

# Distortions

*Fundamentalist*  
**DISTORTIONS**  
*on*  
*Bible Versions*

By Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.

# The Seven “Major” Fundamentalist Schools

Here are the **seven “major” fundamentalist schools** that sent their **nine representatives** to appear on this video presentation:

1. **Bob Jones University (BJU)**
2. **Detroit Baptist Seminary (DtBS)**
3. **Central Baptist Seminary (CtBS)**
4. **Calvary Baptist Seminary (CvBS)**
5. **Maranatha Baptist Bible College (MBBC)**
6. **Northland Baptist Bible College (NBBC)**
7. **Clearwater Christian College (CCC)**

# The Nine Spokesmen

The names of the **nine spokesmen** from the **seven “major” fundamentalist schools** were as follows:

1. Dr. Thurman Wisdom (Bob Jones University, BJU)
2. Dr. Randy Jaeggli (Bob Jones University, BJU)
3. Dr. David Doran (Detroit Baptist Seminary, DtBS), Video Chairman
4. Dr. William Combs (Detroit Baptist Seminary, DtBS)
5. Dr. Kevin Bauder (Central Baptist Seminary, CtBS)
6. Dr. David Burggraff (Calvary Baptist Seminary, CvBS)
7. Rev. Larry Oats (Maranatha Baptist Bible College, MBBC)
8. Dr. Sam Horn (Northland Baptist Bible College, NBBC)
9. Dr. Robert Delnay (Clearwater Christian College, CCC)

# The Video Title

The title chosen either by the “*Coalition for the Defense of the Scriptures*” or by the nine participants was “*Fundamentalism and the Word of God.*” It was produced in late 1998.

## The Topic and Purpose

The topic and purpose for the video was “*A Response to the Debate over Bible Translations and the Preservation of the Word of God.*”

# Introductory Questions

“As with all division among Christians we must ask the following question: *Is this a necessary division between light and darkness?* In the following panel discussion . . . we will discuss a number of provocative questions concerning what has come to be known as **the King James Only Issue**. The discussion participants will seek to answer questions like: *Is use of the King James Version now a test of orthodoxy for fundamentalists?*”

# NOTES ON THE 7 SCHOOLS' VIDEO ON FUNDAMENTALISM AND THE WORD OF GOD

**“In recent years, no issue has been more divisive among fundamentalists than the KING JAMES VERSION CONTROVERSY.”**

**“Should we trust the church, or any ecclesiastical group to tell us which translation to use?”**

**“Are some King James Only advocates promoting heretical doctrines?”**

# NOTES ON THE 7 SCHOOLS' VIDEO ON FUNDAMENTALISM AND THE WORD OF GOD

All these institutions getting together for this video, why? Doran asked: **“Why is this so important to you as a fundamentalist?”**

**“This particular forum has been prompted because there has occurred presentations that have been circulated around our country to pastors . . . .”**

What some are saying, **“It’s now, if you don’t hold this position, you’re not a fundamentalist.”**

# NOTES ON THE 7 SCHOOLS' VIDEO ON FUNDAMENTALISM AND THE WORD OF GOD

Thurman Wisdom: “I’ve heard people again and again say, ‘**Where is the Bible that I can hold in my hand that is the exact replica of the originals?**’ And my response to that is ‘Where is the Incarnate Word, the Lord Jesus Christ? Can you handle Him? Can you hold Him in your hands? It was doubting Thomas who said ‘I must be able to hold Him in my hands before I believe....’”

Larry Oats: “**This is His Communication to me. It’s His Word to me. It carries His authority. And when this Bible is attacked by those who would defend this Bible, not for the sake of it being **a communication from God**, but for the sake of Words on a page, we’re in trouble.”**



# NOTES ON THE 7 SCHOOLS' VIDEO ON FUNDAMENTALISM AND THE WORD OF GOD

Sam Horn quoted Erasmus and then said: “. . . it's that mind-set that **produced the edition of the T.R. that eventually came from that philosophy and became the basis for what we call the King James Version.**”

Dr. Randy Jaeggli, Hebrew teacher from BJU said “. . . to make allowance for **scribal mistakes** . . . from time to time they would make unintentional mistakes . . . one or the other of those numbers is correct, and one is in error . . . now if we don't make any provision for **scribal error** in transmission, we have a real problem there . . . **we must have room for these scribal errors in transmission of the text** . . .”

# NOTES ON THE 7 SCHOOLS' VIDEO ON FUNDAMENTALISM AND THE WORD OF GOD

Larry Oats said: **“The Textus Receptus is just a series of 18 or so printed editions,** whereas the Majority Text comes from these hand-copied editions.”

William Combs of Detroit said: Most of the Greek manuscripts, about 80% of the all Greek manuscripts are of the Byzantine family, so we look at all 5,000, . . . **the Textus Receptus is something that goes back many hundreds of years, but that's only based upon approximately 7 of those Byzantine manuscripts.**”

# NOTES ON THE 7 SCHOOLS' VIDEO ON FUNDAMENTALISM AND THE WORD OF GOD

Kevin Bauder said: “these texts (the Textus Receptus kind of Texts) are all basically the same and so we’re going to give it this name, Received Text, because the differences were minor. You take all of the differences of ALL of the Greek texts, not just the Textus Receptus, but ALL of them, and it would hardly fill two pages in your Bible.”

Dave Doran interrupted and said: “I think all of us would agree with that, yet at the same time, they had very strong confidence in the fact that they had the Scriptures. They did not feel like they were in some illusive chase to try to restore.

Larry Oats again: “They felt they were so close to the originals that there was no doctrine lost.”

# NOTES ON THE 7 SCHOOLS' VIDEO ON FUNDAMENTALISM AND THE WORD OF GOD

**Larry Oats:** “The King James Only now makes my English Bible or my Greek text a basis of fellowship.

**William Combs said:** “These differences in the text do not constitute any doctrinal differences between us. . . . The same doctrine can come from the T.R., the Majority Text, or whichever Greek text one might use.”

**Kevin Bauder said:** “When I hold the King James Bible in my hand, I hold the Word of God in my hand. I believe the Textus Receptus is the Word of God. When I hold the Textus Receptus in my hand, I hold the Word of God in my hand. I also believe a New American Standard Bible is the Word of God and when I hold that book in my hand, I’m holding the Word of God in my hand.”

# NOTES ON THE 7 SCHOOLS' VIDEO ON FUNDAMENTALISM AND THE WORD OF GOD

Doran asked: **“Is it true to say that all of our institutions believe that God has preserved His Word? [All agreed] ...the question is how? “**

Dave Doran asked: **“Must you use the Textus Receptus to be a fundamentalist?”**

Dave Doran said: **“Some people are not content... to be satisfied that you folks use the King James. They want you to use the T.R. underneath the King James or else they're accusing you of hypocrisy... and are somehow deceiving people... but it is not necessarily hypocrisy... you could use a Greek New Testament that is not a Majority Text, it's in a sense, technically called eclectic, but you, out of deference to people, and the place that the King James has had and, I'll use it in quotes, its authority as a translation, you're not being hypocritical.”**

# NOTES ON THE 7 SCHOOLS' VIDEO ON FUNDAMENTALISM AND THE WORD OF GOD

Thurman Wisdom said: “. . . God hates six things, and the last of those six things is the person who sows discord among brothers. And so we use the King James, partially for that reason. Another reason we use the King James is that we just love it as a Bible. We feel that has power in the English language that I personally feel no other translation has. . . . With reference to the underlying Greek text as well. Dr. Delnay mentioned that most people, most Greek students would not be aware if you took the cover off for probably weeks that they were using the other Greek text. We're not really dealing with a lot of differences there.”

# Introductory Bible Verses

## Psalm 138:2

I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy name for thy lovingkindness and for thy truth: for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name. (KJV)

# Introductory Bible Verses

## 1 Peter 3:15

But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and *be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you* with meekness and fear: (KJV)



# Introductory Bible Verses

## Jude 1:3

**Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. (KJV)**

# Introductory Bible Verses

## Matthew 24:35

Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. (KJV)

## Mark 13:31

Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away. (KJV)

# Introductory Bible Verses

## Luke 21:33

Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away. (KJV)

## Matthew 5:18

For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

(KJV)

# Concluding Remarks

Perhaps the most useful way of concluding this analysis would be to sum up the various “serious distortions” that have been made by these nine skilled leaders from the seven major fundamentalist schools that have formed a “Coalition for the Defense of the Scriptures.”

# Serious Distortion #1

Dr. Doran (DtBS) Said:

*“It seems now that some in the King James Only position are starting to argue that **to ask for inerrancy in the originals is actually a new and some are even saying a heretical position.”***

It is a **serious distortion** of the beliefs of those of us who defend the King James Bible to imply that all of us or even most of us deny Biblical *“inerrancy in the originals.”* (p. 10) With the exception of Ted Letis, the liberals, and a few others, **we do not deny *“inerrancy in the originals.”*** We believe it firmly.

# Serious Distortion #2

Rev. Oats said:  
“ . . . if you look at a 1611 King James it has marginal notes. That indicates here’s one Greek word that we could have read, but we chose another. Here are alternative readings in the Greek . . . .”

It is a serious distortion of the marginal notes of the original 1611 Bible to imply that all marginal notes in that Bible were “alternative readings in the Greek” or Hebrew (p. 18). **Only 104 of the 7,404 O.T. & N.T. marginal notes (1.4%) refer to “alternate readings.”** The rest were merely other words that could have been used or other comments.

# Serious Distortion #3

Dr. Horn (MBBC) said:  
“Let me read the quote from Erasmus. . . It's that mind set, and that philosophy, and that practice that produced the base of the edition of the TR that eventually came from that philosophy and became the basis of what we call the King James Version.”

It is a serious distortion of the basis of either the Textus Receptus or of the King James Bible's New Testament text. The Traditional Text of the manuscripts begun in apostolic times is the basis of the Textus Receptus, not the Greek text of Erasmus. Beza's 5th edition (1598) was the basis of the King James Bible's New Testament, not the Erasmus' Greek text (1516), 82 years earlier.

# Serious Distortion #4.

Dr. Thurman Wisdom (BJU) said:  
“. . . *this is also an illustration for preservation, because we do have God's Word there preserved for us. God made a point to see that it is there.*”

It is a serious distortion His fellow teacher, Dr. Jaeggli (pp. 21-24), had just pointed out numerous “scribal errors” and “mistakes” in the O.T. What kind of “preservation” is that? What he means here is merely the “message,” “idea,” “concept,” or “thought,” but not the actual “Words” of God.



# Serious Distortion #5

Rev. Larry Oats (MBBC) said:  
“... the Textus Receptus really is kind of a series of eighteen or so printed editions ...”

It is a serious distortion. On the contrary, the Textus Receptus kind of text is represented by over 99% of the 5,255+ manuscripts available as of 1967. These manuscripts have **Words that go back to the apostolic era** rather than being confined to editions since the invention of printing.

# Serious Distortion #6

Dr. Doran (DtBS) said:  
***“Some don't automatically give advantage to the older texts as much as they say. We should look at all of the manuscripts and make a decision as to which one we believe is the best reading.”***

It is a **serious distortion**. This is not what is done by those who favor the revised Greek text. **Instead of looking at “all” of the Greek manuscripts, they selected mainly one or two (“B” and “Aleph”) and perhaps 43 others (less than 1%) that agree with these two. In fact, Westcott and Hort preferred only one manuscript—“B” or the Vatican. These people studiously avoid over 5,210 other manuscripts (over 99%).**

# Serious Distortion #7

Dr. Combs (DtBS) said:

***“True, that's how most textual scholars look at it today. They don't discount any particular manuscript or group of manuscripts.”***

**It is a serious distortion. In fact, the critical text people “discount” over 99% (over 5,210) of the New Testament Greek manuscripts, stressing only one or two, or at most 43 (less than 1%) of the manuscripts.**

# Serious Distortion #8

Dr. Combs (DtBS) said:  
“Zane Hodges and Arthur Farstad issued a text based upon looking at all those Byzantine manuscripts.”

It is a serious distortion. In fact, Hodges and Farstad used Von Soden’s error-ridden notes which were based partially on only 414 manuscripts of the over 5,255 in all. They did not look at “all” or even a majority of them.

# Serious Distortion #9

Dr. Combs (DtBS) said:

***“The text we have been talking about the Textus Receptus is something that goes back many hundreds of years. But that’s only based upon approximately seven of those Byzantine manuscripts.”***

**It is a serious distortion. The Textus Receptus is based on over 99% (over 5,210) of the Greek manuscripts extant today, not “approximately seven.”**

# Serious Distortion #10.

Dr. Combs (DtBS) said:  
*“So it is rather confusing because many people who argue the Textus Receptus position will sometimes use arguments for the Majority Text. But, they are really two distinct types of texts.”*

It is a serious distortion. These two texts agree in all but about 1,800 places. For the most part, they are united in their opposition to the Westcott and Hort text and methods.

# Serious Distortion #11

Dr. Doran (DtBS) said:

*“ . . . if **the Majority Text type or the Byzantine Text type is the big circle the Textus Receptus is a very small representation of it.**”*

It is a serious distortion. In point of fact, the **Textus Receptus** is based on over 5,210 manuscripts (over 99% of the present evidence) whereas the so-called “**Majority Text**” differences with the Textus Receptus are based upon only 414 manuscripts or less that Von Soden looked at in partial and faulty fashion.

# Serious Distortion #12

Dr. Combs (DtBS) said:

***“The King James based upon the T.R. actually has ‘standing before God’ there. There is only one Greek manuscript in existence where it has ‘standing before God’”***

**It is a serious distortion. In point of fact, I have listed thirteen Greek manuscripts that have this phrase.**



# Serious Distortion #13

Dr. Combs (DtBS) said:

***“Sometimes some of the men that are used to be arguing for the Textus Receptus really were not arguing for the Textus Receptus. They were arguing for the Byzantine Text Type.”***

**It is a serious distortion. Dean Burgon did defend for the most part the “received” text as over against the revised text of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, or Westcott and Hort as I have shown in his quotations (see pages 34-36).**

# Burgon's T.R. Defense

**“Obtained from a variety of sources [that is, the **Textus Receptus or the Traditional Greek Text**] **this text proves to be essentially the same in all.** That it requires revision in respect of many of its lesser details is undeniable: but it is at least as **certain that it is an excellent text as it stands, and that the use of it will never lead critical students of Scripture seriously astray,**—which is what no one will venture to predicate concerning any single critical edition of the N.T. which has been published since the days of Griesbach, by the disciples of Griesbach's school.” [Dean Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 269.]**

# Burgon's T.R. Defense

“The one great Fact, which especially troubles him and his joint Editor, [He is speaking of Hort and Westcott here]-(as well it may)-is The Traditional Greek text of the New Testament Scriptures. **Call this text Erasmusian or Complutensian-the text of Stephens, or of Beza, or of the Elzevirs,-call it the “received” or the Traditional Greek Text or whatever other name you please;-the fact remains, that a text has come down to us which is attested by a general consensus of ancient copies, ancient Fathers, ancient versions.** This, at all events, is a point on which, (happily,) there exists entire conformity of opinion between Dr. Hort and ourselves. Our readers cannot have yet forgotten his virtual admission that,-beyond all question **the Textus Receptus is the dominant Graeco-Syrian text of A.D. 350 to A.D. 400.”** [Dean Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 269.]

# Burgon's T.R. Defense

**“But we do insist, [speaking of the Textus Receptus] (1) that it is an incomparably better text than that which either Lachmann, or Tischendorf, or Tregelles has produced: infinitely preferable to the ‘New Greek Text’ of the Revisionists, . . .”[The Revision Revised, p. 21]**

# Serious Distortion #14.

Dr. Sam Horn (NBBC) said:

*Erasmus used the texts that he used not necessarily because he thought they were the best texts, but because that what was available to him.*

It is a serious distortion. On the contrary, Erasmus searched the libraries of Europe, finding from 200 to 300 variant readings and believed firmly that the Traditional Text readings were the best. With careful decision he rejected totally the “B” and “Aleph” readings with which he was very familiar.

# Serious Distortion #15

Dr. Combs (DtBS) said:

**“So, the Textus Receptus is a product of Erasmus in 1516.”**

**It is a serious distortion. As the quotations indicate, this Textus Receptus or Traditional Text “goes step by step in unbroken succession regularly back to the earliest times.”**

# The Traditional Text

**“The history of the Traditional Text, on the contrary, goes step by step in unbroken succession regularly back to the earliest times.... Erasmus followed his few MSS because he knew them to be good representatives of the mind of the Church which had been informed under the ceaseless and loving care of mediaeval transcribers: and the text of Erasmus printed at Basle agreed in but little variation with the text of the Complutensian editors published in Spain, for which Cardinal Ximenes procured MSS at whatever cost he could. No one doubts the coincidence in all essential points of the printed text with the text of the Cursives.”**

**[Dean Burgon, *The Traditional Text*, p. 236]**

# Serious Distortion #16

Rev. Larry Oats (MBBC) said:

*“If you take all of the differences of all of the Greek texts not just the Textus Receptus but all of them it would hardly fill two pages of your Bible.”*

It is a serious distortion. These 5,604 places of difference (involving 9,970 Greek words) between the Textus Receptus and the Westcott and Hort revised text, if put end to end, would amount to 7% of the Greek New Testament. This would fill about 45.9 pages, not “two pages.”



# Serious Distortion #17

Rev. Larry Oats (MBBC) said:  
“No. No. They thought that they were so close to the originals that there was no doctrine lost.”

It is a serious distortion. In point of fact, between the Westcott and Hort revised Greek text and that of the Received Greek text, there are 356 doctrinal passages wherein the Westcott and Hort text teaches false doctrine or some other falsity of one kind or another. Indeed there has been  
“doctrine lost.”

# Serious Distortion #18

Dr. Combs (DtBS) said:  
*“I think the reason that Larry and I can agree, we may disagree on our view of the text, because these differences in the text do not constitute any doctrinal differences between us.”*

It is a serious distortion. As mentioned before, there are 356 doctrinal passages involved in the “differences in the text” between the Westcott and Hort text and the Textus Receptus. In point of fact, there are **many** “doctrinal differences” in these two texts.

# Serious Distortion #19

Dr. Burggraff (CvBS) said:  
“*We read in the Scriptures that God inspired holy men.*”

It is a serious distortion.  
“Inspired” in the New Testament means “God-breathed.” God did not breathe out “holy men,” but only His Words.

# Serious Distortion #20

Rev. Larry Oats (MBBC) said:  
“The argument basically is that unless you have been led to the Lord with a King James Bible you're not born again of the Spirit you are born again of Satan and you have a false religion”

It is a serious distortion. The implication is that all or most of those who defend the King James Bible believe this. That is not true. This is taught by a very few Fundamentalist leaders.

# Serious Distortion #21

**Dr. Sam Horn (NBBC) said:**  
***“. . . the mentality that unfortunately has infected some of the camp that says that the King James Version is the only inspired version actually holding it in their hands as re-inspired have come to the conclusion that God re-inspired the King James in English.***”

**It is a serious distortion. This is basically a position held by Dr. Peter Ruckman and his followers, and is rejected by most others who defend the King James Bible. This difference was not made clear.**

# Serious Distortion #22

Dr. Kevin Bauder (CBS) said:

*“When I hold the King James Bible in my hand, I hold the Word of God in my hand. I believe that the Textus Receptus is the Word of God. When I hold the Textus Receptus in my hand I hold the Word of God in my hand. I also believe that a New American Standard Bible is the Word of God and that when I hold that book in my hand I am holding the Word of God in my hand.”*

It is a serious distortion. Obviously, since the Greek texts that underlie the King James Bible and the NASV differ in 5,604 places, they cannot both be “*the Word of God*” unless “Word” is re-defined as “message,” “concept,” “thought,” or “idea.” They cannot both be the “Words of God” because of these 5,604 places of difference. This is a clever, deceptive, semantical technique.

# Serious Distortion #23

Dr. Doran (DtBS) said:

*“Do we all believe that God has preserved His Word? Everyone of our institutions agree that God has preserved His Word.”*

It is a serious distortion. Again, the “institutions” do not believe God has “preserved His Words,” (they said so clearly) but only “His Word.” They must mean by “Word,” only the “message,” “idea,” “concept,” or “thought.” Such a statement is defective and unscriptural as a doctrine of Bible preservation.

# Serious Distortion #24

Dr. Doran (DtBS) said:

*“You can have points of disagreements as to how God has preserved His Word.”*

It is a **serious distortion**. The Scripture is clear that God preserved His Word by means of preserving the Words of the original writings. There should be no **“disagreements as to how.”**

**God promised verbal preservation of His Words, not merely His “message,” “thought,” “idea,” or “concept.”**

**What He promises He fulfills, including this promise.**



# Serious Distortion #25

Dr. Thurman Wisdom (BJU) said: *“Dr. Delnay mentioned that most Greek students would not be aware if you took the cover off for probably weeks that they were using the other Greek text. We're not really dealing with a lot of differences there..”*

It is a serious distortion. I would differ on this decidedly. I believe 5,604 different places involving **9,970 Greek Words** that are either added, subtracted, or changed in some other way constitute *“a lot of differences.”*

# Serious Distortion #26

Dr. Doran (DtBS) said:

*“We trust that the time that we've spent today discussing this issue has been helpful to you. Let me just say that all of us are glad that we have confidence in the Word of God and we are glad that we are fundamentalists.”*

It is a serious distortion. To make the statement about their “confidence in the Word of God” points up the fact that their false view of Bible preservation constitutes a “confidence” only in the “message” of God, the “thoughts” of God, the “concepts” of God, and the “ideas” of God—not in the Words of God! This is where the battle lines are drawn in the battle for the Bible in the hour in which we live. Where do you and your church fellowship stand on these issues?