pure Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words which underlie it.

a.*DOES DR. WAITE UNDERSTAND AND ACTUALLY BELIEVE THE WORD “TRUE” AS APPLIED TO THE KING JAMES BIBLE? IT SEEMS NOT. [Webster 1828 = Genuine; pure; real; **not** counterfeit, **adulterated or false**; **Free from falsehood**; **Exact**; **right to precision**; as a **true copy**; a **true likeness** of the original.

b.*DOES DR. WAITE UNDERSTAND AND ACTUALLY BELIEVE THE WORD “RELIABLE” AS APPLIED TO THE KING JAMES BIBLE? IT SEEMS NOT. [**reliable** - worthy of reliance or trust; dependable, honest, true trustworthy, trusty - worthy of trust or belief;

c.*DOES DR. WAITE UNDERSTAND AND ACTUALLY BELIEVE THE WORD “ACCURATE” AS APPLIED TO THE KING JAMES BIBLE? IT SEEMS NOT. [Webster 1828 = “In exact conformity to truth, or to a standard or rule, or to a model; **free from** failure, **error**, **or defect**.”]

*WHY DOES DR. WAITE DISTANCE HIMSELF FROM EVER USING/MEANING TO APPLY ANY OF THE TERMS USED IN THE DEFINITION OF “ACCURATE” (FOR EXAMPLE) AS BEING APPLICABLE TO THE KJB (FOR EXAMPLE, “FREE FROM ERROR”/ “INERRANT”)?
*FURTHERMORE, DOES DR. WAITE CONSIDER IT HERESY TO BELIEVE THAT THE KJB IS INERRANT? (ESPECIALLY GIVEN HIS OWN USE OF THE TERM “ACCURATE”; THOUGH PERHAPS HE MISUSES THE TERM) THIS QUESTION IS PARTICULARLY PERTINENT GIVEN THAT DR. WAITE SAYS THE KJB IS “ACCURATE”. DOES DR. WAITE BELIEVE THAT THE KJB IS IN FACT INERRANT GIVEN THAT THE WORD “ACCURATE” MEANS WITHOUT ERROR? IT SEEMS NOT.

2. I believe **2 Timothy 3:16** refers to this once-for-all inspiration by God of those original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words.

THE CONTEXT CLEARLY SHOWS THAT 2 TIMOTHY 3:16 REFERS TO COPIES THAT TIMOTHY HAD AND NOT TO ONCE FOR ALL INSPIRATION OF ORIGINAL SOMETHING OR OTHERS. FURTHERMORE, DR. WAITE CANNOT PROVE THAT THE O.T. COPIES OF THE SCRIPTURES THAT TIMOTHY HAD WERE IN FACT IN HEBREW. NOR CAN DR. WAITE PROVE BEYOND A SHADOW OF A DOUBT THAT TIMOTHY COULD EVEN READ HEBREW.

3. I believe it is an inaccurate view of the King James Bible to refer to it as "*inspired*," I believe this term must be reserved exclusively for the original, preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible and not for the King James Bible itself.

*WOULD DR. WAITE SAY THAT THE WORD “INSPIRED” CAN BE APPLIED TO EXACT COPIES OF THE HEBREW, ARAMAIC, AND GREEK WORDS UNDERLYING THE KING JAMES BIBLE? IF SO, WHERE ARE THOSE COPIES? GIVEN DR. WAITE’S VASCILLATION ON THAT MATTER (I.E., IS IT SCRIVENER’S TEXT, OR DOES SCRIVENER’S HAVE READINGS THAT NEED CORRECTED/DO NOT MATCH THE READINGS UNDERLYING THE KJB – DR. WAITE CAN’T SEEM TO MAKE UP HIS MIND), IS TOUGH TO REALLY TELL.

4. This **HERESY** view is held by Gail Riplinger, Peter Ruckman, and many of their followers.

AND MANY WHO ARE NOT THEIR “FOLLOWERS”. (LIKE MYSELF, FOR EXAMPLE). DEFINE “FOLLOWERS”. ONE IS NOT A “FOLLOWER” MERELY BECAUSE HE OR SHE HAPPENS TO AGREE WITH THE

POSITION OF ANOTHER BELIEVER. THEORETICALLY, IF SOMEONE BELIEVED THIS BEFORE RIPLINGER DID, WOULDN'T IT MAKE RIPLINGER A FOLLOWER OF THEM RATHER THAN THE OTHER WAY AROUND?

5. Because of this, their so-called verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible supplants the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words given by God Himself. HOW DO YOU REALLY KNOW WHAT THOSE GREEK AND HEBREW WORDS ARE WITHOUT THE KJB BEING THE PRESERVED INERRANT WORDS OF GOD? CERTAINLY SCRIVENER IS NOT THOSE WORDS IN TOTALITY, IN THE MINUTAE. CERTAINLY THE VARIOUS PUBLISHED "MAJORITY" TEXT EDITIONS ARE NOT THOSE WORDS IN TOTALITY.

6. She rejects the truth that God's breathing-out His Words or inspiration occurred only once. [However] It occurred [only] when God breathed-out His own perfect, inspired, inerrant, infallible, pure Words in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. This process was never repeated by God.

BOOK, CHAPTER AND VERSE PLEASE. MERELY AFFIRMING SUCH A THING DOESN'T MAKE IT SO. 2 TIMOTHY 3:16 WON'T DO HERE FOR EVIDENCE SINCE IT NEITHER MENTIONS THAT SUCH A THING OCCURRED ONLY ONCE, NOR DOES IT MENTION THAT IT OCCURRED "ONLY WHEN GOD BREATHED OUT HIS OWN ...", NOR DOES IT MENTION THAT IT APPLIES ONLY TO THE ORIGINAL. THE PASSAGE, IN CONTEXT, IS REFERRING TO COPIES WHICH ARE CALLED SCRIPTURE GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD.

7. She totally REPLACES the Old and New Testament original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of God, with the English King James translation which are the words of men. This REPLACEMENT is serious doctrinal **HERESY**! [Underlining added]

WHERE DOES GOD SAY THAT HIS WORDS ARE ONLY THE GREEK, HEBREW, AND ARAMAIC WORDS WHICH HE BREATHED OUT IN THE ORIGINALS? WHERE IS A VERSE WHICH WOULD PROVE THAT THE WORDS OF THE KJB ARE [IN THE CONTEXT OF DR. WAITE'S STATEMENTS] MERELY THE WORDS OF MEN AND NOT ALSO THE WORDS OF GOD WHICH HE WANTED ENGLISH SPEAKERS TO HAVE?

8. Gail Riplinger's letter to the Waites, threatening to sue me if I didn't retract some things in two weeks (pp. 43-60). **8. About January 12, 2010**, Dr. D. A. Waite's answer to Gail Riplinger's threat to sue him (unpublished), pp. 61-72.

(9.) About January 15, 2010, Dr. Phil Stringer's letter on "*Does Dr. Gail Riplinger Have a Right to Sue Those who Disagree with Her?*" (pp. 73- 76). 10. January 15, 2010, David Cloud's report on "*GAIL RIPLINGER THREATENS TO SUE DR. AND MRS. WAITE*" (pp. 77-82). 11. February 17, 2010, Dr. Phil Stringer's letter on "*Gail Riplinger and Suing Baptists*" (pp. 83-84).

I HAVE READ ALL THE DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE TO ME AND I SAW NOT ONE PLACE WHERE RIPLINGER THREATENED SPECIFICALLY TO SUE DR. WAITE.

9. She defends a different King James Bible than I do. Her Bible is a verbal plenary inspiration of the English King James Bible. This is inspiration **HERESY**. My Bible is the King James Bible which is **not** "*inspired by God*" or "*God-breathed*" but is the only accurate, reliable, and true **translation** of the preserved, inerrant, **inspired, God-breathed**, perfect Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words on which it is based.

JUST BECAUSE DR. WAITE CALLS IT "HERESY" DOES NOT MAKE IT SO. FURTHERMORE, BASED ON THE DICTIONARY DEFINITIONS OF "ACCURATE", "RELIABLE", AND "TRUE", WOULD DR. WAITE SAY THAT THE KJB IS WITHOUT ERROR? IT SEEMS NOT; AND IF NOT, THEN HE IS PLAYING ANTICS WITH SEMANTICS AND IS USING THOSE THREE TERMS IN A WAY NOT JUSTIFIED BY EITHER THE PRINCIPLES OF THE KJB NOR BY ENGLISH DICTIONARIES, NOR BY THE WAY THOSE WORDS ARE COMMONLY USED. I ALSO NOTE THE ABSENCE OF BOOK, CHAPTER, AND VERSE PROVING THAT RIPLINGER'S BELIEF IS "HERESY".

10. Gail Riplinger does not know where the preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words are.

DR. WAITE'S OMNISCIENCE IS AMAZING HERE IN KNOWING FOR SURE WHAT RIPLINGER DOES OR DOES NOT KNOW. I THINK SHE IN FACT DOES KNOW WHERE OR WHAT THE PRESERVED HEBREW, ARAMAIC, AND GREEK WORDS ARE. I THINK SHE WOULD SAY THEY ARE THE EXACT WORDS UNDERLYING THE KJB. BUT THE REAL QUESTION IS, INDEED, WHERE ARE THEY!!!!??? DOES DR. WAITE KNOW WHERE THEY ARE ALL GATHERED INTO ONE PLACE? IF SO, WHERE WOULD HE SAY THEY ARE GATHERED INTO ONE PLACE? ARE THEY PUBLISHED IN ONE PLACE SOMEWHERE? (I DON'T THINK SO – AND CERTAINLY SCRIVENER, WHO DISAGREES WITH THE READINGS CHOSEN BY THE KJB TRANSLATORS IN SOME 40+ PLACES, CANNOT BE CONSIDERED "WHERE THEY ARE".)

*ADDITIONAL MATERIAL ON THE ABOVE MATTER. Having read the material, I can't honestly say that I agree with everything you brought out, but you made some good points. However, you made a statement on page 28 which at the very least contradicts the statements you made to me and others (via email cc) in the attached information (and which I personally believe to be in error). You also seem to "fudge" on the matter of Scrivener being correct in your statement on p. 52: "It is true that Scrivener's Greek Text is the closest to the KJB." Also on p. 66 you say something different "I don't *"unwisely"* use Scrivener's Greek New Testament. I believe those are the preserved Words of the original New Testament." I raise the issue because numerous others received a copy of your comments (both from yourself and from me) and those comments are "out there" in the hands of many folks. You said on page 28: The "*Scrivener Greek New Testament*" is not "*slightly tainted*." I believe the Words in this "*Greek New Testament*" to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words. Also, p. 66 "I believe those [the words of Scrivener's text] are the preserved Words of the original New Testament." Now Dr. Waite, you and I have discussed this exact problem and the conclusion was that there are indeed places (20 or so to this point) where Scrivener is NOT an "accurate copy of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words". I have highlighted, in yellow, your statements in the attached document to the contrary of your affirmation on p.28. [If the problem is your usage and understanding of the word "accurate" (i.e., not 100% the "accurate copies of") then it's logical that your position seems contradictory -- maybe you can explain further; especially in light of Webster 1828 = "In exact conformity to truth, or to a standard or rule, or to a model; **free from** failure, **error**, **or defect**;"]

As I, and you, noted: if Scrivener clearly does not use the underlying word that the KJB translators used, then one or the other is wrong. In your comments to me (and others via email cc) you indicated that Scrivener was wrong. Are you now saying that you were mistaken in making those comments?

11. It's a bad enough **HERESY** for her to believe that God gave the King James Bible by verbal plenary inspiration. It is a far-out fringe **HERESY** that even Peter Ruckman (so far as I know) doesn't even believe in!

MUDSLINGING, NAME-CALLING, ATTEMPTED DEMEANING, AND GUILT-BY-ASSOCIATION ARGUMENTS DO NOT PROVE ONE'S POINT, NOT FOR RIPLINGER AND NOT FOR DR. WAITE. BACK TO FIRST YEAR

LOGIC DR. WAITE (AND ESPECIALLY SINCE DR. WAITE DOES NOT PRODUCE BIBLICAL SUPPORT FOR THIS AFFIRMATION AND CONTRARY TO THE RESEARCHED CONCLUSIONS OF DR. SAM GIPP AND OTHERS).

12. Gail Riplinger spread the false view that nobody should use any Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek lexicons to find out meanings of Bible words. Because of her **HERESY** view of the plenary verbal inspiration of the King James Bible, Gail Riplinger doesn't even want people to look in either Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek or even English dictionaries to find out the meaning of the words in the King James Bible.

I DON'T BELIEVE THAT RIPLINGER EVER SAID THAT. SHE SAID NOBODY "NEEDS" TO USE SHE ALSO MADE MENTION OF THE CORRECT WAY TO USE EVEN ENGLISH DICTIONARIES (I.E., NOT AS FINAL AUTHORITY), THUS INDICATING THAT SHE IS NOT OF THE OPINION THAT SHE "DOESN'T EVEN WANT PEOPLE TO LOOK ..."

13. Inspiration is defined as the once-for-all process of God's "*breathing-out*" (THEOPNEUSTOS) of the original Old and New Testament Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.

THIS IS DR. WAITE'S DEFINITION OF THE TERM. THE ACTUAL BIBLICAL USAGE OF THE TERM DOES NOT REFER NOR STATEDLY RESTRICT THIS WORD TO JUST THE ORIGINALLY BREATHED OUT WORDS IN THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS. I AM WELL AWARE THAT DR. WAITE HAS NOT RAISED THE "SPECTER" OF "ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS", YET IT SEEMS THAT HE IS SAYING THAT ONLY THE ORIGINAL WORDS OF (ON/IN?) THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS ARE THE "INSPIRED" ONES; I.E., THEY ARE NOT INSPIRED IF THEY ARE COPIES OF THOSE WORDS IN ANOTHER PLACE OR EVEN IF MOST OF THEM ARE IN ONE PLACE (SCRIVENER, FOR EXAMPLE). FURTHERMORE, IT SEEMS THAT DR. WAITE DOESN'T THINK THE 54+ LEARNED MEN WHO WORKED ON THE KJB REALLY KNEW WHAT THEY WERE DOING HERE IN TRANSLATING THE WORDS BEFORE THEM AS, "*IS* GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD", RATHER THAN "GOD-BREATHED".

14. This verse has nothing whatsoever to do with the alleged verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible or of any other **translation** of the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek Words.

O, BUT DR. WAITE, IT SURELY DOES, SINCE IT REFERS TO COPIES OF O.T. READINGS, AS WELL AS GREEK TRANSLATIONS OF O.T. QUOTES

IN THE N.T. BOOKS THAT TIMOTHY HAD UP TO THE POINT WHERE HE RECEIVED PAUL'S 2ND LETTER TO HIM.

15. [Inspiration] refers only and exclusively to the "*breathing-out*" or inspiration by God of those original Words.

BOOK, CHAPTER AND VERSE PLEASE. AND 2 TIMOTHY 3:16 DOESN'T CUT IT ON THIS COUNT SINCE THE REFERENCE IS TO COPIES.

16. The KJB translators "they were still just men."

THAT SAME POINT COULD BE MADE FOR ALL THE WRITERS OF THE N.T. YET GOD USED THEM TO PEN HIS EXACT WORDS IN THOSE DAYS. THERE IS PLENTY OF SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE (PSA. 12:6-7 FOR EXAMPLE) THAT SHOWS THAT GOD WOULD DO THE SAME THING WITH OTHERS TO PRESERVE HIS INSPIRED WORDS, INCLUDING IN TRANSLATIONS SO THAT OTHER PEOPLES, I.E., OTHER THAN HEBREW AND GREEK SPEAKERS, COULD HAVE THE PRESERVED INSPIRED WORDS OF GOD IN THEIR OWN LANGUAGE. TO DENY THIS IS TO DENY THE PRIESTHOOD OF EVERY BELIEVER TO KNOW ALL THE WORDS [MT. 4:4; LU. 4:4] AND TRUTH OF GOD [JN. 17:17] AND RESTRICT THAT POSSIBILITY TO ONLY THOSE WHO ARE COMPLETELY FLUENT IN HEBREW AND GREEK. NOW THAT'S NONSCRIPTURAL, NONBAPTIST NONSENSE THAT, IF NOT HERESY, SURELY BORDERS ON IT.

17. the extent to which the volume produces honest, helpful, and accurate meanings and examples of the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible.

HOW CAN A LEXICON DO THIS IF IT WAS WRITTEN BY AN UNSAVED MAN, OR IS TAKEN FROM SECULAR SOURCES OR DOES NOT CONSIDER EVERY USAGE/CONTEXT OF A PARTICULAR WORD (AND NO LEXICONS DO THIS), AND PARTICULARLY ALL THE BIBLICAL USES??????

18. Gail Riplinger likens us to the Roman Catholic Church just because we differ from her.

SHE LIKENS DR. WAITE, ET AL, TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH BECAUSE DR. WAITE AND COMPANY AFFIRM THAT THE INSPIRED WORDS OF GOD ARE NOT AVAILABLE TO THE COMMON PEOPLE (JUST LIKE THE ROMAN CATHOLIC INSTITUTION AFFIRMS), **NOT** BECAUSE SHE DISAGREES WITH DR. WAITE.

19. 2 Timothy 3:16 describes the inspiration, or God-breathing out of His Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.

WELL, NOW, 2 TIMOTHY 3:16 DESCRIBES, THEN, THE INSPIRATION [“BREATHING OUT”] OF THE EXACT **COPIES** OF THE WORDS OF THE ORIGINALS, SINCE THE CONTEXT CLEARLY SHOWS THAT WHAT TIMOTHY HAD IN HIS HANDS WAS NOT THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS. FURTHERMORE, IT REMAINS TO BE PROVEN THAT 2 TIMOTHY DOES NOT REFER TO SOME OTHER LANGUAGE MANUSCRIPT THAT TIMOTHY HAD IN HIS HANDS. IT FURTHER REMAINS TO BE PROVEN THAT 2 TIMOTHY 3:16 SPECIFICALLY INCLUDES THE FACT THAT TIMOTHY INDEED KNEW HEBREW, AND ESPECIALLY IS THIS PERTINENT SINCE HE WASN’T EVEN CIRCUMCISED IN HIS CHILDHOOD.

20. In years gone by, the DBS speakers could not say from the DBS platform that the King James Bible, or any other translation, was inspired or God-breathed. As of this year, the DBS Executive Committee and Advisory Council cannot say this anywhere, at any time, in any place.

DOES THIS MEAN THAT SOME OF THEM MIGHT BELIEVE IT, BUT JUST NOT SAY IT?

21. “*Perfection*” of translation is not possible.

THIS IS PURE PRESUPPOSITION, ASSUMPTION, AND PRESUMPTION ON DR. WAITE’S PART. IT DEPENDS ON HOW BIG GOD IS AS TO WHETHER PERFECTION OF A TRANSLATION IS POSSIBLE. THIS AUTHOR IS NOT READY TO ACCEPT SUCH A THING AS BEING THE CASE JUST ON DR. WAITE’S “SAY-SO”, AND ESPECIALLY GIVEN THE CONTRARY EVIDENCE IN THE SCRIPTURES.

22. Only God has “*perfection.*” He is “*perfect.*”

IS DR. WAITE SAYING THEN THAT NO WORD OF GOD, NO WORK OF GOD, AND NO WAY OF GOD, INCLUDING HIS DEFINITION OF THE GOD-BREATHED WORDS OF THE WORD OF GOD, WAS OR CAN BE PERFECT???? HOW DOES THAT MATCH WITH PSALM 19:7 AMONG OTHER SCRIPTURES. NUMEROUS SCRIPTURES IN ADDITION TO PSALM 19:7 SHOW THAT THE USAGE OF THE WORD “ONLY” IN DR. WAITE’S AFFIRMATION ABOVE MAKES HIS STATEMENT COME AWFULLY CLOSE TO ACTUAL **HERESY**.

23. Or is it the second edition of the King James Bible that is “*perfect*”? Or is it the third edition of the King James Bible that is perfect? Or is it the fourth edition? Or is it the fifth edition? Or is it the sixth edition? Or is it the seventh edition?

THIS IS THE SETTING UP OF A STRAW MAN ON DR. WAITE’S PART. IT IS THE TEXT(!) OF THE KJB, NOT NECESSARILY THE PRINTED EDITIONS WITH THEIR TYPOS, ETC.

24. I believe the word, “*perfection*,” is a word we can only use when referring to God Almighty.

THUS, ACCORDING TO DR. WAITE, ONE CANNOT OR SHOULD NOT SAY THAT EVEN THE ORIGINALS WERE PERFECT BECAUSE THEY WERE WRITTEN BY MEN. THIS IS A DENIAL OF PSALM 19:7; 1 CORINTHIANS 13:8, JAMES 1:25, ETC.

25. All you have to do is find one place where it is not “*perfect*.”

BY THIS STATEMENT IT IS CLEAR THAT WAITE PRESUPPOSES AND ASSUMES THAT THERE ARE [PROBABLY] ERROR(S) IN THE KJB OR THAT THE KJB DEFINITELY HAS AT LEAST ONE ERROR. IF I, ON THE OTHER HAND, PRESUPPOSE (BY FAITH AND ON GOOD GROUNDS) THAT THE KJB DOES NOT HAVE ANY ERRORS, THEN IT IS A MATTER OF STUDY TO FIND THE RESOLUTION TO THE SUPPOSED “ERROR”, RATHER THAN SIMPLY SAYING, “WELL, NO TRANSLATION IS ‘PERFECT’ (OR ‘INERRANT’ OR WHATEVER).

26. the King James Bible’s word is the only thing you can use. Otherwise, to her, it is an “*error*.”

IF THIS IS RIPLINGER’S POSITION, IS IT REALLY SUCH A PROBLEM GIVEN DR. WAITE’S OWN STATEMENT THAT THE KJB IS THE “BEST”, “ACCURATE”, ETC. ... TRANSLATION. IF THAT IS TRUE, THEN THE WORD GOD WANTED IN ENGLISH IS THE ONE IN THE KJB, AND ANY OTHER WORD WOULD NOT CONSTITUTE THE PRESERVED WORD(S) OF GOD IN ENGLISH IN THAT PLACE. THUS IT WOULD BE AN ERROR. AND TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION THE PARTICULAR CONTEXTS IN WHICH THOSE WORDS OCCUR, IT MAY WELL BE THAT THE WORD CHOSEN BY THE KJB TRANSLATORS IS NOT ONLY THE BEST WORD, BUT PERHAPS THE ONLY WORD THAT REALLY FITS THAT GIVEN CONTEXT. DR. WAITE IS ENTITLED TO HIS OPINION, BUT IT IS NOTHING MORE THAN THAT. RIPLINGER IS ENTITLED TO HERS AS WELL.

27. She believes you can't explain any of the King James Bible's words or define them. STRAW MAN. BACK TO LOGIC 001. RIPLINGER SPECIFICALLY SAID THAT YOU CAN(!!) FIND THEIR MEANINGS OR DEFINITIONS BY STUDYING THE KJB (AS DISTINCT FROM HAVING TO USE A LEXICON).

28. If people don't understand the word "*OUCHES*," for example, it is too bad for them, in her judgment.

STRAW MAN. RIPLINGER SAID THAT THE WAY TO FIND THE MEANING IS TO STUDY THE KJB. HOW THAT CAN BE CONSTRUED AS BEING "TOO BAD FOR THEM" IS A REAL STRETCH OF LOGIC ON DR. WAITE'S PART.

29. Gail Riplinger despises the definitions of uncommon words.

THIS IS A BALD-FACED LIE ON DR. WAITE'S PART. RIPLINGER LOVES(!!) THE BIBLICAL(!!) (KJB) DEFINITIONS OF UNCOMMON WORDS IN THEIR BIBLICAL CONTEXTS.

30. She believes you must chase all over the King James Bible to find the definitions of its words,

DR. WAITE'S IMPLICIT, THOUGH PROBABLY UNINTENDED, PROMOTION OF LAZINESS OVER STUDY IS UNBIBLICAL AND DESPICABLE IN LIGHT OF ACTS 17:10-11 AND 2 TIMOTHY 2:15. RIPLINGER DID NOT USE THE TERM "CHASE ALL OVER THE KJB", BUT RATHER SHE USED "TRACE" [I.E., STUDY] THE WORDS ALL THROUGH THE KJB TO FIND THEIR EXACT, PRECISE, CORRECT, IN-CONTEXT, BIBLICAL MEANING.

31. She believes you must ... never consult any dictionaries or lexicons of any kind. Riplinger despises the use of lexicons of any kind.

EXACTLY WHERE DID RIPLINGER SAY THIS? WHAT SHE ARGUES FOR IS THE PROPER AND VERY CAUTIOUS, NON-FINAL AUTHORITY USE OF THEM, AND SUBMITTING THEM TO THE FINAL AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE ITSELF (I.E., THE KJB). OTHERWISE, THE LEXICONS AND DICTIONARIES BECOME THE FINAL AUTHORITY, OR WORSE YET, THE INDIVIDUAL CHOICE OF ONE OF THE DEFINITIONS BY AN INDIVIDUAL PERSON BECOMES THE FINAL AUTHORITY. IF THAT ISN'T EVERY MAN DOING WHAT IS RIGHT IN HIS OWN EYES, THEN THE PHRASE MEANS NOTHING IN ANY PRACTICALLY APPLICABLE SENSE.

32. this position is insane!

ACTUALLY, THE “CHASING [TRACING!] ALL OVER THE BIBLE” IS QUITE BIBLICAL. ACTS 17:11; 2 TIMOTHY 2:15.

33. This happened once-for-all when these God-given original Words were [originally – poh] given. It has never happened again.

SO DESPITE THE CLEAR DECLARATION OF 2 TIMOTHY 3:15-17, DR. WAITE SAYS THAT TIMOTHY DID NOT HAVE THE ENTIRE INSPIRED WORD OF GOD (O.T. FOR EXAMPLE) IN HIS HANDS, WHICH HE HAD READ FROM HIS YOUTH. IF IT “ONLY HAPPENED ONE TIME” THEN WHAT TIMOTHY HAD IN HIS HANDS [“THE HOLY SCRIPTURES”] WAS NOT “GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD” DESPITE THE DECLARATION THAT WHAT TIMOTHY HAD (COPIES) WAS “SCRIPTURE” AND IN FACT AND INDEED “GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD” (GIVEN THAT HE HAD “ONLY” COPIES AND PERHAPS “ONLY” TRANSLATIONS). MAYBE DR. WAITE IS ATTEMPTING TO MAKE A DISTINCTION BETWEEN “THE HOLY SCRIPTURES” AND “THE GOD-GIVEN ORIGINAL WORDS” (A TRUE BIT OF NONSENSE/HERESY).

34. This accurate definition of the Bible’s inspiration by God.

WELL ACTUALLY IT ISN’T AN ACCURATE DEFINITION OF “INSPIRATION” BASED ON THE BIBLE’S OWN USE OF THE TERM IN THE CONTEXT OF 2 TIMOTHY 3 AND THE ONE OTHER PLACE IT IS USED (JOB 32:8).

35. our final and ultimate “*authority*” is the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie the King James Bible. This [is the] genuine and final “*authority*” HERE, ULTIMATELY (AND FUNDAMENTALLY!) IS THE CRUX OF THE MATTER FOR DR. WAITE. HERE HE REFUSES TO SUBMIT HIMSELF TO THE FINAL AUTHORITY OF THE KJB. GIVEN HIS POPISSH STATEMENT, THE CONSEQUENCE IS THAT ONLY THOSE WHO ARE FLUENT IN HEBREW, ARAMAIC, AND GREEK HAVE A “GENUINE” FINAL AUTHORITY. THAT IS SURELY HERESY AS FAR AS BAPTISTS ARE CONCERNED AND ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING REGARDING THE PRIESTHOOD OF EVERY BELIEVER. IT ALSO MEANS THAT SOMEONE WHO IS NOT FLUENT IN HEBREW, ARAMAIC, AND GREEK HAS NO GENUINE FINAL AND ULTIMATE [DIVINE] AUTHORITY TO STUDY OR HAVE AS A GUIDE IN ANY PRACTICAL SENSE. THIS WOULD BE A REAL PROBLEM TO SPIRITUAL

LIVING AND GROWTH IN LIGHT OF WHAT JESUS HIMSELF COMMANDED IN MATTHEW 4:4 AND LUKE 4:4.

36. We strongly believe in the King James Bible's "*authority*, WONDERFUL. BUT THE PROBLEM IS THAT DR. WAITE DOES NOT BELIEVE IT IS THE GENUINE OR THE FINAL AUTHORITY FOR ENGLISH SPEAKING PEOPLE. WHAT DR. WAITE BELIEVES BASED ON HIS STATEMENT HERE IS THAT THE KJB IS NEARLY OR MOSTLY ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY. AT THE VERY LEAST, THAT IS AN OXYMORON.

37. Gail Riplinger confuses people by not defining "*our Holy Bible.*" My "*Holy Bible*" is the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments that God Himself breathed-out and inspired. Her "*Holy Bible*" is only a translation of that "*Holy Bible,*" the King James Bible.

WELL THE FACT IS, RIPLINGER CLEARLY DEFINES HER TERM "HOLY BIBLE" AS BEING THE KJB. AND HERE AGAIN AND INDEED IS THE CRUX OF THE MATTER. THERE IS NO HOLY (I.E., INERRANT) BIBLE ["BIBLOS" – BOOK] IN HEBREW OR GREEK AVAILABLE TODAY WHICH HAS ALL OF THE EXACT TEXTS, READINGS, WORDS WHICH UNDERLIE THE KJB. OF COURSE IF DR. WAITE NOW SAYS SCRIVENER IS THAT BIBLE, CONTRARY TO STATEMENTS HE MADE IN THE FALL OF 2008 TO THIS AUTHOR, THEN HE WILL CONCLUDE THAT THERE ARE ERRORS IN THE KJB (BECAUSE THE KJB DOES NOT FOLLOW SCRIVENER'S TEXT IN A NUMBER OF PLACES). WHICH IS IT? SCRIVENER'S TEXT OR THE EXACT WORDS/READINGS/TEXTS WHICH UNDERLIE THE KJB?

38. There is no scriptural proof that any translation of God's Words is inspired of God.

WITH JUST AS MUCH VEHEMENCE AND WITH THE SAME POSSIBLILITY OF CORRECTNESS, SOMEONE ELSE COULD SAY, "THERE IS NO SCRIPTURAL PROOF THAT A TRANSLATION COULD NOT BE THE INSPIRED WORD OF GOD IN THE _____ LANGUAGE". (THE LATTER IS PROBABLY A MUCH MORE LIKELY SCENARIO GIVEN THAT O.T. QUOTES IN THE N.T., I.E., SOME TRANSLATIONS ARE INDEED INSPIRED. THAT IS, THE POSSIBILITY THAT "A TRANSLATION COULD POSSIBLY BE THE INSPIRED WORDS OF GOD IN A GIVEN LANGUAGE" IS MUCH MORE PLAUSIBLE GIVEN THE POWER OF GOD [LUKE 1:37 AMONG OTHERS] AND THE PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED FACT

[TRANSLATION OF O.T. VERSES IN THE N.T.], THAN DR. WAITE'S PRESUPPOSITION AND ASSUMPTION THAT SUCH A THING IS NOT POSSIBLE.

39. The word inspired is only used for the Words that God Himself breathed out, not that which man has merely translated.

THIS IS PURE OPINION ON DR. WAITE'S PART AND IS NOT TRUE BASED ON 2 TIMOTHY 3:15-16 WHERE THE ISSUE IS COPIES (AND EVEN POSSIBLY TRANSLATIONS; AND CERTAINLY TRANSLATIONS OF O.T. VERSES IN THE N.T. BOOKS THAT TIMOTHY HAD TO THAT POINT).

40. "*Inspiration*" has nothing whatsoever to do with translations.

HOW SO IF THERE ARE O.T. VERSES TRANSLATED AND QUOTED IN THE N.T.?!? THIS IS PURE OPINION ON DR. WAITE'S PART AND SMACKS OF ASSUMING WHAT HE IS TRYING TO PROVE. SEE ALSO GIPP'S RESEARCH.

41. For fallen, sinful, imperfect, depraved men to be able to construct anything that is absolutely "*perfect*" would exalt them to the status of God Himself.

THIS COULD BE APPLIED TO THE ORIGINAL WRITERS OF SCRIPTURE AND THUS EVEN WAITE'S ORIGINALS ONLY THEORY FALLS ON ITS FACE. HIS STATEMENT SOUNDS LIKE NUMEROUS ONES HEARD BY THIS AUTHOR FROM THE MOUTHS OF LIBERAL PROFESSORS IN SECULAR COLLEGE REGARDING THE [LACK OF] INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE. FURTHERMORE, GOD HIMSELF MAGNIFIES HIS WORD ABOVE HIS NAME (PSALM 138:2).

42. This [Waite refers here to "a perfect Bible"] is blasphemous.

WELL THEN DAVID WAS BLASPHEMOUS IN PSALM 19:7; JAMES IN JAMES 1:25; PAUL IN 1 COR. 13:10.

43. Does Gail Riplinger consider it was "*perfect*" to include the error-filled Apocrypha in the AV 1611? STRAW MAN. RIPLINGER REFERS TO THE TEXT OF THE AV1611, NOT THE PRINTER ERRORS, NOR THE APOCRYPHA, ETC. WHICH NEITHER SHE NOR THE KJB TRANSLATORS EVER CONSIDERED PART OF THE TEXT OF THE AV.

44. Though the King James Bible translators selected a proper word, there are other proper words as well that could have been used.

PERHAPS IN THAT PARTICULAR CONTEXT THERE WERE **NOT** OTHER “PROPER” WORDS, AND THUS NOT ONLY IS THE KJB CORRECT IN THAT PLACE, BUT PERHAPS THE WORD THEY USED IS INDEED THE ONLY ENGLISH WORD WHICH WOULD BE COMPLETELY CORRECT IN THAT PLACE. FURTHERMORE, DR. WAITE MUST RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTION: DID THE TRANSLATORS SELECT THE PROPER (CORRECT) ENGLISH WORD IN EVERY CASE (THUS RESULTING IN AN INERRANT TRANSLATION)? THE WORD “PROPER”, ACCORDING TO WEBSTER’S 1828 DICTIONARY, MEANS “CORRECT”, “JUST”, “AS A **PROPER** WORD”.

45. She despises dictionaries and lexicons completely!

I DON’T THINK SO. SHE DESPISES THEIR BEING PLACED ON A HIGHER LEVEL THAN THE KJB ITSELF. SHE DESPISES THE COMMENT THAT WITHOUT THOSE THINGS ONE CANNOT KNOW FOR SURE THE MEANING OF EVERY PART AND WORD OF SCRIPTURE.

46. Again, she doesn’t want any “*light*” at all on the words of the Bible. She prefers to remain in the dark.

NOT SO. SHE PREFERS TO HAVE THE KJB’S OWN DEFINITIONS FOR THE WORDS. “THY WORD IS A LAMP UNTO MY PATH AND A **LIGHT** UNTO MY FEET.”

47. I deny absolute perfection of any translation.

AS AN ASIDE, DR. WAITE DENIES THAT SUCH A THING IS EVEN **PRESUPPOSITIONALLY** POSSIBLE. WOULD THIS APPLY TO THE TRANSLATION OF O.T. VERSES WHICH WERE IN HEBREW AND ARE TRANSLATED INTO GREEK IN THE N.T.? (I DOUBT DR. WAITE WOULD GO THIS FAR, BUT IT SHOWS THAT HIS PRESUPPOSITION OF THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF A TRANSLATION BEING PERFECT IS OUT OF LINE WITH BIBLICAL PRACTICE, AS WELL AS OUT OF LINE WITH THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD – LUKE 1:37) IMPLICITLY, DR. WAITE SEEMS TO BE SAYING THAT ONE NEEDS SOMETHING IN ADDITION TO THE KJB TO BE ALL THAT HE OR SHE SHOULD BE FOR THE LORD. THIS AUTHOR, BY FAITH AND ON GOOD GROUNDS, DOES **NOT** BELIEVE THAT SOMEONE **NEEDS** SOMETHING IN ADDITION TO THE KJB TO BE ALL THAT HE SHOULD BE FOR THE LORD (SEE MATTHEW 4:4; LUKE 4:4; 1 PETER 2:2).

48. she is clearly exalting the English King James Bible translation by men (which she believes was given by verbal plenary inspiration) as superior over God's own Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words.

PERHAPS NOT. THE REAL ISSUE IS **WHERE** ARE THE EXACT 100% CORRECT "GOD'S OWN HEBREW, ARAMAIC, AND GREEK WORDS"? WHERE CAN I GET A COPY TO STUDY? (SURELY NOT SCRIVENER OR TBS HEBREW WHICH HAVE BEEN SHOWN TO HAVE DIFFERENCES WITH THE KJB AND PERHAPS EVEN INTERNAL ERRORS [BEELZEBUB/BEELZEBUL FOR EXAMPLE]. DR. WAITE ADMITTED AS MUCH TO THIS AUTHOR IN AN EMAIL IN THE FALL OF 2008.)

49. I firmly believe that I have the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. WHERE, EXACTLY? DOES DR. WAITE BELIEVE THEN THAT A PERSON WHO IS NOT FLUENT IN HEBREW, ARAMAIC, AND GREEK DOES NOT HAVE ACCESS TO THE WORDS (MATTHEW 4:4; LUKE 4:4) AND THE [WHOLE] TRUTH (JOHN 17:17) OF GOD? HMMMM. WITH JUST AS MUCH VEHEMENCE AND POSSIBLE CORRECTNESS, I CAN SAY THAT I "FIRMLY BELIEVE THAT I HAVE [IN ENGLISH FOR ENGLISH SPEAKERS!!] THE EXACT PRESERVED, INSPIRED, INERRANT, INFALLIBLE, WORDS OF GOD IN THE KING JAMES BIBLE.

50. The Scrivener text, which underlies our King James Bible.

THIS IS A LIE AND DR. WAITE KNOWS IT. SEE THE MATERIAL ABOVE AFTER NUMBER 10 ABOVE.

51. For Gail Riplinger to say that the King James Bible was given by plenary verbal inspiration, she would have to say that God produced false doctrine for putting the error-ridden Apocrypha in the A.V. 1611. Does she admit this moral flaw in God? I hope not. **WHICH KING JAMES BIBLE DOES SHE THINK WAS [SIC - "IS"] GIVEN BY PLENARY VERBAL INSPIRATION?** The King James Bible has undergone hundreds of different printings and has had at least seven major revisions. Each printing and each edition is different.

THIS IS A STRAW MAN ON DR. WAITE'S PART. IT IS THE **TEXT**(!!) OF THE KJB THAT IS THE ISSUE, NOT NECESSARILY THE PRINTED EDITIONS WITH THEIR TYPOS, ETC. NONE OF THOSE THINGS WHICH DR. WAITE MENTIONED HAVE TO DO WITH THE CORRECT **TEXT** OF THE AV1611.

52. It is the GRAPHE, (Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words) underlying the King James Bible that were given by plenary verbal inspiration and were Godbreathed (THEOPNEUSTOS).

AND THOSE WORDS ARE NOT EXACTLY WHAT SCRIVENER HAS. SEE THE MATERIAL AFTER NUMBER 10 ABOVE.

53. He merely discovered what “*Greek text*” underlay the King James Bible. THIS IS A LIE AND DR. WAITE KNOWS IT. HE ADMITS THE OPPOSITE OF THIS IN HIS SEPTEMBER 2008 EMAIL TO THIS AUTHOR. SEE THE MATERIAL AFTER NUMBER 10 ABOVE.

54. We hold to the Greek text that underlies our King James Bible. We believe it is the closest to the original Words of the New Testament.

DR. WAITE’S EMAIL TO THIS AUTHOR INDICATED THAT HE REALIZED THAT SCRIVENER’S WORDS WERE NOT EXACTLY THE WORDS WHICH UNDERLIE THE KJB IN A FEW PLACES. THIS IS CONFIRMED BY HIS NOW SAYING “CLOSEST” (AS ON P. 52). BUT HE ALSO SAYS THAT SCRIVENER IS “copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words” (p. 28). THIS IS DOUBLE TALK. IF SCRIVENER’S TEXT NEEDS CORRECTED, I.E., IF SCRIVENER’S TEXT IS NOT THE EXACT WORDS UNDERLYING THE KJB (N.T.), AS DR. WAITE INDICATED IN HIS SEPTEMBER 2008 EMAIL TO THIS AUTHOR, THEN SCRIVENER’S TEXT IS NOT “COPIES OF THE INSPIRED, INERRANT, INFALLIBLE, PRESERVED, ORIGINAL GREEK WORDS”. IF ON THE OTHER HAND, AND AGAIN I SAY IF, SCRIVENER’S TEXT IS INDEED THE COPY “OF THE INSPIRED, INERRANT, INFALLIBLE, PRESERVED, ORIGINAL GREEK WORDS”, THEN DR. WAITE SHOULD RETRACT HIS STATEMENTS TO THIS AUTHOR THAT SCRIVENER’S TEXT IS NOT CORRECT IN SOME PLACES. THE MONKEY WRENCH IN ALL THIS IS THAT DR. WAITE ALSO TOLD THIS AUTHOR THAT THE [HIS] ACTUAL “TR is made up exclusively of the exact Words underlying the KJB. That settles it for me and should settle it for anyone. I would like for the English and Greek to be united [matched] exactly and precisely.” DR. WAITE CAN’T HAVE IT BOTH WAYS. SCRIVENER’S TEXT DOES NOT PRECISELY AND EXACTLY MATCH THE READINGS/WORDINGS/TEXTS USED BY THE KJB TRANSLATORS IN PRODUCING THE KJB. SO EITHER SCRIVENER’S TEXT IS RIGHT AND THE KJB WRONG IN SOME PLACES, OR THE KJB IS RIGHT AND SCRIVENER’S TEXT IS WRONG IN SOME PLACES. SCRIVENER’S TEXT CAN’T BE MERELY “CLOSEST” AND AT THE SAME TIME BE “INERRANT”. WHICH IS IT, DR. WAITE? DR. WAITE SHOULD

CLEARLY ANSWER THE QUESTION AS TO WHETHER THERE ARE ERRORS IN THE KJB OR NOT, PARTICULARLY GIVEN THE CONFLICTING STATEMENTS ABOVE REGARDING SCRIVENER'S TEXT (OR AT LEAST EXPLAIN HOW THEY CAN BE RECONCILED). DR. WAITE ALSO OUGHT TO HONESTLY ANSWER THE QUESTION, WITH "YES" OR "NO", OF WHETHER SCRIVENER'S GREEK TEXT NEEDS CORRECTED, I.E., "IS SCRIVENER'S TEXT THE EXACT WORDS UNDERLYING THE KJB?" (YES OR NO DR. WAITE.)

ADDENDUM 3

Miscellaneous Scriptures which should be applied consistently, logically, and practically by Dr. Waite

This is a sample list and not an exhaustive list. The list could probably be considerably expanded.

Psalms 119:105 – How can one be truly and completely guided by the light of the word of God, if that light, that “word of God” has errors (is not inerrant)?

2 Timothy 4:2 – How can one “preach the word”, the WHOLE counsel of God, if that word is not complete and inerrant, i.e., “perfect”?

Acts 20:23 – Why does Dr. Waite acknowledge that this verse is “the words of the Lord” (in English in the KJB), but is unwilling to do so for ALL the words of the KJB? (i.e., to believe and declare that the KJB is without mistake)

2 Corinthians 2:17 – If Dr. Waite is unwilling to say that the KJB is inerrant (i.e., uncorrupt), then how could a “mere” English-speaking Christian ever know for sure as to whether (or where) someone has corrupted the word of God?

1 Timothy 4:5 – How can something be “sanctified by the word of God” if that “Word of God” (an acceptable term for the KJB according to Dr. Waite) is not “sanct” (i.e., “holy” [set apart from wrong], “pure” [set apart from corruption], “inerrant” [set apart from error], etc.)?

ADDENDUM 4

Dr. Waite's response to Pastor Marc Grizzard's questions (with comments by this author – POH)

From: <http://amazinggracebaptistchurchkjb.com/Download32.html>

Warning!!!!

By Pastor Marc Grizzard

I went to Greenville, SC to a Bible Conference to hear Dr. D.A. Waite on 9-26-09 at Wayside Baptist Church. During question and answer time I asked Pastor Waite if he believed that the King James Bible was inspired, and he said, "The word inspired is not found in the Bible. No! I don't believe the KJV is inspired."

[Dr. Waite, to be consistent, should also have noted that the term "God-breathed" is not found in the Bible either. – POH]

A Dr. H.D. Williams was there as well to assist Pastor Waite. After this particular question time was over I asked Dr. Williams the same question. He reaffirmed what Pastor Waite had said. He said that the word "interpretation" found in 2 Peter 1:20 ("Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation") was translated in the Greek to mean translations. (Which is incorrect. A translation or translate is not the same thing as interpretation.)

[Here, Dr. H.D. Williams violates one of the DBS resolutions, published in the DBS eNews for June 2010, which says that DBS will not change any words of the KJB. – POH]

He said, "All copies of the originals are inspired but not translations according to this verse." I then asked him, "so the KJV according to you has errors", he said, "Certainly, it is not inerrant."

[Here, Dr. Williams evidences more integrity than Dr. Waite in honestly, directly, and unequivocally answering a simple question from Pastor Grizzard. This author is "still waiting for Dr. Waite" to do the same. However the curious thing is that Dr. Williams neglected to mention where those errors are in the KJB. – POH]

In several emails that I have had with Brother Waite he said that the KJB was not inspired, infallible or inerrant. I quote:

"1. Inerrant--I leave this strong 100% term for God alone and anything He says or writes. The Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the KJB are "inerrant."

[Dr. Waite still hasn't directly and unequivocally answered the question as to whether the KJB is without error. It seems from the above statement that Dr. Waite is implying (at the least) that if "alone" the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the KJB are "inerrant", then the KJB is not inerrant and thus as far as Dr. Waite is concerned, the KJB has errors. The inconsistency evidenced by Dr. Waite here is that if the KJB is not inerrant, or if Dr. Waite isn't sure it is inerrant, then how can he KNOW for sure that even "the words 'underlying the KJB'" are the right ("inerrant") ones? This author is still "waiting for Dr. Waite" to give an honest, direct, "yes" or "no" answer to the following question: "Is the KJB without error?" (i.e., "Is the KJB inerrant?") – POH]

2. Infallible--I also leave this strong 100% term for God alone and anything He says or writes. The Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the KJB are "infallible."

Mr. Waite said that only the original words in the original languages are inerrant, and infallible, not the KJB. There is a difference. Even Bruce M., Westcott, Hort, James White, Catholics, JW's, believe what Brother Waite is saying above. Brother Waite, Mr. Williams, or their ministries will not use the words inerrant, infallible, and inspired when speaking of the KJB, only the originals which no one has.

[Actually, Dr. Waite says he does have the "inspired", "inerrant", "infallible" Words of God, but he equivocates so much on the matter that this author is "still waiting for Dr. Waite" to declare just WHAT they are and just WHERE they are. At some points, Dr. Waite says "Scrivener's text". At other times, "the exact readings underlying the KJB". In still other cases, he says, "only the original words when originally given" are "inspired", "inerrant", "infallible", etc., yet declares that "copies of those original words" can be considered "inerrant" (it is likely Dr. Waite would not apply the word "inspired" or "infallible" to said copies, despite the truth of 2 Timothy 3:15-16). Furthermore, an additional inconsistency evidenced by Dr. Waite here is that if the KJB as "GOD'S Word" (Dr. Waite's term) is not infallible, or if Dr. Waite isn't sure that the KJB as "God's Scripture" (another term of Dr. Waite's) is infallible, then how can he

KNOW for sure that even “the words ‘underlying the KJB’” are the right (“infallible”) ones, or even WHAT those exact words might be?]

I challenge you to find it. They openly say this in their teachings and video's, if you will just listen.

I will say that I disagree with Brother Waite on this issue, but I don't think he is going to hell. I believe that the work he is doing is great, as well as his ministry.