

# **FUZZY FACTS FROM FUNDAMENTALISTS on Bible Versions**

**A Refutation of  
*One Bible Only?***



*the*  
**BIBLE  
FOR  
TODAY**

900 Park Avenue  
Collingswood, NJ 08108  
Phone: 856-854-4452  
[www.BibleForToday.org](http://www.BibleForToday.org)

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

Published by

**THE BIBLE FOR TODAY PRESS**  
**900 Park Avenue**  
**Collingswood, New Jersey 08108**  
**U.S.A.**

**Phone: 856-854-4452**  
**Orders: 1-800-John 10:9**  
**e-mail: BFT@BibleForToday.org**  
**website: www.BibleForToday.org**  
**fax: 856-854-2464**

July, 2002

**BFT3064BK**

Copyright, 2002  
All Rights Reserved

ISBN #1-56848-032-6

# Acknowledgments

I wish to acknowledge the assistance of the following people:

- **Yvonne Sanborn Waite**, my wife, who encouraged the publication of this book, read the manuscript, and gave helpful suggestions;
- **Dianne W. Cosby**, for typing this material from the cassette tapes and putting them in computer format;
- **Daniel S. Waite**, the Assistant to the Bible For Today Director, who guided the book through the printing process;
- **Barbara Egan**, our Bible For Today secretary who also read the manuscript and offered valuable comments.

Yours for God's Words,

*D. A. Waite*

DAW/w

Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.  
**Bible For Today Baptist Church**

# Foreword

● **The Beginning.** In 1997, the Central Baptist Seminary published a book entitled *The Bible Version Debate--The Perspective of Central Baptist Theological Seminary*. I answered this 148-page book in a volume I called *Central Seminary Refuted On Bible Versions*. It is 184 pages in length and is available as **BFT #2926** for a gift of **\$10+\$4 S&H**. In that volume, I responded to 529 issues of importance that were covered in this Central Seminary book.

● **A Second Attack.** The Central Baptist Seminary evidently didn't think their first book was sufficiently powerful enough to destroy a Christian's faith in the Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament Text, the Textus Receptus Greek New Testament Text, and the King James Bible which is based on those two original language texts. For reasons known only to them, they mounted a second attack in the year 2001. The book has 238 pages. Four of the Chapters or Sections were almost identical reprints from the former book. Their book is called *One Bible Only?--Examining Exclusive Claims for the King James Bible*.

● **The Present Reply.** My reply to the present book is broadened from merely an answer to Central Seminary. It embraces a response to the various Fundamentalist institutions that share Central's position such as Bob Jones University, Detroit Baptist Seminary, Calvary Baptist Seminary, and others. For this reason I have called the book *Fuzzy Facts From Fundamentalists on Bible Versions*.

● **The One Point of Attack.** Martin Luther once wrote:  
"If I profess with loudest voice and clearest exposition every portion of the Truth of God except precisely that point which the world and the devil are at that moment attacking, I am not confessing Christ, however boldly I may be professing Christ. Where the battle rages, there the loyalty of the soldier is proved, and to be steady on all the battlefield besides, is mere flight and disgrace if he flinches at that point."

The present major point of attack from some of the Fundamentalist world is in the area of a **denial** that God **promised** and has fulfilled His promise to preserve the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek **Words** which were originally given by verbal, plenary inspiration. This present controversy led by Fundamentalist institutions engenders grave doubt about the position on the Bible which will be taken by future generations of Fundamentalists. Already, unbelief is present regarding the **Words of God**.

# Table of Contents

Publisher's Data .....	i
Acknowledgments .....	ii
Foreword .....	iii
Table of Contents .....	iv
Introductory Remarks .....	1
Back Cover (No Author Given) .....	1
Preface--by Douglas R. McLachlan .....	2
Introduction--by Kevin T. Bauder .....	5
Chapter 1--by Douglas R. Kutilek .....	14
Chapter 2--by Roy E. Beacham .....	20
Chapters 3 & 4--by W. Edward Glenny .....	26
Chapter 5--by Robert W. Milliman .....	50
Conclusion & Appendix A--by Kevin T. Bauder .....	59
Appendix B--by Larry D. Pettegrew .....	86
Index of Words and Phrases .....	89
About the Author .....	100
Order Blank Pages .....	101

## Introductory Remarks

This study is an attempt to answer in as brief a manner as possible 265 **FUZZY** facts contained in this *One Bible Only?* book published by Central Baptist Seminary in Plymouths, Minnesota. They are "**FUZZY**" because they are not true. They require answers which I have given briefly in my responses. The method I have used is to give the **FUZZY** fact and then my brief response.

All seven authors of *One Bible Only?* have some connection with Central Baptist Seminary. (1) Douglas R. McLachlan wrote the Preface; (2) Kevin T. Bauder wrote the Introduction, Conclusion, and Appendix A; (3) Douglas A. Kutilek wrote Chapter 1; (4) Roy E. Beacham wrote Chapter 2; (5) W. Edward Glenny wrote Chapters 3 and 4; (6) Robert H. Milliman wrote Chapter 5; (7) Larry D. Pettegrew wrote Appendix B. Each writer is named and the pages from which their quotations were taken are also given.

## I. Comments from the Back Cover No Author Is Given

### Meaning of "Inspired-God-Breathed"

● **FUZZY** Fact #1: "Is there only one inspired Bible?" (*One Bible Only?* Back cover)

● **Response #1:** The authors are talking about the translations of the Bible. I do not hold (nor do the Dean Burgon Society or the Bible For Today) that the King James Bible or any translation is "*given by inspiration of God*" or "God-breathed." Only 2 Timothy 3:16 gives us the Bible's definition of "inspiration." One Greek word, "THEOPNEUSTOS," is translated by five English words, "*given by inspiration of God.*" "THEOS" is "God" and "PNEO" is the word for breathe. It is literally God-breathed. God did not breathe out or "inspire" Spanish, French, English, or any other translation. God breathed out or "inspired" only Greek, a little Aramaic, and Hebrew.

### KJB-Only Accurate English Translation

● **FUZZY** Fact #2: ". . . some believers insist that the King James Version is the only accurate translation of the Bible. 'King James-Only' proponents claim it is the only choice for those who want the 'inspired' Scripture as their guide for faith and practice." [*One Bible Only?* Back cover]

● **Response #2:** I agree it is the only accurate translation of the proper Hebrew and Greek texts in the English language. I do NOT believe the King James Bible is either "inspired by God," "*given by inspiration of God*" or God-

breathed. This is a false charge.

## **Not Balanced**

● **FUZZY** Fact #3: "This honest examination of the 'King James-Only' position offers a balanced and scholarly presentation of the issues based on biblical and historical evidence." [back cover]

● **Response #3:** This book is neither honest, balanced, scholarly, Biblical, or historical. I disagree completely. The present book, *One Bible Only?* contains four chapters also found in their earlier book, *The Bible Version Debate*. It is therefore NOT a completely NEW book.

## **II. Comments from the Preface**

**By Douglas R. McLachlan**

### **"Trustworthy"—Not Good Enough**

● **FUZZY** Fact #4: In the Preface, "*The Richness of Scripture*," Central Seminary President, Douglas R. McLachlan, wrote: "Christians celebrate, in particular, the **trustworthiness** of Scripture as a breathed-out, written-down document from God Himself." (P. 9)

● **Response #4:** It is not simply "**trustworthiness**." God has promised to preserve the Hebrew and Greek WORDS of the Scriptures and He has fulfilled that promise. The word, "**trustworthiness**," is a very weak, illusive, and vacant term when referring to "Scripture." No meaning is assigned to this term.

### **"Preserved" Only In the "Originals"?**

● **FUZZY** Fact #5: Douglas McLachlan stated: "It [making the originals] did not demean the human authors into machines, as though they were Dictaphones, and yet it **preserved from error** the text of Scriptures as originally given by God." [p. 10]

● **Response #5:** How does he know anything about the "originals" except by faith. He was not there. He does not believe we have a preserved Greek and Hebrew text today, so how does he know that the originals were "**preserved from error**." He never saw the originals.

### **"Access" to Originals Not Lost**

● **FUZZY** Fact #6: Douglas McLachlan wrote: "The unfortunate reality is that in the intervening years we have **lost access** to the original manuscripts of Scripture. None of them has survived." [p. 10]

● **Response #6:** Though the originals have not survived, **we have NOT "lost access** to the original manuscripts of Scripture." God promised to preserve His "original" Words. I believe He has fulfilled His promise by

preserving them in the Masoretic Hebrew and the Textus Receptus Greek texts that underlie the King James Bible. Because of this, we do have “access” to the Words of the original manuscripts by the verbal preservation of the copies of those manuscripts. Apart from these proper Hebrew and Greek texts (which Central Seminary and others have abandoned) there is a “lost access” to the “original manuscripts of Scripture.”

## **More Than “Original Content” Needed**

● **FUZZY Fact #7:** Douglas McLachlan wrote: "Notwithstanding, God in His grace and governance has ensured access to the **original content** of those documents by preserving for us a rich abundance of manuscript copies." [p. 10]

● **Response #7:** He believes only that the “**original content**” of the original manuscripts were preserved, but not the Hebrew and Greek Words of those originals. I believe that the Lord Jesus has promised to preserve His Words and believe that this promise has been fulfilled in the Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Textus Receptus Greek Text underlying the King James Bible. They use manuscripts “B” and “Aleph” instead.

## **“Theology” IS Affected**

● **FUZZY Fact #8:** Douglas McLachlan wrote: "Significant variants number about two thousand, none of which affects the overall **theology** of Bible-believing Christians." [P. 10]

● **Response #8: Theology** is affected by the Westcott and Hort kind of false N.T. texts used by Central Seminary, Bob Jones University, and others. Theology is seriously affected. Dr. Jack Moorman (**BFT #2956**, 100 large pp.) points out 356 doctrinal passages and errors in the Greek Texts of Westcott and Hort, United Bible Society, or Nestle Aland.

## **How Does He Know “Copyists” Errors?**

● **FUZZY Fact #9:** Douglas McLachlan wrote of the NT: ". . . the copyists [scribes] made **every conceivable error**, as well as times intentionally altering [probably with the idea of 'correcting'] the text." [p. 11]

● **Response #9:** How does he know this? Was he there when Paul wrote the book of Romans or Galatians? How does he know that the scribes made “**every conceivable error**”? How does he know that copyists were “intentionally altering the text”? Where is his evidence? He is apparently following some leader by blind and erroneous faith.



## **T.R. Manuscripts “Virtually Identical”**

● **FUZZY** Fact #10: DouglasMcLachlan wrote: “Moreover, no two MSS anywhere in existence are **exactly alike**.” [p. 11]

● **Response #10:** This is misleading because Dean Burgon says that the manuscripts that make up the Textus Receptus and Traditional Text are “**virtually identical**.” DouglasMcLachlan gives the idea to his readers that there are wide variations even between the Textus Receptus manuscripts. That is not the case. If he is talking about Westcott & Hort’s Vatican and the Sinai manuscripts (which he favors), he is correct. In these two manuscripts there are over 3,000 important differences in the Gospels alone. In the Textus Receptus manuscripts, we have a seamless garment, as it were. There may be slightly different spellings or something small like that, but Dean Burgon rightly says that the Traditional Text manuscripts are “**virtually identical**.”

## **Book Based on “Chapel Services”**

● **FUZZY** Fact #11: "This book began as a lecture series in the chapel services of Central Baptist Theological Seminary of Plymouth, Minnesota. . . with regard to the growing Bible version controversy. Those lectures eventually were reworked and drafted into an initial printed publication that was produced by Central Seminary for the information and edification of graduates, alumni, and other interested students of Scripture." [p. 11]

● **Response #11:** Chapel lectures were used to initiate Central’s earlier book, *The Bible Version Debate*. This has been answered carefully in my book, *Central Seminary Refuted on Bible Versions* (BFT #2926).

## **Not “Very Balanced”**

● **FUZZY** Fact #12: DouglasMcLachlan wrote: "As you will see in the following chapters, the approach that these contributors take to the whole matter of textual criticism (the study of the original text of Scripture) and of translation issues has been **very balanced**." [p. 12]

● **Response #12:** This is false. The book is **not balanced**. It is not positive in thrust. It is a negative attack. The book’s purpose is threefold: to destroy the Textus Receptus which underlies the New Testament of the King James Bible; to destroy the Masoretic Hebrew Text which underlies our King James Bible; and to destroy the King James Bible itself.

## **Not “Accurate, Fair, and Charitable”**

● **FUZZY** Fact #13: DouglasMcLachlan wrote: "I believe that you will find their Responses to these questions to be **accurate, fair, and charitable**." [p. 12]

● **Response #13:** This book is **not accurate** in place after place. This book is **not fair** because it does not present the King James Bible's arguments fairly. It is **not charitable**. It is uncharitable and most unloving when they deal with some of us who stand for the King James Bible and the Hebrew and Greek texts that underlie it.

## **They Use “One Narrow Family”**

● **FUZZY Fact #14:** Douglas McLachlan wrote: "In our view, becoming frozen in time by anchoring to and absolutizing only one English translation or **one narrow family** of Greek manuscripts while ignoring all of the rest of the textual evidence does not seem to be a prudent course to follow. We believe that investigating and probing the abundance of available manuscript evidence that is accessible to the serious student has merit." [p. 13]

● **Response #14:** This is what Dean Burgon has done. He has probed many of the manuscripts. Central and its coalition schools follow the Westcott-Hort, Nestle-Aland, and UBS texts which follow the “**one narrow family**” of Vatican and Sinai manuscripts. They use as few manuscripts as they can--less than 1% of the evidence. They reject over 99% of the evidence.

## **III. Comments from the Introduction**

**By Kevin T. Bauder**

### **NASV Not “Precise” and “Faithful”**

● **FUZZY Fact #15:** Kevin Bauder wrote: “The NASB quickly found a home in many fundamentalist Bible college and seminary classrooms, where professors valued it for its **precision** and **faithfulness** to the Greek and Hebrew.” [“*Introduction*” by Kevin T. Bauder, p.14]

● **Response #15:** He says the NASV has “faithfulness to the Greek and Hebrew.” This is false. I have found over 4,000 examples where the New American Standard Version used dynamic equivalency. They have either added, subtracted, or changed in some other way the Bible’s preserved Hebrew and Greek Words. It has **neither “precision” nor “faithfulness.”**

### **NIV Not “Faithful”**

● **FUZZY Fact #16:** Kevin Bauder wrote: “When the New International Version (NIV) was released, however, it was welcomed as a **faithful** yet readable alternative, even by many people within fundamentalism.” [p. 14]

● **Response #16:** The NIV is **not “faithful”** to the Hebrew and Greek texts. It is less “readable” than the King James Bible. You can read it, but it is not anymore readable than the King James Bible. This is based on the careful research of my son, D. A. Waite Jr., in his book, *The Comparative Readability*

of the Authorized Version [BFT #2671]. This is a careful, objective computer study of 7 different Bible Versions. Nor is the NIV a “faithful alternative.” It is not faithful to the preserved Hebrew and Greek texts. From Genesis to Revelation I found over 6,653 examples of dynamic equivalency in the NIV [BFT #1749-P], that is, either adding, subtracting, or changing in some other way the Hebrew and Greek Words.

## **KJB—The Only True English Bible**

● **FUZZY Fact #17:** Kevin Bauder wrote: “The real question was what to do about the controversialists who began to push the King James Version as the **only true Word of God** in the English language.” [p. 15]

● **Response #17:** We should accept them. We should trust them. We should praise them for standing for the accuracy of the King James Bible. It is the **only “true Word of God** in the English language.” This is a true statement. It is the only accurate translation from the proper preserved Hebrew and Greek texts. What does Kevin Bauder recommend they do with us? At the end of the book (p. 167) he urges people to depart from us and “reject” us!

## **False and Libelous Accusations!**

● **FUZZY Fact #18:** Kevin Bauder wrote: “Over the years, they came to portray their opponents (even their fundamentalist opponents) as **enemies** of the Christian faith. Words such as **heretic**, **apostate**, and hypocrite became weapons of choice in the effort to discredit anyone who disagreed with them.” [p. 15]

● **Response #18:** This is absolutely false. I, for one, have never called “fundamentalist opponents” either “**enemies** of the Christian faith,” “**heretics**,” or “**apostate**.” You will never find that in my writings. I sometimes say that it is a hypocritical position, or an apostate position, or a heretical position may be taken. It is the “**POSITION**,” not the **PERSON**.

## **We have a True Position on Preservation**

● **FUZZY Fact #19:** Kevin Bauder wrote: “Our firm conviction is that most of the people who champion a particular edition, or version of Scripture to the exclusion of all others have based their belief upon neither an accurate understanding of the Bible’s own teachings nor the actual facts of the case. Rather, their position is founded on a **misunderstanding** of the Bible’s own statements and a defective line of reasoning about the manner in which **Scripture has been preserved**.” [p. 16]

● **Response #19:** I do have an “accurate understanding of the Bible’s own teachings” whether it is the Hebrew text, the Greek text, or the English text. We are not “defective” as to how the “**Scripture has been preserved**.” The Bible has been verbally preserved. I differ completely with Kevin Bauder’s

view of message, thought, concept, or idea preservation.

## **He Doesn't Define His Terms**

● **FUZZY Fact #20:** Kevin Bauder wrote: "We do not intend to criticize the moderates (for the King James-Only movement does have a relatively mod- rate wing) by holding them accountable for the actions of extremists." [p. 16]

● **Response #20:** Who are the "moderates" he speaks about? Are "moderates" ones who prefer the King James Bible, but think there are other "good" English versions? This is an ecumenical view of the Bible--most any Bible will do. What does he mean by "extremist." **He never defines it.** Is he talking only about Dr. Peter Ruckman? Or does he include us who believe that the King James Bible is the only accurate English Bible?

## **We Are Honorable**

● **FUZZY Fact #21:** Kevin Bauder wrote: "We believe, sorrowfully, that this movement [for the King James Bible] has propagated a seriously damaging doctrine within the Church of Jesus Christ. We also believe that the conduct of some people in that camp has been **less than honorable.**" [p. 17]

● **Response #21:** I disagree completely. I have not "propagated a seriously damaging doctrine." My "conduct" is **not "less than honorable."** I am not dishonorable. I am talking honestly and giving truth. I am refuting what is being taught by this terrible book, *One Bible Only?*. I quote my opponents fairly and I argue against them in a fair manner.

## **Not Opponents of Truth**

● **FUZZY Fact #22:** Kevin Bauder wrote: "The result is that we might seem to regard the King James-Only leaders as enemies. We do not. In our view, they are friends, but they are mistaken in doctrine and conduct, and in those cases, have become **opponents of truth.**" [p. 17]

● **Response #22:** Those of us who stand for the King James Bible as the only accurate English Bible in existence, and is translated from the verbally preserved Hebrew and Greek texts are **not "opponents of truth."** **They** are the ones who are "opponents of truth." They have rejected the Greek and Hebrew texts of the King James Bible. They have rejected the accuracy of the King James Bible. They are the ones who are the opponents of truth.

## **KJB Was Not "Reinspired"**

● **FUZZY Fact #23:** Kevin Bauder wrote: "At the extreme end of the movement are those who believe that God '**reinspired**' the **King James Bible**, or the Textus Receptus; that all versions that are translated into other languages should be translated from the King James rather than from the Greek or the

Hebrew; that the King James is actually superior to the Greek and Hebrew texts and can correct them; or that people who have been led to the Lord from one of the modern versions of the Bible (they would say ‘perversions’) are not really saved.” [p. 18]

● **Response #23:** Not one of the above four charges is true of our position, though they are all true of Dr. Peter Ruckman’s heretical position.

## **Here Are Four Sound Criteria From DAW**

● **FUZZY Fact #24:** Kevin Bauder wrote: There were “**four criteria**” of King James Bible people for translating Bibles: 1. “They must be translated from the proper texts . . .” 2. “They must employ the proper translation technique . . .” 3. “They must be the work of superior translators . . .” 4. “They must manifest proper theology . . .” [p. 18]

● **Response #24:** I agree with all four of these criteria. In fact, they are taken right out of my book, *Defending the King James Bible*.

## **KJB—Only Acceptable English Bible**

● **FUZZY Fact #25:** Kevin Bauder wrote: “Given these strictures the King James version turns out to be the **only translation** that constitutes an **acceptable** version of the Bible.” [p. 19]

● **Response #25:** This is correct. The King James Bible is the **only acceptable** translation from the preserved Hebrew and Greek texts. All the other versions in the English language have improper texts of Hebrew and Greek, or else improper translators, or else improper translation technique, or else improper theology. We must have all four criteria. That is what the King James Bible has. I stand for the King James Bible. This book is an attack on the King James Bible and its underlying Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Textus Receptus Greek Text.

## **Enemies In 356 Areas of Doctrine**

● **FUZZY Fact #26:** Kevin Bauder wrote: “In advocates of the Nestle-Aland Greek Text or the New American Standard Bible they perceive not only academic opponents but also **enemies of Christianity**.” [p. 19]

● **Response #26:** This is a doctrinal issue. I believe that those who use the Nestle-Aland Greek Text or who use the New American Standard Version or The New International Version are using texts that have 356 NT doctrinal errors and perversions. The details are found in a 100 page study written by Dr. Jack Mormon, missionary in London, England. These false versions use the false Greek text and neither the Textus Receptus nor the Masoretic Hebrew Text. These versions are “**enemies of Christianity**” as far as the **Bible doctrines** are concerned.

## It Is a “Doctrinal Matter”

● **FUZZY Fact #27:** Kevin Bauder wrote: “The boundary of the King James-Only movement is the willingness to treat the superiority or exclusive use of the King James Version, the Textus Receptus, or the Ben-Chayyim Hebrew Text as a **doctrinal matter** in which some aspect of the **Christian faith** is at stake.” [p. 19]

● **Response #27:** This is factually true. Some parts of **Christian doctrines and faith** are at stake unless you use the Ben-Chayyim Hebrew Text and Textus Receptus Greek Text which underlie our King James Bible. Look at John 6:47. “*On me*” is omitted in the W/H Greek text. The Gnostics who made this change did not believe that you need Christ to be saved. There are 356 of these doctrines. I list 158 of these in Chapter 5 of my book, *Defending the King James Bible* (BFT #1594).

## KJB—Only True English Bible

● **FUZZY Fact #28:** Kevin Bauder wrote: “In fact, we do not completely agree among ourselves on these matters. What we do agree on is this: the King James is not **the only true Bible** in the English language.” [p. 19]

● **Response #28:** It IS the only true Bible in the English language. Why? It has the TRUE preserved Hebrew and Greek texts. It has superior TRUE translators. It has TRUE superior translation technique. It has TRUE superior theology. The Bible For Today has produced the *Defined King James Bible* (BFT #3000, 42,000 to date published) so people can understand uncommon words that have changed their meanings in our day and age. I want to preserve the King James Bible, not destroy or replace it.

## “Words” Not Only “Thoughts”

● **FUZZY Fact #29:** Kevin Bauder wrote: “In the following pages, we will assert that the critical Greek texts or the New American Standard Bible, for example, are in fact the **Word of God**.” [p. 19]

● **Response #29:** The critical Greek text does not have all of the **Words of God** in it. The New American Standard Version does not have all of the Words of God in it that it should because it is based on the false Vatican (B) and Sinai (Aleph) manuscripts. It is not the Word of God unless you redefine “Word.” He defines it as the message, the thoughts, the ideas, or the concepts of God, but **not the Words of God**. The Greek critical text differs from our Textus Receptus which underlies our King James Bible in 5,604 places by my actual count. Furthermore, the critical text eliminates no fewer than 2,886 Greek words. You cannot take away 2,886 Greek words and still call it the Words of God.

## **Their Views Mislead Many**

● **FUZZY** Fact #30: Kevin Bauder wrote: "The errors of **their view** need to be exposed for the sake of souls who are being **misled by them.**" [p. 20]

● **Response #30:** The exact REVERSE of this is true. Our view does not have "errors" that "need to be exposed." It is their view that has "errors" that "need to be exposed." "Souls" are **not "being misled"** by our view. Many, however, are being "misled" by the "errors" of their view which espouses the false Westcott & Hort kind of Greek texts and false versions based upon them.

## **"Words" Needed, Not Just "Word"**

● **FUZZY** Fact #31: Kevin Bauder wrote: "Must all of **God's words** be preserved to have **God's Word**? . . . Can a person consistently believe in the preservation of God's Word without believing in the preservation of every word of the original documents of Scripture?" [p. 20]

● **Response #31:** You must believe in the "**Words**" that have been preserved or you have not believed in "God's Word" being preserved unless you redefined "Word" to mean message, idea, thought, or concept. These men who say they believe in the "preservation of God's Word" don't say they believe in the "preservation of God's Words". That's the battle before the fundamentalist world today. You can't have preservation if you are talking about the "God's Word" meaning the concepts or message only. We must have more than the message. We must have "**Words.**"

## **"Words" Preservation Needed**

● **FUZZY** Fact #32: Kevin Bauder wrote: "The King James-Only theory of preservation, then, is a theory of verbal preservation. The writer of this book might at different times refer to this theory as **verbal preservation**, perfect preservation, exact preservation, or word-for-word preservation. Whatever nomenclature is used, the theory is understood to contain the same three elements: (1) preservation of all the words of the originals (2) preservation in a single manuscript, text, textual family, or translation, and (3) public access- sibility." [p. 20]

● **Response #32:** This is what I believe. I believe the Bible teaches "**verbal preservation**" of the Words of Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek originals. These Words are found in the Traditional or Received Text which has had continuous "public accessibility."

## **Hebrew and Greek Words Preserved**

● **FUZZY** Fact #33: Kevin Bauder wrote: "The importance of this definition cannot be emphasized too strongly. According to the King James-Only position, the doctrine of preservation requires the perpetuation of *all* the

words of the originals *only* the **words of the originals**, in a *singular* place, *publicly accessible* to the people of God.” [p. 21]

● **Response #33:** These requirements are proper. God has preserved the Words that He originally gave us in the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek originals. These Words have been “publicly accessible” from Apostolic days to the present in the Hebrew and Greek texts underlying our King James Bible. I furthermore believe that the King James Bible is the only accurate translation of these preserved **Hebrew and Greek Words**.

### **“Imperfect” Things Won’t Do!**

● **FUZZY Fact #34:** Kevin Bauder wrote: “Can we hold up an **imperfect** manuscript copy, an imperfectly edited text, or an imperfectly translated version, and rightly say, ‘This is the Word of God’? The authors of this book, in harmony with the vast majority of Bible believers throughout history, will insist that **we can**.” [p. 21]

● **Response #34:** You cannot call the “Word of God” “**imperfect manuscripts**” such as “B” and “Aleph” and the “edited texts” based upon them (either that of Westcott and Hort, Nestle-Aland, or United Bible Society). Nor can you call “the Word of God” such an “imperfectly translated version” such as the New American Standard Version, NIV or similar perversions unless you redefine “Word” to mean message, thought, idea, or concept.

### **Like Neo-Orthodox--Redefinitions**

● **FUZZY Fact #35:** Kevin Bauder wrote: “Most of all, we can know Him, for the **Bible is His Word** even when it contains some imperfectly copied or translated words.” [p. 21]

● **Response #35:** The Bible is based upon God’s Words. He’s changing the definition of “Word.” This is exactly what the **Neo-orthodox** theologians like Brunner, Barth, or Tillich did by **redefining** Biblical terms many decades ago. We must not let Kevin Bauder or others **redefine** “**Word**” and call it concept, message, thought, or idea rather than Words.

### **All Hebrew & Greek “Words” Needed**

● **FUZZY Fact #36:** Kevin Bauder wrote: “This strict position suggests a test by means of which we will evaluate the King James-Only theory. Can the adherents to this view produce the single manuscript, text, or translation that contains **all of the words**, and only the words of God?” [p. 21]

● **Response #36:** By faith, I believe I have the texts that “contain **all of the words**” of God are those that underlie our King James Bible (the Masoretic Hebrew Text, and the Textus Receptus Greek Text). These texts, I believe, have every single Word. They don’t add, subtract or change a word. By faith I take that position. “By faith we understand.” (Hebrews 11:3) “Without faith



it is impossible to please Him." (Hebrews 11:6)

### **Why Not A "Faith Position"?**

● **FUZZY Fact #37:** Kevin Bauder wrote: "King James-Only proponents regularly admit that their theory is fundamentally a 'faith position' What they mean is that their conclusions do not rest primarily upon reasons or evidences but upon biblical promises, God, they say, is responsible to preserve His words, for He has promised in the Bible that He will do so." [p. 22]

● **Response #37:** Yes, I have a "faith position." He sounds like he has a "reason" position. "Without FAITH it is impossible to please Him" (Heb. 11:6), God has promised that He will preserve His Words. The Lord Jesus said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my Words shall not pass away." What could be clearer than that. He implies every single word.

### **God Promised "Words" Preservation**

● **FUZZY Fact #38:** Kevin Bauder wrote: "Those who oppose the King James-Only hypothesis are willing to concede that the Bible might contain promises that God will preserve His Word. That concession, however does not end the debate. The specific issue is whether any of those passages constitutes a promise that God will **preserve the actual words** of the original documents of Scripture." [p. 23]

● **Response #38:** I believe there is a promise and I have shown this promise in 10 or 12 verses that say that God's "actual Words" shall be preserved. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my Words shall not pass away." Matthew 5:18 safeguards both the letters (jot is a YODTH, the smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet) and the parts of letters (the tittle is the smallest distinguishing feature of a Hebrew letter.)

### **God's Promises Are Clear**

● **FUZZY Fact #39:** Kevin Bauder wrote: "Having faith in God's promise is not quite the same thing as having faith in one's own interpretation of a passage." [p. 23]

● **Response #39:** I am not using false interpretation as I believe the opponents are using. Psalm 12:6-7 is properly interpreted. It says thou shalt keep these Words thou shalt preserve them from this generation forever. **God has promised** to preserve His Words. Proverbs 22:20-21 is another promise of God's Words being preserved so that we would have "certainty" of the Words of truth. Matthew 4:4 implies that God has preserved every Word so that we can live by every Word. The phrase "it is written" [GEGRAPTAI] is a Greek perfect tense. It means something that has been done in the past with results carried into the present and on into the future. Matthew 5:18 is very clear about "jot" and "tittle" preservation.