

# King James Bible ONLY Debate: is The KJV The Only Real Translation? White vs. Waite

sermonaudio.com

*King James Bible ONLY Debate*

By Larry Wessels

**Bible Text:** Acts 13:42; Hebrews 9:27

**Preached on:** Monday, October 3, 2011

## **Christian Answers of Austin, Texas**

9009 Martha's Drive

Austin, TX 78717

**Website:** [www.biblequery.org](http://www.biblequery.org)

**Online Sermons:** [www.sermonaudio.com/christiananswers](http://www.sermonaudio.com/christiananswers)

Announcer. If you would like a free newsletter on this or other subjects, just give us a call Christian Answers. The phone number is (512) 218-8022. Or you could email us at [cdebater@aol.com](mailto:cdebater@aol.com).

Dale. Good evening and welcome to "In Defense of the Faith" and we have a really great show for you in store. I'm here with Davd K. and our special guest tonight, James White. He's a good man to have on the program He's written books, "Letters to a Mormon Elder," also, "How to Answer Catholic Claims," and he's just pretty much a theologian, I would say, and it's a pleasure to have him on the program.

Now the format is a little different tonight than usual. We have a debate in store and we are going to have Dr. D. A. Waite, Director of Bible of Today, and of course, James White is Director of Alpha & Omega Ministries. And what we're going to do is give a quick intro as we do every show. We tell you why a Christian should defend the faith, present the Gospel, which is the only way of salvation that God has for humanity. David, for our audience out there, why don't you tell them why a Christian should defend the faith and the Gospel.

David. Well, before Paul had finished in his preaching of the Gospel and his starting churches and delivering what Jesus Christ had revealed to him, false Gospels had arisen and even in Galatians when he wrote the letter to the Galatians, he wrote in chapter 1, "I'm amazed that you are so quickly deserting him to call you by grace of Christ for a different gospel." So if Paul wrote that, we know that there is a one true Gospel and then all other Gospels, as Paul goes on to say, are not really even another. They are a false Gospel and so most of the New Testament was written to exhort Christians but also to go against the heresies that had arisen that Paul knew so well would come about. So that's what we try to do. Some people get very upset that we name names and we say what we believe the Bible says, and they just want to just all hold hands. Whoever says, "I'm a Christian," or says, "Jesus is Lord," it should be off-base, you can't touch them. But Paul, he directly went after Judaizers, he went after the Gnostics and even in his letters he named names.

But there is a different Gospel and we believe that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is the only thing that can save. We believe that Jesus Christ is God in the flesh and that he died on a Roman cross for the sins of the people. He shed his blood for the sins for the wrath and imputed the sins to his Son, Jesus Christ. He gave up his spirit and he died. He was buried in a tomb and in three days he rose physically and he showed himself to be both Lord and Christ. And we believe that the Gospel is that you must repent of your sins and turn from your wicked ways and place your faith and trust, a living trust, not just a head trust but a living, volitional trust in Jesus Christ and his merits, what he's done, his work on the cross. He fulfilled the law. He did not sin. He was obedient to the Father and by the grace of God and you turn your faith to Jesus Christ and trust in him and God saves you. Then after that, the working of the Spirit begins a work in your life and you become more like Jesus Christ until the day of the redemption of your body. So we believe that Christ is the only way to heaven. There is no other. That you are saved by faith, by grace through faith in him alone, and that there is no other way to heaven but through Jesus Christ.

Dale. Alright, thank you for that, Dave. And that's right, the Bible plainly says that many many people will say, "Lord, Lord," and they will not be true Christians. And Jesus said, as a matter of fact, "I'll just say depart from me, I never knew you. Never knew you." And so we would just tell you the narrow way, the truth is narrow and Jesus is the only way and a commitment of your life to him is the only way of salvation where if you are a new creation, you shall bear fruits of repentance. So, we'd encourage you to examine yourself and if you're not a Christian, listen to the program and you can call us up and after this debate here and we'll be happy to answer any questions you have that maybe are keeping you from turning your life to Christ.

We were told to read a letter from Tex Marrs having to do with this controversy. Larry, are you on the line?

Larry Wessels. I sure am, Dale.

Dale. Okay, we have our very own Larry Wessels via telephone line and why don't you tell us what you've got and quickly read the letter.

Larry. Yes. I invited Tex Marrs to debate James White in person and this is his reply.

Dale. This is a debate on the Gail Riplinger book, or what?

Larry. Oh yes, I invited Tex Marrs to debate James White on the Gail Riplinger book, "New Age Bible Versions," and he sent this reply in the mail. I got it in the mailbox yesterday and wanted it read on the radio show tonight. So here's what Tex Marrs has to say. He's written many books and is Director of Living Truth Ministries. Many people may be aware of him. Tex Marrs says,

"I believe in debating to reach the lost, the New Agers, cultists, etc. Thus in the past, I have debated Satan worshipers and witches in Seattle, New

Age psychics in Miami, homosexuals in New York, and even Lord Maitreya's forerunner, Benjamin Creme here in Austin, but the word of God, the King James Bible, is not up for debate. Regrettably, many fine and sincere Christians use the false new versions because they are unaware of the facts according to King James. They are unaware, too, of the hideous omissions and perversions of the New International Version, New American Standard Version, Revised Standard Version, etc. But Mr. James White is not one of the misinformed. He intentionally maligns the truth. Mr. White claims to be a Christian but he eagerly defiles the Holy Bible. I will be pleased to debate Muslims, witches, Satanists, Scientologists, or atheists, but I do not wish to give a heretic the forum to blaspheme God's precious biblical truth."

And that's what Tex Marrs has to say.

Dale. Okay.

Larry. Thank you and I'll be listening.

Dale. Alright, thanks, Larry. Alright, obviously we don't agree with Tex Marrs's statement but that's where he stands and with that, let me bring on Dr. D. A. Waite. Hi, Dr. Waite, are you there?

Dr. Waite. Yes.

Dale. Anyway, what we're going to do is give you an opening statement, we'll give you each opening statements of three or four minutes and you may start and then we're just going to have an open forum all the way to 10:05 and then open up for phone calls. At the end of the debate, we will allow both of you to give your addresses and phone numbers. Okay?

Dr. Waite. Okay. We both agree that we each have the same number of minutes and seconds to answer each question so that there is fairness and we will be able to speak without interrupting one another.

Dale. Certainly. And you can begin now.

Dr. Waite. My turn?

Dale. Yes, sir. You can begin with your opening statement.

Dr. Waite. Alright, you want me to take about three minutes?

Dale. Yes, sir.

Dr. Waite. Okay. The opening statement that we have to make would be that I am the author of a book, we call it "Defending the King James Bible," and we believe that the King James Bible has a fourfold superiority over all other versions in the English language. We believe it has a fourfold superiority, namely, it has superior texts of Hebrew and Greek. We believe it has superior translators that translated it. We believe it has superior technique of translation. And we believe it has superior theology. We believe it's God's word kept intact in English and we have outlined these points in our book and I believe that these other versions, we believe have a fourfold inferiority, whether that be – now I'm speaking basically and specifically of the versions that Bible-believing Christians are using today. I'm not involved with the ones the liberals are using. We could include those because those also are true, as far as the Revised Standard Version, New English Version and so on, but we're centering in specially on the ones that the King James people formerly used and now they're using these other new versions, such as the New American Standard Version, such as the New International Version, the New King James Version, and the New Berkeley Version.

Those are the four that we cite in our book. And we believe that they're inferior on texts of Hebrew; they do not use strictly the Masoretic traditional Hebrew text. They say so in their prefaces. They use other things to correct the Hebrew. They do not use the Received Greek Text, the Textus Receptus on which our King James Bible is founded, but they use the Critical Text based by Nestle-Aland 26 Edition or the 4<sup>th</sup> edition or 3<sup>rd</sup> edition United Bible Society, otherwise known as the Westcott-Hort text. They were the architects basically following manuscripts B and Aleph, the Vatican and Sinai. So that's, we believe, inferior as to manuscripts. Then we believe that they are inferior translators. We do not believe that our present men can hold a candle to our King James Bible men and their erudition and their spiritual insight and especially their equipment for knowledge of the Hebrew and cognate languages, the Greek and cognate languages, and of course, the English language. The translation technique we believe is inferior in these other versions which they use either to a greater or lesser extent than AM equivalency which adds to the words of God, subtracts from the words of God and changes them. Then they're inferior in theology. Many errors in theological statement that are found. We have over 158 of those in our book. There really are over 356 doctrinal passages.

So these are the four reasons for superiority of the King James and inferiority of these other versions. That's my three minutes.

Dale. Hey, that's really good timing, Dr. Waite. Now, so you wouldn't, you're not going so far as to say that these other versions are of the devil or anything like that? Are you quite in that camp or....?

Dr. Waite. No, I think that the other versions of the Scriptures, I believe that they're made by men probably of integrity and in fine abilities and so on, but I do not believe that they're as accurate as our King James. But what their motivations are, I think some of the publishers now, I think their motivations are the dollar sign. What the motivations of the translators, though, I wouldn't, I can't read their hearts and their minds so I wouldn't know.

Dale. Right. I was just wanting to know if you're in that extreme part of the camp. Alright, James, your opening statement.

Dr. White. Well, I appreciate Dr. Waite being with us this evening, especially knowing how late it is back in his part of the nation.

I believe that the King James Only controversy is based upon normally a misplaced allegiance to a 17<sup>th</sup> century translation that, certainly, God has blessed tremendously and if a person wishes to use that translation, I certainly don't have any problem with that, but I do not believe that the King James Version is the most accurate version for today, and I do not believe that especially the Textus Receptus, called the Received Text, underlies the King James Version, is the best Greek text that can be utilized today by any stretch of the imagination.

I am concerned when the King James Version becomes a point of contention within churches; when churches are split over the issue of whether one uses a 17<sup>th</sup> century translation done by Anglicans or whether one uses a 20<sup>th</sup> century translation done by interdenominational scholars. I am very concerned when that becomes an issue of fellowship in the church and when that, then, causes churches to no longer be able to, for example, send out missionaries because people have left the church, etc. etc. I see this as a non-issue in the sense that I do not believe that there is any conspiracy involved in the new translations to attempt to hide or deny cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith, such as the deity of Christ or the physical resurrection of Christ or the virgin birth, or any of these other issues. I believe that Christians should avail themselves of all the information that is available to them; that they should be aware of textual variation within the Greek manuscripts; and that they should have a freedom to examine all that information and I think they would be best suited by comparing a number of different translations, including the KJV. But taking a position that the KJV I think is the best, I think is somewhat untenable in light of mistranslations within the text itself and other things that have come to light that even the King James Version translators didn't know about such as the Granville Sharp construction of Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1. So I think these are issues that we need to discuss and to bring out.

Dale. Okay. Thank you for that. Well, now that we have the opening statements, let's just have an open forum and dialog and, I guess, of course, each person can clearly state their point and hopefully there will be no filibustering but we'll have a gentlemanly debate. And who wants to start?

Dr. White. Well, I thank Dr. Waite for sending me his book, "Defending the King James Bible." I've had the opportunity of looking through it and I just did want to ask him in light of what he said about other translations. On page 125 of your book, you made the statement that, I'll just read it here, "I believe the New King James Version is probably the most dangerous of the new versions on the present market today." And then just below that you also said in bold print, "The diabolical nature of the New King James Version shows itself in their printing all the various readings of the Greek text in the

footnotes; they print all sides and take a stand in favor of none of them. By so doing, they confuse the readers." And I was just wondering, I carry a New King James Version, in fact, the primary reason that I do so is because the New King James does provide the textual footnotes, it does let the reader know because it's based upon the Textus Receptus, obviously the reading of the TR is found in the Bible itself, and then they give you what's called the Majority reading and then the NU reading, the Nestle-Aland United Bible Society reading. You seem to feel that they shouldn't give you that information and my first real question was: why would you feel they shouldn't give that type of information in the footnotes?

Dr. Waite. Okay, I'll take about the same time that you took to ask it, to answer it, Mr. White. I think that the information that they give in the footnotes is very misleading to the new Christians as well as to the older Christians. In the top of their text, they claim to use the Textus Receptus reading, in the bottom, they have a smorgasbord, a veritable cafeteria of other possible readings. As you said, very honestly, either the NU, and that's the United Bible Society, or the M, the Majority Text readings, and so when a pastor is preaching from the upper top and says, for instance, that the last 12 verses of Mark are genuine, Mark 16:9-20, and then in the footnotes there is a question that certain manuscripts omit these portions, there is a decided bifurcation of loyalty either to the upper part or to the lower part.

So I believe that's a serious situation. I believe the New King James, for instance in the edition that I have, page 1235, they say it was the policy – let me just get that exact quotation here. Just bear with me a second. It was the editor's conviction the use of footnotes would encourage further inquiry by readers. They recognize that it was easier for the average reader to delete something that he felt, he or she felt was not properly a part of the text than to insert a word or phrase which had been left out by the revisers. So I believe that their motivation is to try to make people textbook critics and I don't believe that that's a part or necessary in the word of God.

And of course, we could go on. My time is up on this portion but I could go on and say that I've done a study on the New King James and found that there are over 2,000 examples of addition to the words of God, subtraction from the words of God, or changing of the words of God, and I think that is a very serious thing as well, maybe not as much as the New International, not as much as the New American Standard which has 6,000 and 4,000 respectively, but it is in the wrong direction. I'm sorry. That took me two minutes.

Dr. White. Well, Dr. Waite, I hope you won't cut your response short just out of a sense of making sure it's absolutely the same amount of time. I hope we can just have a regular conversation here and do so in such a way as to get all the information out.

But you just said that changing God's words, you use the King James as the standard for determining what God's words are and you said you don't feel that people should be being textual critics, basically, by having the information that the New King James prints at the bottom of the page. Let me ask you, though, if a person just has the KJV that has no

textual notes, or if they have the Textus Receptus that is printed by the Trinitarian Bible Society, which also does not give any textual notes, doesn't that limit them to having to believe whatever the TR says, even when there are places in the Textus Receptus that are plainly in error due to the rush that Desiderius Erasmus was in to get his Greek text into print? Aren't we, in point of fact, telling people that they have to believe whatever Desiderius Erasmus said? Wouldn't it be better to let them have the information and make a decision for themselves?

Dr. Waite. Well, Mr. White, just let me say, first of all, I don't believe that the ground of the comparison where I said adding, subtracting or changing as in the New Kings James, some of the New King James, over 2,000 places in my book, number 1442, that wasn't based upon the King James. When I read through word by word the New King James and compared it, I did compare it, first of all, with the King James to see if there was an upset here and there, but I always went back to the original Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek to check and to see which was the closer of the two. So that's the first thing I would say.

I don't also believe that there are errors in the Textus Receptus because of haste. I don't believe Erasmus was the only one, of course, who was the pilot and the source of what we call the traditional texts. Dean John William Burgon has written five books on textual matters which we've published and reprinted in our Bible for today, and Dean Burgon feels that the traditional text, I agree with him, goes all the way back to the writings of Paul and Peter and James and John. We have confidence in that. I was brought up on the Westcott and Hort text myself, from Dallas Seminary. That was the text I was given to learn my Greek in and for 21 years I was that way. The last 22 years or 23, I've been reading and studying and I've come to a different conclusion.

But Erasmus' text was not the only Textus Receptus or traditional text at that time. As you know, there were certainly the Complutensian Polyglot of Cardinal Jimenez who came out really first to print, rather to finish but not to publish. And of course, you have the ?? brothers, and of course Beza in 1598, which is a form of the King James. So there are others. I don't think we have to be shut up to any Erasmian "errors."

Dr. White. Well, the TR that you're talking about, I'm assuming it's the same one published by the Trinitarian Bible Society?

Dr. Waite. Yes, sir.

Dr. White. Okay. Does that not still to this day, for example, contain Erasmus' translations into Greek from the Latin Vulgate at the end of Revelation, as well as some of the importations that he made, like in Acts 8, from the Latin Vulgate into the Greek text without Greek textual support? Isn't that still a part of that particular edition that is printed by the Trinitarian Bible Society?

Dr. Waite. Well, in answer to that, Mr. White, the Erasmus last six verses, for instance in Revelation which he had no manuscript in the Greek, so the story goes, using the Latin, I compared, for instance, the critical text that was used by the Revised Standard Version

and I looked at it word by word and read it from that and read it from the Textus Receptus that underlies the King James, and I didn't find more than two or three words that were out of place or different. So I believe Erasmus was not the only one. I think he did a pretty good job of translating it. I think Acts 8, I think that's got legitimate standards and standing with many other texts and for early church fathers quotation.

Dr. White. But you will admit that there are words like ?? at Revelation 22:16 that basically he made up as he translated it into the Greek and they are still a part of the TR. You wouldn't defend them as being God's word, would you?

Dr. Waite. Well, Mr. White, I go by faith in what God has preserved for us through the years and as was accepted by the church. We have over 37 historical links in our book, as you notice, down through the centuries, and also that which is accumulated and proved by the evidence that is before us. Over 99% of the texts that we have, 5,210, go along with the text basically that underlies our King James Bible, and I believe that's what God has preserved for us.

Dr. White. Yeah, I would agree if you're talking about the Majority Text, but that certainly has a deep historical root, but the specific readings of the Textus Receptus, such as the one I just gave you, Revelation 22:16 or 22:18 or 22:19 or Revelation 17:4, Revelation 14:1, especially the book of Revelation, there are a number of problems where there is no Greek manuscript support and none of those readings existed prior to 1516. The church had never seen ?? at Revelation 22:16 prior to 1516. So I don't understand how it could be said that the church accepted these things when the church had never seen these readings in the first 1,500 years of its existence.

Dr. Waite. Well, I don't think that our discussion should center around one or two Greek words. I believe that the thrust of the text that underlies our King James Bible is the text that the early church copied and recopied, and the text that underlies these false versions, these versions that are not based upon proper texts, is a text of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, they claim, 350, 375 AD, and that text, basically Egyptian text doctored by heretics, Egyptian text really B and Aleph, those two particular that they almost worship, those texts were never copied and recopied by the church. There are a measly 45 Greek documents and that's as far as it goes, B and Aleph and 43 others, and they have kept themselves buried until Westcott and Hort and some of the others unburied them and said, "Aha, these are the texts that the Bible, the New Testament should be based on." And we believe that that is serious because the early church realized that there were forgeries and falsities and errors abounding in those two Egyptian texts and they never copied and recopied them.

Dr. White. Well, Dr. Waite, certainly you're aware of miniscules that exist long after the time of the Egyptian text that still maintain the Alexandrian readings like 1739, 1881 and others, but I don't agree that these texts were "doctored by heretics" or things like that. I certainly see no evidence of that when I examine the texts themselves.

I noticed that in your book, you do feel that there are a lot of theological issues that are impacted by the textual readings that we choose. You, for example, noted when the



modern text will say "Jesus" and the King James says "Lord Jesus," that you feel that this is, in fact, an attack or a denigration of his deity. Am I correctly representing what you said in your book on that?

Dr. Waite. Yes, I believe, Mr. White, I think that when these docetists or these Arians or these Egyptians who, all of whom were unorthodox in the area of Egypt, even according to some scholars on the other side, when they came to these places, they often removed the Lordship, especially "the Lord Jesus Christ." That was foreign to the Gnostics and so as far as the doctoring of the verses there, Dean Burgon in his book called "Causes of Corruption of the Early Manuscripts," lists in chapter 13 quite a few of these heretics: the Gnostics, the Ebionites, Marcion, Tatian, ??, Valentinus, ?? All of these, in fact, they said the greatest heretics and the greatest corrections and corruption occurred within the first 100 years after the Scripture was made.

Dr. White. But, sir, can you actually historically demonstrate that any of these heretics ha anything whatsoever to do with what you would identify as the Alexandrian manuscripts?

Dr. Waite. Well, I don't know by name. All I know is these men that were writing their own gospels, certainly that's a change in the word of God. Marcion, for instance, AD 150, wrote his own gospel and mutilated shamefully the Scriptures. Tatian in his ?? tried to weave the four gospels into one and thus polluted it. ??, he was a heresy elite heretic. He wrote the gospel of ??, 134 AD. And Valentinus, 140 AD, wrote his own gospel. These I can't pin down as this man or that man, for instance, took away the word "theos/God" in 1 Thessalonians or 1 Timothy 3:16, but that certainly is a heretical reading and it's certainly not a reading that ought to be accepted by the texts that we have. ?? manifest in the flesh, not simply he appeared in the body.

Dr. White. Well, sir, I would happen to agree with you that the best reading of 1 Timothy 3:16 is theos personally but I don't see that there is any theological reason to assert that someone, some scribe who saw "hos" there which is the other reading, was somehow a heretic. But I don't think I really got an answer to what I was saying earlier and that is, while we all agree that there were heretics in the early church, I asked where you can demonstrate that these heretics had anything to do with the writing of the manuscripts that are vilified by King James Only advocates. In fact, the first one you mentioned, Marcion, you also mentioned Valentinus, they both flourished in Rome, not Alexandria, Egypt, and hence, could not one if we're just citing names, assert that maybe that's why the Byzantine text does not contain the reference to the deity of Christ of John 1:18? I mean, could we not utilize that type of an argumentation? I mean, I wouldn't but it would seem that if you're going to use that type of argumentation, it has to go in both directions, doesn't it?

Dr. Waite. Well, as far as 1 John or John 1:18, I believe it is inimical to the deity of Christ, the reading that the only begotten God, to have God, the only begotten, I believe is a travesty and a heresy and a theological perversion. I believe the only begotten Son is the proper reading. I believe it's the proper doctrine and I think that what you said about those heretics in Rome or whether they're in Rome or wherever they are, they had an

influence in the early church in some of these versions. For instance, if you take 1 John 4:3, "every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God, this is the spirit of antichrist," the words "Christ has come in the flesh" is left out of Aleph, or rather B. There is no Aleph here in this portion. And I believe this is a great heresy. They did not want to believe that Jesus Christ, perfect God, perfect man, is come in the flesh, Incarnate, and I believe that's the essence of 1 Timothy 3:16 as well.

Dr. White. You just mentioned 1 John 4:3, if I just might turn our readers' attention to that. You just indicated that that phrase is not found in modern translations and you're right, and you consider that heretical. Isn't it significant, though, you indicated these manuscripts did not want to believe this, why then do they all include it in verse 2, the verse immediately before the one that you read which in all the modern translations speaks of "the one confessing that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, is from God"? Isn't it much more logical to understand that the reason that the Byzantine manuscripts have this same phrase twice was due to scribal error and not the other way around? And isn't it clear no matter which direction you go on that, that since all the manuscripts at 1 John 4:2 contain that phrase, there obviously was not some sort of conspiracy to attempt to deny the wonderful truth that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh?

Dr. Waite. Well, in 1 John 4:2, "By this know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God," I believe that wherever there is wrong doctrine, wherever there is heresy, I believe it should be included whether it's twice, whether it's once. I don't believe that we say that we can take out any portion of that which is solid and straight. I didn't name the versions that did remove "Christ has come in the flesh," but the New American Standard Version is one, and certainly the New King James in the footnotes.

I believe that we should take, for instance, another example of heresy and theological error in, for instance in John 7:8 where the Lord Jesus is made out to be a liar by Aleph and by the New American Standard Version. I believe this is serious heresy against our Savior, the Lord Jesus, who loved us and gave himself for us.

Dr. White. Well, sir, again, if you're asserting that there is some heresy on the part of these manuscripts, when you have the phrase "Jesus has come in the flesh" right there in verse 2, obviously if someone wanted to take that doctrine out of the Bible, then they would take it out of the Bible, but they didn't. In John 7, what you're talking about here, again, it is not calling Jesus a liar to take out the word "yet" going up to this feast. That could be understood very plainly in other ways other than calling Jesus Christ a liar. There would be no reason for anyone to attempt to do such a thing but there would be a very good reason why later scribes would want to put that word "yet" in so that they wouldn't have to explain why Jesus put it the way that he did. Again, one can understand the situation here without resorting to some sort of theory that certain manuscripts are somehow attempting to insert heresy.

But you did just say something that intrigues me. You said that whatever is, I think you put it, fuller or more strong in solid doctrine, that that's the reason that we should go with. Let me ask you possibly about another passage and see what your opinion on it is. In Acts 4:25 in the King James Version, Acts 4:25 we read the following, "Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things?" Now, the New American Standard Bible at Acts 4:25 says, "who by the Holy Spirit, through the mouth of our father David Thy servant, did say, 'Why did the Gentiles rage, and the peoples devise futile things?'" The modern translations teach very clearly here the role of the Holy Spirit in the inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures. Could not a person, if they're using the same methodology and argument that I'm finding in your book, say that this, at this point the modern texts are superior to in both text and translation to the King James at Acts 4:25?

Dr. Waite. Well, Mr. White, you said a number of things in this last question. Regardless of Acts 4:25, I believe we ought to leave it the way the Textus Receptus has it and the King James has it. I'll let the readers, rather the listeners to decide as far as the John 7:8, whether Christ is made a liar or not. Here he says, "Go ye up unto this feast." The Lord Jesus in John 7:8 was talking to his half-brothers. The feast was at Jerusalem and he said, "I go not up yet unto this feast; for my time is not yet full come." But Aleph, the Sinai manuscript, there is no B here in this area, but they remove the one word "yet," and so does the New American Standard Version, so does the New King James in the footnotes, suggesting that we ought to take that away. I'll leave it to the listeners' discretion to see whether or not the Lord Jesus says, "I go not up into this feast," and yet he went up afterward, and if he says, "I go not up," that would make him a liar, wouldn't it? And regardless of what you say, you say the scribes added this or added that, I'm pointing out there are theological errors in these versions and their superiority in theology in our King James Bible.

Dr. White. Well, sir, the going up to the feast, if you're familiar with that situation, as I taught through the Gospel of John over the past couple of years, I explained that and I think it's a very logical explanation, that when Jesus says, "I am not going up because my time has not yet fully come," he's talking about the public displaying of himself to the people of Israel. He went up, as the book of John says, secretly and not openly and, hence, there is a perfectly logical exegetical reason for the reading that is found in the manuscripts upon which the new translations are based, and there is no evidence that they're attempting to cause Jesus to be called a liar.

But you said you feel in Acts 4:25 that you should just stay with the Textus Receptus. Again, why is that the case? Do you feel that you should stick with the Textus Receptus even when it goes against, for example, the majority of Greek manuscripts? And if so, why?

Dr. Waite. Well, the Textus Receptus that underlies our King James Bible is the basic text ?? The fifth edition, 1598, and for two reasons: it's been accepted by the church down through the centuries; and it's been attested by the evidence. And I believe the early church in the apostolic times, that we list over 37 historical links with the Textus

Receptus in the early churches right down from the beginning, and I believe that's the first reason. The second reason is it's been attested by the evidence. Over 99% of the manuscripts that we presently have are underlying the King James Bible. The papyrus fragments, 85% of those go along with the King James. Uncials, the big ones, over 97%. The cursives, over 99%. The lectionaries, 100%. That's over 99% of the whole manuscripts that we have and I believe by faith that we have in this Textus Receptus the word of God that the church has accepted. If you reject the received Greek text that underlies our King James Bible, what you're saying is the church had no real Bible from the 4<sup>th</sup> century until the 1900s, 1,500 years of the false Bible. I don't believe God works that way. He promised to preserve his words. I believe he did in the Hebrew Masoretic and the Greek Textus Receptus.

Dr. White. But, sir, you're making an error there in that I asked you when the TR varies from the Majority Text, when you talk about the text going back to the early church, you're talking about the Majority Text, not the TR. Not the specific TR where it differs due to Erasmus' mistakes or whatever from the actual Majority Text. At one point you defend the TR and the next point you're defending what's actually the Majority Text and they're not always identical to one another. I have an entire list of readings where the TR is very different from the Majority Text.

And so, I again have to ask. Let me give you an example. Maybe it will help if I have an example for us to look at. In 2 Timothy 2:19, we have a passage where we have a quotation from, two quotations from the Old Testament. The King James says, "Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." Now, maybe you know otherwise, sir, but to my knowledge, I have not been able to find a single Greek manuscript that says Christ at this passage. The Majority Text reads, "Lord." The UBS reads, "Lord." All the uncials, all the miniscules, all the lectionaries, they all read, "Lord," at this place and not, "Christ." And so maybe this will help us to get the question more clearly. Why should I believe that the correct reading here should be "Christ" when to my knowledge no Christian prior to 1516 had ever seen the reading "Christ" here? Everyone had thought it said "Lord." You just said, you know, if you reject the received text, you're saying the church didn't have a Bible until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, why should I accept the TR's reading at this point against all the Greek manuscripts?

Dr. Waite. What was the verse?

Dr. White. 2 Timothy 2:19. Again, the King James says, "Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." If you'll look at the Hodges, Farstad edition of the Majority Text, it will indicate there that that reading is a TR reading over against pretty much everybody else. All the other manuscripts say "Lord." My feeling is, it was just an error on Erasmus' part. He was in a hurry, just like Revelation 14:1. But it seems to me that you're saying that because the TR was used for,

maybe, what, 200 years from the time of Erasmus onward, 300 years, that somehow we should accept that reading even when it doesn't have any Greek manuscript support.

Dr. Waite. Well, let me just say a few words without getting specific on any verse. I think it's not necessary that we go into verse by verse. Let me just say a little something about the so-called Majority Greek text of Hodges and Farstad or Robinson and Pierpont. There are two Majority texts, as you know, floating around vying for power. I guess Hodges and Farstad is not even in print, at least, I guess, maybe it's gone back recently but it had gone out of print. There are great defects in this so-called Majority Text. They did not revise the Textus Receptus in the way that Dean John William Burgon suggested. They used basically the footnotes of ???. We have a booklet called "Defects in the So-called Majority Greek Text," and also, "Why Reject the Majority Text?" They use ??? footnotes and he only had about 414 manuscripts total and he called that the Majority Manuscript. They did not look at all 5,255+ manuscripts. They had a shortcut, quick fix type of a text. They realized and admitted that it was not really sure, it's not accurate in rock, and this is very serious, indeed. Of course, ??? was not a believer. He was an apostate and they followed slavishly.

Also, the Majority Text, although some of its leaders, Dr. Pickering for example, he was writing that book, "Identity to Greek New Testament," a very good book, but he was following Dean John William Burgon very strongly in that area, and Burgon, as you recall, was very much against the idea of families, and yet they pick up the family idea here. He also was against the idea of intrinsic and transcriptional probability which was Westcott and Hort's theory completely. But yet they say if we do it right, we'll have a transcriptional or intrinsic probability and we'll use our efforts on that line. Then the idea of families, Burgon said instead of having families for the woman taken in adultery, John 7:53-8:11, or Revelation, we should remember that families are not true in the Greek text. Every text is an individual. They stand or fall with very few exceptions. They are like going into a graveyard with 5,000 unmarked graves, for example, and nobody can say this one is related to that one or the other one because they're unmarked.

So I find great serious defects in the so-called Majority Text. They did not use all of the cursives and they did not use all the uncials. They did not use any of the lectionaries. They did not use any of the quotations of the church fathers. They did not use any of the early translations of the Bible in early versions. So they are faulted for many reasons so I don't trust the Majority Text.

Dr. White. Well, Dr., if you don't want to get specific, though, in answering my question about 2 Timothy 2:19 on the basis of the text, perhaps we could turn our attention for a few minutes to your assertion that the translation of the King James is superior in all respects. There are two questions that I would like you to address, if you would, and please take the time to fully do so. I would allege that there are two very important mistranslations in the King James Version of the Bible. I would allege that Acts 19:2 is mistranslated. It reads, "He said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." If you could comment, sir, in light of your academic training in the subject

of the koine Greek of the New Testament in regards to the translation of Acts 19:2, specifically the aorist participle, ?? at that particular point, I'd appreciate it.

And the other issue in light of the scholarship of the King James translators, which is acknowledged by all, is what is called the Granville-Sharp constructions at Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1. In Titus 2:13, we have the great God and Savior Jesus Christ, which in the KJV is the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ. And a similar construction in 2 Peter 1:1, our God and Savior Jesus Christ, there being five Granville-Sharp constructions in 2 Peter, the King James properly translating the other four but not the first. If you could comment on the fact that the Granville-Sharp construction was not yet understood at the time of the King James Version translators in light of your assertions in your book, that would be very helpful.

Dr. Waite. Well, I would believe very strongly, Mr. White, that the King James Bible is much more accurate than these other versions that we call perversions. They follow a verbal equivalence and a formal equivalence from the Hebrew into English, Greek and English, not a dynamic equivalence which these other versions do to a greater or lesser extent. For instance, they want to bring the very words over from Hebrew to English, the very words from Greek to English. These other versions feel that they can play fast and loose with this type of thing and have dynamic equivalence; that is, they can feel they can add to God's words anytime they want to; they can subtract from God's words anytime they want to; or they can change God's words anytime that they wish.

As far as Acts 19:2, again, I think it would be unwise for us to get into great syntactical aoristic tacts one way or another and translations and so on. As far as 2 Peter 1:1 and Titus 2:13, the Granville-Sharp rule, I believe was fully understood. They may not have called it the Granville-Sharp at that time, obviously he wasn't alive, but the God and Savior Jesus Christ, as you well know, Mr. White, the word "kai" there in the Greek language means not just only "and," but also "even." Even Christ, equating them. So the use of the "and" there is certainly not minimizing the fact that it is both the God and Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, either in 2 Peter 1:1 or Titus 2:13.

But as I said before on the translation accuracy of the King James Bible, the NIV boasts in saying we want to be accurate to the thought of the writers. Well, the King James Bible translators wanted to get the words of the writers. I would just like to mention to our listeners the battleground that we're facing in the entire attack in our New Testament area. We have the Textus Receptus with about 140,521 words, an average text would be 647 pages. Westcott and Hort back in 1881 undermined that received Greek text in 5,604 places. The Majority Text, so called, undermines the Textus Receptus in 1,800 places. Not as many as 5,604, but those changes include some 9,970 Greek words by actual count. I've counted them myself, 9,000, that's 30 words short of 10,000 Greek words.

Now these are Greek words that by Westcott and Hort because of their adherence and worship of Vatican and Aleph, the Sinai Manuscript B and Aleph, those two Egyptian manuscripts that, by the way, contradict one another over 3,000 times in the Gospels alone, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, 3,000 places alone, because of their worship of B

and Aleph, they have perverted the historic Greek New Testament text in 9,970 Greek words. Either they've added the Greek words that shouldn't be added, they subtracted from the Greek words that shouldn't be, or they have changed them in some way. This is 15 words per page on the average of a Greek New Testament. That's 7% of the words in the New Testament. If you put all of their additions, subtractions or changes, these 9,970 words in one place, you'd have 45.9 pages, almost 46 pages of the Greek New Testament that would be altered in some way and these do affect doctrine, theology.

We've got a few of them in here. We could take others and we hope we will before the night is out, but these heretics, Westcott and Hort, changed these. They were theological heretics. We have a book that we've written, "The Theological Heresies of Westcott and Hort," and we give over 125 quotations from their own books, three from Westcott, the Gospel of John, the book of Hebrews, the epistles of John; two from Hort, 2 Peter, Revelation, and we show their heresy in various theological areas. We also have written a book on Westcott's clever denial of the bodily resurrection of Christ. We analyze two of Westcott's books. But these heretics have doctored the word of God and we believe we should stand on the historic Christian faith and the traditional text that underlies our King James Bible.

Mr. White. Well, I would say in conclusion that I stand on our historic Christian faith and I don't need to do that with the Textus Receptus which was collated by a Roman Catholic priest who made errors in the process. I think that we have seen this evening in our conversation that there have been many assertions made but no proof provided in regards to these various assertions that have been made. I have brought up passage after passage, 2 Timothy 2:19, Acts 19:2, and these issues have not been addressed. I think people can hear that. Acts 19:2 is a mistranslation in the King James text. Anyone who is familiar with the koine Greek is aware of the fact that you cannot translate a participle the way the King James version did. It's an error. It's been fixed in all the modern translations.

Secondly, the Nestle-Aland text, the UBS fourth, is not the Westcott and Hort text. Anyone who asserts that it is, is in error. There are many many many changes between these two texts and since they do give full readings at the bottom of the page, a person has the ability by doing a little bit of work, a little bit of homework to determine their readings for themselves.

So I do not believe that we have heard any evidence that would really substantiate the claim that the King James Version is superior to all of the translations either in text or in translation this evening, and I would encourage people to look up the passages that have been referenced and to ask for documentation of the assertions that are made. I think that's extremely important that we do that because we as Christians, we need to be people of truth, we need to love the truth, but I think we need to be very careful about limiting God's truth to a 17<sup>th</sup> century Anglican translation of the Bible whose New Testament was based upon the text that was initially collated by a Roman Catholic priest who was in a hurry to get his text out before the Complutensian Polyglot came out. I don't think Erasmus would ever tell anyone to believe that everything that he wrote was somehow inspired or inerrant in and of itself, and I do not believe that he would be a King James

Only advocate today if he were alive. So I think the issues have been made very clear this evening.

Dale. Okay. These are the concluding statements and we are now going to open the phone lines. Again, our number is 447-5495, 447-KIXL, and you can call up and talk about the King James controversy, for or against it, and what you believe on that. We have two experts in the field and with that, let's go to our first caller. We have Tex Marrs. Tex, are you there?

Tex Marrs. I am, Dale, and it's been good to hear your voice on the radio.

Dale. Well, thank you. Okay, and your comments to the debate here?

Mr. Marrs. Yes, Dale, I just want to compliment Dr. Waite on defending God's word, the King James Bible. Maybe he could let people know how to get his book because I have a copy of it and it's tremendous. But my specific question and one of the things that I'm heartbroken about the new versions and what they've done to pervert God's word, three things in specific maybe Dr. Waite could comment on. Is it true, Dr. Waite, that the new versions have totally eliminated the statements by Jesus, for example, "Get thee behind me, Satan"? Another one when Jesus told to "take up the cross and follow me." Evidently, those are missing from the new versions.

And also, what about the Lord's prayer? I recently read the NIV, the NAS, the two versions of the Lord's Prayer and I found out that they were horribly gutted and entire lines were totally missing in the new versions and maybe you could comment on that.

Dr. Waite. Okay, I'd be glad to comment and, of course, Mr. White would want to comment equally. The statement of Brother Marrs as far as "take up thy cross and follow me," it is eliminated in one of the Gospels in the Westcott and Hort text type text, and that's text B and Aleph text. It is, however, found in some of the other synoptic Gospels, but at least in that area, that one portion, it is taken away.

As far as the Lord's prayer, "thy kingdom come, thy will be done," there are certain parts of it that are omitted. There is no question about that either.

And as far as the other one, "get thee behind me, Satan," that is left out also in that portion of the Gospel there, and certainly we feel that the King James Bible is superior in the keeping of these areas and these portions that are in line with truth and in line with doctrine and in line with correctness in all ways.

Dr. White. I would like to comment on each of those. In regards to, "get thee behind me, Satan," it is found, of course, in Matthew 16:23 in the New International Version. Mr. Marrs, when you were on KXEG last week commenting on the Lord's prayer, you were referring only to the Gospel of Luke. Many of the things that you said were deleted are actually in the Gospel of Matthew and were not actually taken out.



"Take up the cross" occurs four times in the King James Version. It occurs three times in the modern text. The only place where it is removed is Mark 10:21 because it's not in many of the early manuscripts, and interestingly enough, it is not in the parallel passages where Matthew and Luke record the same instance as Mark 10:21, specifically Matthew 19:21 and Luke 18:22. So there is very good reason why it is not found in many of the modern translations.

I would like to ask you, Mr. Marrs, if 2 Timothy 2:24-26 is indeed found in your Bible where it talks about how we're to address these particular issues of how we're to refute those who contradict us. The Scripture says the Lord's bondservant must not be quarrelsome but be kind to all, able to teach, patient when wronged, with gentleness correcting those who are in opposition if perhaps God may grant them repentance leading to the knowledge of the truth, and they may come to their sense and escape from the snare of the devil having been held captive by him to do his will. When I sent you information on the errors in Gail Riplinger's book, you wrote me a letter back that began, "Don't write me again unless in sincere repentance. You are a devil, plain and simple, and I understand well why Mrs. Riplinger does not respond to your ridiculous assertions. Why dignify the lying claims of a servant of Satan?" Would you maybe explain why you identify someone as a devil and a servant of Satan in light of 2 Timothy 2:24-26?

Mr. Marrs. Because, James, you were attacking the word of God. Also because what you have done, for example, is name your ministry Alpha and Omega and yet in Revelation 1:1, some of the new versions take out the word "Alpha and Omega" and yet you have the audacity to give your ministry that name. And by the way....

Dr. White. Tex.... Hold on a second.

Mr. Marrs. You asked me a question, could I answer it?

Dr. White. Well, I just wanted to correct what you had just....

Mr. Marrs. Why won't you let me answer the question, my friend?

Dr. White. I just want to correct what you just said. You're confusing people. It's not Revelation...

Mr. Marrs. I would like to answer your question, James.

Dr. White. Go ahead.

Mr. Marrs. Alright. As far as your being a researcher, I received your treatise about Gail Riplinger's book and I noticed you misspelled her name throughout it. If you can't spell her name right and all you had to do was call her up or call me or call any one of a thousand bookstores that have her name, if we can't trust the fact that you can't even spell an author's name right, how can we trust any other supposed scholarliness?

Dr. White. Tex. Tex. Tex.

Mr. Marrs. By the way, I read your 40 pages but it was full of errors and I really think that you need to get down and read some books. Dr. Waite's book. Dr. Fuller's book.

Dr. White. I have.

Mr. Marrs. Riplinger's book. Excellent books and they're much needed by Christians today.

Dr. White. Well, Tex, if I could point out a few things. First of all, it's not Revelation 1:1, it's Revelation 1:11 that you're attempting to refer to there, and I provided you a full response to that in the letter.

Mr. Marrs. (unintelligible)

Dr. White. Sir, I'm going to answer your question. Tex, I'm going to answer your question now. Revelation 1:11, not Revelation 1:1, and I explained that.

Mr. Marrs. (unintelligible)

Dr. White. Excuse me, it's Revelation 1:11.

Mr. Marrs. That's what I said, Revelation 1:1,1, Revelation 1:11.

Dr. White. Actually, sir, on the front of the last letter you sent me where you sent back my fax with red....

Mr. Marrs. (unintelligible)

Dr. White. Excuse me, Tex. Tex.

Mr. Marrs. There is no moderator. Are you trying to take over the debate?

Dr. White. No, sir. No, sir. Tex, I'm just responding to....

Mr. Marrs. (unintelligible).

Host. Excuse me, I'm part of "In Defense of the Faith," and you're, Tex, you're going to have to let James respond now. You have to be quiet. They're going to turn you down.

Mr. Marrs. (unintelligible) Dr. Waite is the guy you should debate, not me. I'm going to let you good men go. All the best to you, my friends.

Dr. White. That's fine.

Host. Tex, I have one question for you. Are you still there, Tex? He's not.

Dr. White. If I could respond to that. First of all, I sent a letter to Tex Marrs explaining, responding to his letter to me. He sent my fax back with red ink across it saying he didn't want any more of my evil trash. And interestingly enough, he just tried to say he didn't say Revelation 1:1, the front of the envelope has Revelation 1:1, right here, I'll show it to you, written on the front, not 1:11.

Secondly, if I could finish responding to what he was saying. When he says I attack the Bible, no, I do not. I love God's word. I preach God's word. A couple of you, Dale, were there today as I opened God's word and spoke that word. I love God's word. I do not attack it in any way, shape or form, but I do attack those who would attempt to limit God's word to a 17<sup>th</sup> century Anglican translation, and that just simply is, those are the problems with what Mr. Marrs said. And you'll notice he did not respond to my citation of 2 Timothy 2:24-26 to explain why he would identify someone as a servant of Satan. That is not how Christians are to discuss this issue. I have respect for a person who can handle a discussion of this issue on a rational basis without resorting to names, but Mr. Marrs obviously is not one of those individuals who can deal with this issue. What he said about "get thee behind me, take up the cross," Lord's prayer, in each of those things, you know, we could have a good discussion on those things but he's in error about many of the things that he said.

Dr. Waite. Alright, Dale, I wonder if I might have a few words. I've been quiet for about five minutes.

Dale. Go ahead, Dr. Waite.

Dr. Waite. Okay. In regard, without getting into what was mentioned previously, in regard to the "get thee behind me, Satan," for example, that portion of Scripture, that is a Scripture portion that is found, as you know, in Luke 4 and verse 9, and that, verse 8, excuse me, that portion of the Lord Jesus saying, "Jesus answered," that's alright, "and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan," that's all taken out of B and Aleph. The rest is in there, "for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Now B and Aleph, the Vatican and Sinai, false Greek texts on which Westcott and Hort based their text and on which the Nestle-Aland 26<sup>th</sup> edition and other editions based their text, and Nestle in 1890s said that he picked three different texts that he chose and he picked the Westcott and Hort or he picked the Trigellus or he picked the Tischendorf, whichever was in the majority. So he did use Westcott and Hort's text but that removes, that B and Aleph is removed there. And of course, the versions that follow this and take away also "get thee behind me, Satan," are as follows. The ones that the Bible believing people use. The New International Version drops out "get thee behind me, Satan" in Luke 4:8. The New American Standard Version drops it out. The New King James Version in the footnotes. The New Berkeley and the others. I'm sure the liberal ones as well do that because they follow B and Aleph.

And the same is true, let me just one more word and then I'll turn it back over to our questioners, in the idea of the Lord's prayer in Luke 11:2. Now that's not to say other places have it, "And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father," well, that's so far so good, but the words "which art in heaven" are removed by the two Greek texts again, B and Aleph followed by these new versions. The New International Version removes "which art in heaven." The New American Standard, the New King James in the footnotes, the New Berkeley. And also, "Hallowed be thy name," that's alright. "Thy kingdom come," is alright. But "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth," at least "as in heaven," that is removed as well.

Now I'm not saying, all I'm saying is we have a theological battleground in the King James Bible as opposed to the new versions. The new versions definitely have theological heresies and errors that are in them. How they got there, that's another debate. But I might get back to Acts 19:2 later on but that's just a brief answer to our questioner.

Dr. White. Well, again, I think it's important that we recognize that when someone says something's been removed and they do not qualify it, that can be very deceptive. And when someone says, for example, that "get behind me, Satan" has been removed, the obvious assumption on people's part is it is found nowhere in that Bible. That's not the case and many of these alleged omissions on the part of modern texts, in reality what they are is especially in the Gospels, you have what's called parallel corruption. When you have a certain phrase or word that becomes familiar to people in, say, and this is very clearly seen in the Lord's prayer between Matthew and Luke, you have things happening to where when someone gets used to the Matthew version and they're copying Gospel, the Gospel of Luke, elements of the Gospel of Luke, then it becomes very easy for them to transpose words from Matthew into Luke to make the two sound the same and this is why the modern texts do what they do at these points.

Again, there is absolutely positively no effort on the part of any of these individuals to downgrade the deity of Christ or the glory of God or any of these things because they recognize the propensity for parallel corruption between the synoptic Gospels. You know, people may believe that but the question then becomes: why do they believe that? Is it not, again, going back to this just overriding assumption the King James is right in everything that it said, and I don't accept that.

Dr. Waite. Can I reply to that, Dale?

Dale. Sure, quickly though.

Dr. Waite. Okay, quickly. I'll give a minutes' reply, is that alright?

Dale. Okay.

Dr. Waite. In the fact that the so-called new versions do not purposely have false doctrine, well, whether it's purposeful or not, all I'm saying is the bottom line is there is false doctrine. For instance, wouldn't you say the assertion of the sinfulness of Christ

would be a false doctrine? To me, that is. B and Aleph, Vatican and Sinai, they didn't care about his sinlessness, his impeccability, and the New International Version, the New American Standard, New Berkeley. In Luke 2:22, that's the portion I'm speaking of, "And when the days of her purification," that is, Mary's, "according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord," that is the Lord Jesus, but the new versions, that is, NIV, NASB and B and Aleph, Vatican and Sinai, remove her purification, Mary, and make it their purification as if both Mary and Joseph and the Lord Jesus Christ needed purification. This, regardless of the why of it, questions the perfection and sinlessness of Christ.

That's my one minute. Turn it back over to you, Dale.

Dr. White. And just a very brief response. There is absolutely no logical reason in the world why having "their" would mean that Jesus was sinful anymore than Jesus being baptized by John meant he had to repent. The modern versions are very plain in presenting the sinlessness of Jesus Christ and to assume because of the purification rites, that that means that it's making him a sinner. I absolutely positively see no reason to follow that at all.

Dale. Now let's go to Charles. Charles, welcome to the program.

Charles. Hi, Dale. Hello, gentleman. I have lots of questions that I could ask of Dr. Waite but I guess the simplest place to start would be: is there any essential Christian doctrine peculiar only to the King James version?

Dr. Waite. Would you repeat that, Charles? I didn't understand. Is there any sinful doctrine?

Charles. No, is there any essential Christian doctrine.

Dr. Waite. Any central?

Charles. Yes.

Dr. Waite. Any central doctrine?

Dale. No, any essential?

Dr. Waite. Essential?

Dr. White. Unique to the King James itself.

Dr. Waite. Well, I don't know that there's any doctrine essential to the King James itself other than the fact that they did revere and respect the words of God and they did follow what they believed to be the proper Hebrew and the proper Greek texts and honored the

translation, ??, transferring from Hebrew to English and Greek to English in a verbal way. I don't know exactly what you're getting at.

Dale. If I might, I think what the caller is asking is: is there any doctrine that is essential to being a Christian that is found only in the King James and not in the modern translations? Caller, am I interpreting you correctly?

Charles. That's hitting the nail right on the head.

Dale. Okay, thank you.

Dr. Waite. Well, I could say this, Charles, in regard to the doctrine of salvation. There are so many, you see, every one of these theological what I believe errors and inferiorities in these new versions that I've listed in my book, chapter 5, every one of these I believe indicates a superiority in theology of the King James Bible. For instance, the very means of salvation. Now, just because these 115 and Dr. Jack Mormon has listed actually 356 doctrinal passages where the Textus Receptus or the King James Bible Greek text varies from the critical text or the Westcott and Hort text or the B and Aleph, Vatican and Sinai text, we consider to be false Greek texts, we're not saying that there is nowhere found but, for instance, in John 6:47, this is an essential verse on how to be saved and if you take the New International Version or the New American Standard or the New King James in the footnotes, following B and Aleph, the Vatican and Sinai Greek manuscripts, you find a perversion of how to be saved. The Lord Jesus said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." And that is a simple Gospel truth that all of us believe if we're saved, but the new versions and the B and Aleph omit the words "on me" and so they read, "Verily, I say unto you, He that believeth hath everlasting life." It doesn't say the object of that belief and that's very essential. The King James Bible does have it accurately in that one verse. That doesn't mean to say another verse, these other versions may not have "on me" in some other area, John 3:16 for instance, but they're defective here and I believe that we've got to point these things out. We don't want our Bible to be defective in any verse.

Charles. Okay. And my other question related to that would deal with which version of the King James? Are you talking about the original one that included the Apocryphal books? Or are you talking about the ones that have been printed since then which don't contain the Apocrypha?

Dr. Waite. Well, Mr. White, do you want to answer that first question? You ought to get equal time on that.

Dr. White. No, he's asking you. If there's a comment, I'll go ahead and I think it is important to ask you the question which King James are we talking about here?

Dr. Waite. I'd be glad to answer that. I wanted to get your comment on that.

Dr. White. Sure, I appreciate that. Thank you, sir.

Dr. Waite. The King James Bible that we believe we should use is that which we have currently. I believe it's, for instance, the one in the old Scofield or any of these modern King James, the one without the Apocrypha. That made itself very scarce, as you know, very very soon in the 1611 King James Bible. I did a study on the original 1611 actually translation. Nelson put out one in English script. I have one in my basement, four volumes from the Library of Congress in the German script, King James 1611. By actual count, there are only 421 changes, that is that I could hear to the ear, and of those between the 1611 and the current King James Bible, only 136 were substantial changes, that is, adding an "and" or a "but." I don't mean in spelling. I don't mean in punctuation. But I mean changes to the ear. I could hear toward and towards. I counted that in my 421. I could hear, well, I can't think of the others. But I've heard several things that are very close. I could hear burnt and burned and so I counted amongst and among, lift and lifted. Those are included in the 421.

So I believe the King James we have in our hands today is, well, in all intents and purposes, identical. I do have this in research form. I've given that and I'd be glad to have anyone who wants it to write for it.

Dr. White. I just want to make one quick comment in regards to John 6:47 and the statement that was made about the belief in salvation. If you look at John 6:47 where the NASB says, "Truly, truly, I say to you, he who believes has eternal life," again, the question that I have to ask is: is there anyone who can honestly question what is being said here? The issue, again, is what did John write and if the facts of the manuscripts demonstrate to us that John did not write, "believes in me," then no matter how true that may be, we don't want to add it to the word of God. There is no one who is going to question what is being said here because if you look at John 6:40 in the NASB, "For this is the will of My Father, that everyone who beholds the Son and believes in Him will have eternal life, and I Myself will raise him up on the last day," believes in him. It's right there. The object of faith, the object of belief is clearly defined both before and after. There is no ambiguity as to what belief in John 6:47 means and, hence, it is not a matter of corruption. The question always has to be: what did the apostles write? And I think in this King James or in a sense the Textus Receptus argument we're having right here, the question I have to keep asking is: why should I believe that Deciderius Erasmus was somehow inspired of God to get everything exactly right when he, himself, denied that that was the case? Which is really what I'm being asked to believe here in regards.

Speaker. Isn't that the position that the King James translators made point of in their introduction?

Dr. White. Oh yes, the King James, the translators themselves. Just to give you an anecdote, I mentioned to a King James Only advocate recently, I said, "Which do you accept as the true and infallible word of God, the 1611 version, the 1611 marginal notes that give alternate translations, or the 1769 edition that you're using now?" And his response was, "Well, I've only got on King James Bible and mine doesn't have alternate translations so they must not have existed." The King James translators gave alternate

readings. You don't give alternate readings when you think you're inerrantly inspired. You're recognizing that you're engaging in the task of translation and that there are other possibilities for a proper way of translating something.

Dr. Waite. Dale, do you want me to reply on that?

Dale. If you'd like.

Dr. Waite. Okay. I would simply say this: though it is possible certainly to have alternative understanding of certain Greek words or Hebrew words, every one of which has four, five, six or seven sometimes nuances and separate meanings, yet I believe that the King James Bible translators did select at least one of those meanings, one of those nuances from Hebrew and put it into English or Greek and put it into English. There may be others and I don't fault these other versions when they use a synonym here and there for this particular word. I'm not faulting them for that, but I do fault them when they add to God's words something that just is not in there at all, or subtract from God's words and take them out as they are told to do in the book translating the word of God. That's the primer for the translators where they have extrinsic arguments and intrinsic arguments and they are taught when they think there's a repetition, why just remove the words of God. I believe that's what I'm talking about, not synonyms at all.

David. Well, Dr. Waite, this is David and I'm in the studio with "In Defense of Faith," and I have something I'd like to ask. I've been trying to follow this and you've been saying, "I feel, I believe," and all those are very subjective, are you trying to tell us and our listeners that the TR is the original autographs, the word of God?

Dr. Waite. Alright, is the TR the original autograph....

David. And do you have any proof?

Dr. Waite. Pardon me?

David. And do you have any proof?

Dr. Waite. Yes. I believe that the Bible clearly teaches divine preservation of his words.

David. Well, sir, that's not my question. I just want to ask you very simply: is the TR the original autographs and do you have the proof for that or is that something that you feel and believe, just a subjective feeling?

Dr. Waite. Well, it's both. It's something I believe and it's also something that's backed up by fact. First I was backing up by saying the Bible preservation, for instance, in Matthew 5:17-18, the Lord Jesus says, "not one jot or one tittle shall in any wise pass until all be fulfilled." God has promised in the Old Testament as well to preserve his words to 1,000 generations, Psalm 105:8. The question is: where has he preserved them? In what Hebrew text? What Greek text? And, yes, I do believe by faith that the Textus Receptus that



underlies the King James Bible. I can't prove it to anybody who doesn't want to believe it, but I believe that those words are the very words that Paul wrote, Peter wrote, James wrote, John wrote, and so on, and I believe that the Greek New Testament that we have that underlies our King James is that which God has preserved word by word the same as the Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament text. I believe that guys preserved those words word by word, otherwise I have no basis, I have no Bible. If I take away my base, what do I have? My foundation, see?

So I have to have something to believe. I spent, as I say, the first 21 years believing Westcott and Hort was right. I've been studying the last 22 or 23 and I believe that the testament speaks for itself. The proof of it, as I say, it's been authorized down through the centuries by the church and accepted by these churches as being the word of God and it's attested by the evidence. Over 99% of the documents that we have are those on which we base our King James and I believe that those two things are certainly evidentiary but, again, nobody can make any of us believe what we don't want to believe.

David. Well, I do, but I'm kind of like a skeptic, I like to have some evidence and I do believe we have the word of God as we have the Majority Text and TR and the Alexander text, and we can get the word of God from that. But what I was getting from you and just what it was for me, I was listening very carefully, is that you say by faith. I've never seen one scholar really say that they would say that the TR is the autographs and so when you actually say it's the word of God, you're doing it by faith and I just want our listeners to know that because you're making a logical fallacy, you're assuming something you've yet to prove and that's what I wanted to bring up. And I've been hearing that by faith and you're casting doubts on people that read the NAS by saying the TR is the word of God, TR is the word of God, and you have not proved that because you cannot prove it's original autographs and that's all I was saying. So we can go to the next call but I thank you for letting me talk to you.

Dr. Waite. Well, let me just comment briefly on your last statement, sir. I would simply say, David, that the idea of faith and belief, I am a Baptist preacher and I must have the word of God to preach. My Lord through 2 Timothy 4:2 said preach the word, ???. That's the motto of Dallas Theological Seminary, my alma mater, and I've got to know what word I'm going to preach and I've got to have a Bible I'm going to preach; I've got to have a Greek text, the Hebrew text, and then I've got to have an English text or a Spanish or French, whatever language I am. So you may say, "Well, no scholar says that they believe the Textus Receptus has been preserved down through the ages," this particular one, maybe that either means I'm not a scholar or maybe that means that I'm one that has. But regardless, I believe you cannot believe in anything, it's all by faith. How can we really prove the Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of God and Savior? You see, we believe it, don't we? There is so much in the whole Christian faith that's by faith.

David. Well, I believe that...

Dr. Waite. We walk by faith and not by sight.

David. I believe we have the eyewitness reports and we have manuscripts that they wrote down and we have 1,500 that I can go to and more and more. I can go into that, but I was just wanting to clear something up, that it is by faith and not by objective evidence.

Dr. White. Dr. Waite, as one Baptist preacher to another, I'm the son of a Baptist preacher who was a part of the GRB back many years ago, as one Baptist preacher to another Baptist preacher, I just want to make sure that you understand, sir, that I do believe that we have the word of God. I do believe that God has preserved his word. I believe the promises of preservation that are found in Scripture. I just hope that you can understand and respect a fellow Baptist minister who feels that God has preserved his word in a way different than having Deciderius Erasmus or the ?? brothers or Stephanus codify his word in what became known in 1633 as the Textus Receptus. I believe that God preserved his word by immediately having it go to all the nations all across the known world, in fact, manuscripts being immediately buried in the sands all over the place, so that there was never a time in the history of the church when any one man or any group of men could gather up all the copies of Scripture and make wholesale changes in them. I believe that God preserved the Scripture in the same way that he determined the canon of Scripture. He didn't have a bunch of men get together and take a vote as to what books would or would not. He led his church. He led his people. He didn't have angels with golden indexes or anything like that. He did it in a way that maybe to the world isn't flashy but it was God's way of doing it, and I feel that's the way he preserved the text. By having the text distributed all over the place immediately, there was no way that it could ever be gathered up and changed and corrupted by men.

Now we now have to deal with textual variation, but I want to make sure everyone understands that I believe that what we have in the Greek manuscripts today, without a doubt contains everything that was written by the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ. We have everything that was said. We don't need a reinspiration of it. God has preserved his word. I just don't believe that we should assume that Deciderius Erasmus happened to get everything right on his first shot in trying to collate those manuscripts.

Dale. Well, David is waiting patiently for a long time, so we're going to have to go to him. Again for our listening audience, we're having an open debate here and you can call in at 447-5495, 447-KIXL. Join us, ask these gentlemen questions. It is the King James Only, the only inspired word of God, and we have with us Dr. D. A. Waite and James White. With that, let's go to David. David, you're on.

David. Well, thank you. I've been enjoying your program very much.

Dale. Thank you.

David. I'd like to make three observations. I'm not a Baptist, number 1. I have many many friends who are but I have no particular quarrel with Baptists at all. I respect them a great deal. I'm Anglican and my church happened to write the Bible you've been talking about and there are some things which have not been mentioned that I think are very

important. One is that most of the Authorized Version Bible which you call the King James Version...

Dr. Waite. Excuse me, Dale. Could he speak up just a little louder, please? It's hard for me to hear way over here in New Jersey.

Dale. Okay.

Dr. Waite. Thank you.

David. Most of the Authorized Version of the Bible, what you call the King James Version, was taken from the work of William Tyndale, as you probably know, which was done almost 100 years before this. Tyndale's work and Miles Coverdale, Miles Coverdale I understand did the first complete translation into English, and the Bishop's Bible and the Great Bible were all consulted to come up with the Authorized Version in 1611, and the Greek and the Hebrew, which was consulted at that time, was the best available. The scholars in Cambridge and Oxford and Westminster took these various versions in English and took the latest possible Greek and Hebrew and came up with what they thought at that time in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century was the best that could be done. Those of us who love the King James Version of the Bible like it's marvelous cadence and its beautiful language, probably the greatest monument to English prose that has ever been written. However, it has some grave deficiencies. Since it was done, there were earlier Hebrew and Greek texts discovered which are more primitive, go back closer to the source, and those texts have been used since the Authorized Version to provide newer translations. The great work of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the English Revised Version of 1881 was a great improvement over the Authorized Version and it eliminated a lot of inconsistencies, a lot of erroneous translation, a lot of just plain absolutely mistranslation than the ones that have been done since then have improved upon their predecessors. But I think the thing that most of us have to look to, is when we read the Holy Bible, what we're looking to as inspiration, the word of God to us today, and the word of God comes through all of these translations if we want to hear it. There is very very little difference in any of the real meaning of any essential point of any of them.

So when we look back to the Authorized Version of the Bible, it uses what we consider more religious language. Many people have commented that in referring to God and the Almighty and his providential works, we shouldn't necessarily use the same certain language we use in talking of human affairs.

Host. Well, David, is there a certain question you'd like to address to either or both of the gentleman?

David. Yes, I'd like to know why we keep hearing this controversy about one over the other when it's quite obvious to anybody who's done any reading that textual biblical criticism has advanced since 1611.

Host. I guess that question would be for Dr. Waite. Okay, thank you. Thank you for your call.

Dr. Waite. Well, Mr. White, do you want to go ahead first and I'll take it last if you want?

Dr. White. Well, since we've done it the other way, sure we'll take it in this direction. Yes, I think there have been advances. I think there have been abuses. I think that Westcott and Hort went too far in one direction. The modern Greek texts such as the Nestle-Aland and the 26<sup>th</sup> and now the 27<sup>th</sup> just now coming out, have corrected many of those abuses. I have collated a number of instances and if anyone really is interested in taking notes and I imagine there probably are some individuals out there that are interested in these things, I just wanted to note real quickly if you're taking down passages and so on and so forth, a couple of places where the modern Greek texts have gone away from the Westcott and Hort text, as soon as I can find them, these are not just merely repetitions of the Westcott and Hort text. I think there has been advances. The specific passages I was talking about would be Colossians 3:6, 1 Peter 1:22, Mark 9:42. Each of these gives you an example where the modern texts have gone toward a more Byzantine reading and I think that that's good.

I think more of a balance has been restored but most definitely modern textual criticism is so far beyond Deciderius Erasmus' attempt to collate 12 manuscripts in Switzerland while he's hurrying to get his text out, as to boggle the mind. And I think it is very important that we do not allow an incipient anti-intellectualism to sneak into our thinking to where if it's modern, it must be bad. You know, there are two extremes there. There are people who think, "Well, if it's new, it must be improved," and that's not necessarily the case; and there are others who think, "Well, if it's new, it must be bad." We need to walk a line there and I think everyone needs to be students of the word and look into these issues themselves. That's why I like the NKJV including in its footnotes these various readings. It gives you data that otherwise you would have to spend a tremendous amount of time digging through Greek manuscripts to find, and I think that's a true advantage of those textual footnotes, not a cause for confusion, but giving Christians information they need to be responsible before God because I can't sit around and say, "Well, Westcott and Hort told me to do it. Or Deciderius Erasmus told me to do it. Or King James told me to do it." I can't put my, that's a Roman Catholic concept, in a sense, of putting my responsibility onto somebody else. I can't say, "The pope made me do it. The pope told me to do that." I as a Protestant and Dr. Waite as a fellow Baptist, we believe in the individual priesthood of the believer and the responsibility of my soul before God, and I can't push my responsibilities off onto somebody else. I need to be willing to do the work and do some study on my own.

Host. Dr. Waite?

Dr. Waite. Okay, almost three minutes. I'll try to answer that in three. The caller talked about the history of the King James Bible and it was fairly accurate as far as Tyndale and Coverdale and the Bishop's Bible and the early Bibles and, of course, they did translate from the Hebrew and the Greek, they did have the three different places as he mentioned,

the six companies, two in each of the companies of Oxford and Cambridge and the other one, I forget. What was the other one? Anyway, they did a good job and he says, though, that we don't need it today. He says that everything is fine and everybody has the same Bible and we don't have to worry about God's word being in every version. Well, to the extent that there is an accord in a certain verse or a certain place, yes, we can say that that's fine but there are discordant notes throughout all of these modern versions whether they're the versions that we speak of that Bible believing Christians use, such as we've talked about tonight, New King James, New American Standard, New International, or whether it be some of the liberal ones, the Revised Standard Version, New Revised Standard, New English Version, the Jerusalem Bible, whatever, there are differences, vast differences. I think we ought to face it.

The second thing the caller mentioned was the praise of the English Revised Version of 1881 where Westcott and Hort were on the committee. They were supposed to just have a few odds and ends of sprucing up the English of the King James Bible, but instead they introduced an entirely new Greek text and they were working on it for 30 years from 1851 to 1881. And far from being the great improvement on the Authorized Version, Dean John William Burgon in his book, "Revision Revised," 500+ pages, almost 600 pages which we have reprinted, has an excellent analysis of this English Revised Version of 1881. I'm glad the caller brought it up. This, he takes apart, first of all, the English Revised Version itself. He likens the English Revised versus the King James to a carriage that's going down a bumpy road, one that has no springs whatever but bump, bump, bump, bump, every bump, and the other that has beautiful springs. Of course, the beautiful springs are not the English Revised Version, they are the springless one and the King James is the one that has the springs. He goes into the analysis of that English Revised Version and, secondly, he goes into the falseness of the Greek texts that Westcott and Hort have perpetrated upon the English speaking world. And thirdly, in "Revision Revised," he goes into the false theory behind that Greek text and one of the things is the oldest has to be the best. Well, the oldest doesn't have to be the best if the oldest has been corrupted by heretics and false teachers. So I believe we have that argument that's constantly made, the oldest has to be the best.

So I would rest my case with that. That's my three minutes and I'll have to give it over to the other questioner.

Dr. White. Dr. Waite, can I ask you a question real quick?

Dr. Waite. Who is that? This is James White.

Dr. Waite. Oh yes. It's up to Dale if he hasn't got any other callers. Go ahead.

Dr. White. No, in what you were just talking about in regards to the heretics changing manuscripts and things like that, I asked you earlier, let me just ask you again, maybe you didn't understand my question but what evidence do you have that say Manuscript P75, to get real specific, what evidence do you have or is it just your faith, your feeling, that that manuscript has actually been altered by heretics? I've taught church history as a professor

and it's important to me to understand these things and I just am not familiar with any information whatsoever outside of just mere assertions that heretics had anything to do with these things. Can you give us any specific information indicating that, like P75 has been altered by heretics?

Dr. Waite. Well, I would simply say this: that we are told by the ones that are working in the Greek textual field, that for instance P70 whatever it is, 5 or 6 or whatever.

Dr. White. P75 is one.

Dr. Waite. P75 and also the B, the Aleph, the Vatican and Sinai, these other manuscripts that go along with them, are Egyptian texts. In some of our research, we've come up to people and men who have written and I would take their word for it, that the Egyptians who copied, the copyists that made these Egyptian texts, didn't even know Greek because of the way that they ended their sentences. They kept them, as you know, they don't have any punctuation like we have here as far as the uncials, the capital letter ones. They didn't even know Greek but as far as the Greek claimant at that time, the professor up there in Princeton, Metzger, Dr. Metzger in his book and it's quoted, by the way, in one of the books that we have, talks about the false religions in Egypt. He goes into great detail. Even though Dr. Metzger is not on my side, as far as Textus Receptus, he would be on your side as far as the pertinent texts, but he says there is no known orthodox Christianity in that day, those early days in the early centuries of the Christian church in Egypt. So I just simply say Egypt and that early century, those men were corrupting, they did have different gospels and they did have different texts and I can't put my finger on this verse and that verse, all I know is there are theological corruptions, some 158 as I mention in my book, very serious ones, and I believe the heretics did it. That's all I can say.

Dr. White. Dr. Waite, if they didn't know Greek, how could they change the manuscripts?

Dr. Waite. Well, they were told, if they didn't know Greek they were told what to write, what to copy, what not to copy.

Dr. White. By who?

Dr. Waite. By the ones that were in charge of them. The copyists working in the copy areas were undoubtedly told, for instance in Mark 16:9-20, the last 12 verses of Mark should not be copied because they didn't want those copied. However, they left, as you know, a space, a blank space in either B or Aleph, to show that really their exemplar, the one from which they were copying, did contain that passage.

Dr. White. But, sir, how do you know they were told this? Isn't this just supposition on your part? I mean, how can you document this?

Dr. Waite. Well, supposition on my part. All I know is the blank space indicates that Luke began afterwards and so we would just simply conclude, like some of those of you who are on the other side of the fence, conclude all of your thoughts. We conclude our

thoughts also, but we have a serious difference in the Greek text that underlies our King James Bible and those that underlie these new versions and I think theologically. How do you explain, for instance in 1 Corinthians 5:7 where the efficacy of the Lord Jesus Christ in his death and the substitutionary blood atonement is gone in B and Aleph other than heresy? I don't understand it, and the New International follows like a puppy dog, the New American Standard, New King James footnotes, New Berkeley. Christ our Passover is sacrificed. Period. No, it's not period. It's for us in our place, in our stead, and if it's just sacrifice, for whom? We're lost unless it's for us. And these are theological verities which are gone from B and Aleph. Now, you can explain it away and say, "Well, they weren't heretics. They were alright. They didn't mean to. Just accidentally." All I can say is the bottom line is in the texts that you appreciate and go along with, B and Aleph and the whole critical text and these new versions, do have theological heresies in them whatever explanation, heretics or otherwise.

Dr. White. Well, sir, again, since all those texts all say that Christ died for us in many other places, obviously there is no conspiracy here whatsoever to somehow deny the substitutionary atonement of Jesus Christ since it is taught all through B and Aleph. You find one place and attempt to extrapolate that out. Sir, that just simply isn't logical. That's not heretical. In point of fact, it's much more logical to understand that drawing from other passages in the New Testament where you have that phrase, in behalf of us, that it would be much more logical to understand that a later text would insert it there to harmonize it with other passages than the other way around. Again, if you don't start with the presupposition that you're starting with, you never come to the conclusion you come to.

Dr. Waite. I believe in preservation of the words of God and I believe that there are two senses of preservation. One is with a capital P, you might say, and I believe God's words have been preserved in the original Hebrew language, words God spoke, a little bit of Aramaic, not much, and the original Greek language. I believe P, preservation, of those words and I believe that they preserved in the Masoretic Text that underlies the King James and the Textus Receptus that underlies our King James Bible, but I believe that there is a small lower case word, preserved, that we can say concerning our King James Bible in the sense that it preserves in the English language what has been given to us in the original Hebrew and the original Greek language. So I would use that in a small p, preservation. It preserves the words, every word of the Hebrew into English, and the Greek into English, and in that sense, it does preserve the words of God in the English language just like if we used those same Hebrew and Greek texts into Spanish or French or Russian, they would be preserved in those languages.

Caller. Okay, because I've been studying and the Bible says in 2 Timothy 3:16 that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God and so I figure, well, if the other Bible has the word of God in it, then they are inspired by him.

Dr. Waite. Alright, I would simply say, Rosalie, that in 2 Timothy 3:16 that you're saying they're all Scripture which in the Greek is ??, all that which has been written down is inspired by God or is given by inspiration of God, ??, which is God-breathed, and I

believe that God breathed out his words in the Hebrew and in the Greek language in the first instance, and I believe that that's what is being referred to here and those words properly translated by the King James Bible into English, yes, and into other languages, yes, and those words are translations but the actual God's breathing of the words, he did not breathe them out in English or Spanish or French but he breathed them out, I believe, in Hebrew, a little Aramaic and in Greek.

Dr. White. I agree with Dr. Waite that, in fact, that's why I like the NIV translation of 2 Timothy 3:16, Rosalie, is because that's exactly what it says, it says all Scripture is God-breathed and I do believe that all Scripture is God-breathed and that you can find accurate translations of that Scripture in the modern translations and in the King James. You can find God's word in these translations and I think the argument this evening has to do with whether you can truly find it fully in the NIV or NASB which are different modern translations of the Bible, or whether it's just the King James only. That's where the disagreements are arising right now and that's what we're discussing. But I do want to make sure that you understand that someone who uses like the New King James Version or the New American Standard can believe and we do believe that God's word is fully inspired, it is God-breathed. You can believe that and still use those translations.

Caller. I read King James and I was just kind of curious.

Host. Okay. Well, thank you for your call, Rosalie. Bye-bye. Phil, you're on.

Phil. Dale, I was just going to call and I heard Tex Marrs call in and I've admired some of his writings and the accusation that he made against James White just kind of is contradictory. You know, I know James stands in y'all's camp and y'all in his. Well, I know that James White holds hand-in-hand the same doctrines that "In Defense of the Faith" team holds to and I was calling to bring out when Tex Marrs called and he claims that James White is the devil, this is exactly what Satan himself does. I mean, he accuses. But, I mean, I want to go in gentleness here. I'm questioning Tex Marrs's credibility when he called, in his discernment. If he doesn't know a Christian from a non-believer, and I do question exactly what Dale asked. He said what church do you go to. I want to know if he is a submissive servant of the Lord Jesus Christ, if he's in a church, and if he's submissive to someone. I've bought his books. I've read some of his material and now I'm starting to question him. My discernment bells are going off and I want him to get back on the air and address these things.

Dr. White. I appreciate the call, Phil, and I think we certainly welcome that. Your call did remind me of something, though, and not to take away from the importance of what you just said, I think it's extremely important to be a member of a local church. I am a member of the Phoenix Reformed Baptist Church. I have a pastor that I'm responsible to there. I think it's extremely important that we all do that because it's real easy when you get into apologetics to sort of go off on your own horse and just sort of think that you're out to save the world all by yourself and ignore what the New Testament says about being a part of the local church. And I think that's important but you did remind me of something when you called and in the rush when Mr. Marrs was on the air, he did say



something that I didn't respond to and that was he attacked my credibility by pointing out that I misspelled Gail Riplinger's name in the first draft of the paper that I wrote. What most people don't know is that the book that she wrote, she used only the name G. A. Riplinger. She nowhere indicated either that she was a woman or what her first name was. The only reason I knew her name was Gail was because I was on a radio program with her and the host called her Gail. Well, when I wrote my paper and I used her first name, I had to guess. Well, how do you spell Gail since she only put G. A. Riplinger in her book? How do you spell Gail? I guessed g-a-y-l-e. I later found out from someone who had gotten a letter from her that she spelled it g-a-i-l and so I made a correction in all the stuff that I had written to Gail. That, if that's the basis for calling someone a liar and a servant of Satan, I think someone has a rather poor basis for that.

But I did want to mention one other thing in regards to Mrs. Riplinger's book: she didn't put her first name in it and there's a reason. I want to quote from "The End Times and Victorious Living" newsletter where she talked about why she wrote her book and she said, "Daily during the six years of this investigation, the Lord miraculously brought the needed materials and resources, much like the ravens fed Elijah. Each discovery was not the result of effort on my part, but of the directed hand of God so much so that I hesitated to even put my name on the book. Consequently, I used G. A. Riplinger which signifies to me God and Riplinger. God as author, and Riplinger as secretary." This is the book that Mr. Marrs is defending which I have documented is filled with numerous errors and here you have the author saying that she specifically did not use her first name because G. A. Riplinger signified to her God and Riplinger, which is an amazing thing to me.

Phil. I'm not trying to get all puffy here, but I would just like this man, who I've read his books and I admire to some extent, get back on the air and address these things.

Dr. Waite. Alright, if I may reply, Dale.

Host. Thank you, Phil. Go ahead.

Dr. Waite. Alright, let me just take the amount of time, probably two and a half minutes or so rather than go into the personalities, I'm not going to get into either Mrs. Riplinger or Mr. Marrs.

Host. Well, Dr. Waite, we do have two other callers waiting. In fact, we've just got caller after caller waiting and we're running out of time.

Dr. Waite. Let me just respond in the same time that Mr. White took, if that's alright? By saying that one of the arguments against the King James Bible, for example, by the New International, is that the New International is more readable. My son has got an excellent research on the different readabilities of all five or six different versions. He's taken every one of the 1,189 chapters by computer, ??, and we find that the King James Version is superior in many areas as far as being easier to read than the NIV. In the 52 chapters, it's very easy, the King James, and I realize the NIV, 81 chapters, Easy, 548, the King James, 531 for the NIV.

Host. Dr. Waite, we weren't really addressing that topic, though. We were talking about Tex Marrs.

Dr. Waite. Well, I realize but I just thought that we should get equal time with whatever the other, Mr. White has talked about, and I wanted to address the subject that is our theme tonight, the King James Bible versus those that...

Host. Well, if you want to address the issue, do you agree with Riplinger's book, "New Age Bible Versions"?

Dr. Waite. Who is speaking now?

Dale. This is Dale. I'm just posing Phil's question.

Dr. Waite. Well, I don't want to get into the issue of that book. We're talking about the issues here.

Host. But Dr. Waite, if I could, please, this book is, this book really is....

Dr. Waite. ...some of the things that Dr. White and I agreed to before we began was that each of us would get an equal amount of time on every question. He took two and a half minutes and I wanted two and a half and that's all I was trying to plead for.

Host. Oh sure. I'm just trying to direct the question. Yeah, but you need to stick....

Dr. Waite. ....his question, but I believe that I should get an equal amount of time to answer as I feel wisely to answer. Mr. White has the same amount of time.

Host. Yes, sir. I agree completely so if you'd like to address what the caller said about Gail Riplinger's book, I think that would be great but I think the objection that is being raised is you're going off on an issue that no one raised. You're going off on to a readability issue. I think as the head...

Dr. Waite. ...the King James Bible and I believe it's important to have equal time. I don't think that the personalities, whether it's Mr. Marrs or whether it's Mrs. Riplinger, is a part of the issue that I was here to address.

Host. But what about the book, sir? The book is definitely representing the King James Only perspective, the King James Only position. Certainly your ministry has taken some position on the validity of her arguments that the NIV and the NASB are actually satanic translations that are specifically designed to bring people into a one world government and lead them to worship Lucifer. Your ministry certainly has to take some stand as to whether that's true or false, doesn't it?

Dr. Waite. Well, we believe that the King James Bible is superior to these other versions. The issue as to whether or not the motivation is satanic or whether it is not, is a question that nobody knows except those people who have got it themselves. I believe it's something we cannot extrapolate but you may have other questioners. Go right ahead on your phones and just so I have the same amount of time that Mr. White has. That's what I'm contending.

Host. Okay, certainly, Dr. Waite.

Larry Wessels. At this point there was a break on the recording that we received and some of the show material was lost and unfortunately the call that Wanda Marrs made to the show to defend her husband's character against the claims made by a previous caller, was in this segment. Wanda did speak for about a minute or so to defend against the charge that Tex Marrs was "evil man."

Host. That's why it's good. Okay, we're just about down to one or two minutes so should we go to one more caller or just conclude?

Host. Let's have conclusions.

Dr. White. Okay. Dr. Waite, would you like to go first or would you like me?

Dr. Waite. Go ahead, Mr. White.

Dr. White. Well, I think we have seen this evening as we have examined what we've been able to get to specifics, there is really no reason to believe that the King James Version is superior in all respects to all the translations or that the Textus Receptus underlies this New Testament, is superior to all modern translations. We have seen mistranslations in the KJV that have not been addressed and errors in the TR that have not been addressed. So I feel that those issues need to be addressed and until they are, I don't believe that a person can tell someone else that they should utilize the King James as their only translation. I think people should be able to utilize a number of different translations in their Bible study.

Host. Dr. Waite.

Dr. Waite. Alright, that was a short one, 40 seconds. Wow. Okay, I'll just sum up and simply say that every one of us is entitled to their own opinion and I do not wish to force anyone to take an opinion on the King James Bible or the Textus Receptus or the Masoretic Hebrew text, or any other matter, that is contrary to their will and their wishes. I believe in freedom and I believe that every one of us must be fully persuaded in our own minds. I believe we're the product of our backgrounds, we're the product of our studies, and some of us study one way, some in others, and so I believe still in defending our King James Bible as superior in its texts, superior in the translators, techniques, and its theology. I'll have to stop there. That's my 40 seconds.

Dr. White. Dr. Waite, I just wanted to thank you very much for agreeing to be on with me this evening and I very much appreciated your demeanor and I just wanted to say that to you.

Dr. Waite. Well, thank you, Mr. White. I appreciate your demeanor as well.

Host. Thank you, Dr. Waite, for being on the program.

Check out our websites:

[biblequery.org](http://biblequery.org) – this site answers 7,700 Bible questions.

[historycart.com](http://historycart.com) – this site reveals early church history and doctrine, proving Roman Catholicism is not historically or doctrinally viable.

[muslimhope.com](http://muslimhope.com) – this site is a classic refutation of Islam, a counterfeit religion created by Mohammad.

Free newsletters are also available.