

# Analysis of D. A. Waite's "Remarks on the Moorman/White Debate"

By Pete Heisey  
Timisoara, Romania

## REMARKS ON THE MOORMAN/WHITE DEBATE

(2/2/11)

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

Bible For Today Baptist Church

900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, NJ 08108

Phone: 856-854-4747; E-Mail: [BFT@BibleForToday.org](mailto:BFT@BibleForToday.org)

Website: [BibleForToday.org](http://BibleForToday.org)

### I. COMMENTS ON JAMES WHITE'S 20-MINUTE OPENING REMARKS FROM THE FIRST 40-MINUTES OF THE DEBATE:

2. Manuscripts differ, but the TR MSS have minute differences only; whereas his Vatican and Sinai MSS have hundreds and even thousands of differences. In the Gospels alone, they differ in over 3,000 significant places.

3. White claims to believe in the "inerrancy of Scripture," but where is his "inerrant Scripture"? **WHERE, FOR THAT MATTER, IS WAITE'S INERRANT SCRIPTURE? IN HAND? WHERE? AND WHAT? AND WHICH?**

4. Debating a Muslim has nothing to do with this theme either. IT IS BRAGGING.

5. Debating a man from the Jesus Seminar has nothing to do with this theme either. IT IS BRAGGING.

6. He believes the "Bible is the Word of God," but which Bible is it, and where is it? **WHICH BIBLE IS WAITE'S "WORDS OF GOD"? THE KJB? [EVEN THOUGH WAITE WOULD DENY THAT IT IS PERFECT, PRESERVED, INSPIRED, OR INERRANT]. "THE" TR? WHICH TR? "THE" HEBREW? WHICH HEBREW? ARE THE HEBREW AND GREEK TEXTS WHICH WAITE WOULD SAY ARE "THE BIBLE WHICH IS THE WORD OF GOD" BOUND TOGETHER SOMEWHERE THAT ONE CAN PURCHASE THEM AND HAVE THEM IN HAND? DOES WAITE HAVE THEM IN HAND?**

7. He said there was "not a Greek text in the entire world that reads like the *Textus Receptus*" that Pastor Moorman had. He had the TBS edition of Dr. Scrivener's Greek text which is the edition of Beza 5<sup>th</sup> edition, 1598. This is a lie. **WELL ACTUALLY, IF WHITE WAS REFERRING TO THE EXACT TEXT/READINGS UNDERLYING THE KJB AS "THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS", THEN WHITE WAS CORRECT AND WAITE IS INCORRECT. FURTHERMORE, SCRIVENER'S GREEK TEXT DIFFERS FROM BEZA'S 1598 TEXT IN NEARLY 200 PLACES BY SCRIVENER'S OWN COUNT (PREFACE, P.IX.). SO WHO IS THE LIAR HERE?**

8. He lied horribly when he stated that Dr. Scrivener "created a Greek text that no one had ever seen before Scrivener created that in the 19<sup>th</sup> century." It was Beza's 5<sup>th</sup> edition, 1598. Scrivener did not create anything. **HOGWASH! WHITE TOLD THE TRUTH HERE. [I WOULD HAVE ADDED "IN ONE PLACE" BEFORE THE WORD "SCRIVENER".] SCRIVENER HIMSELF SAID THAT HIS TEXT WAS AN ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE OR CREATE AN EDITION OF "THE TEXT PRESUMED TO UNDERLIE THE AUTHORISED VERSION" (PREFACE TO SCRIVENER'S TEXT, P.VII.) HIS ATTEMPT WAS TO PROVIDE AN "EDITION ... THAT ACTUALLY**

**MAKES UP THE GREEK BASIS OF THE AUTHORISED VERSION” (PREFACE, P.VIII.). SCRIVENER’S MISTAKE WAS IN LIMITING HIMSELF TO SEARCHING FOR THE UNDERLYING READINGS ONLY IN THE “PUBLISHED GREEK EDITIONS” [A RATHER LIMITING CONSTRAINT]. FURTHERMORE, WAITE AGAIN LIES BY SAYING THAT SCRIVENER’S TEXT IS BEZA’S 1598 EDITION. “VARIATIONS FROM BEZA’S TEXT OF 1598, IN NUMBER ABOUT 190 ...” (PREFACE, P. IX.)**

9. He refused to allow Dr. Moorman’s name of “Byzantine text” as a synonym for the T.R., twisting it to mean only the so-called “Majority Text” (which is not a “majority” of anything) of Hodges and Farstad which has over 1800 differences from the T.R. **SO WHAT IS WAITE’S “THE T.R.”? HE NEVER SAYS. ONE TIME HE SAYS IT’S SCRIVENER AND ANOTHER TIME HE SAYS IT’S THE EXACT READINGS UNDERLYING THE KJB. AND THE TWO ARE NOT THE SAME AS WAITE HIMSELF ADMITTED INITIALLY TO THIS AUTHOR. WAITE ADDS TO THE CONFUSION BY NOW SAYING WHAT HE DOES IN NR. 10 BELOW BY SAYING THAT THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS OF TODAY “IS BEZA’S 5<sup>TH</sup> EDITION, 1598.”**

10. Stevens 1550 text is NOT the “textus receptus” of today. It is Beza’s 5<sup>th</sup> edition, 1598 (48 years after Stevens’ 1550.) **INDEED STEPHENUS’ 1550 TEXT IS NOT “THE” TR. AND NOW WAITE HAS ENDED UP STATING THAT AT LEAST THREE (DIFFERING!!) TEXTS ARE “THE” TR (THE EXACT READINGS UNDERLYING THE KJB – HE DOESN’T SAY THAT ONE VERY MUCH ANYMORE; SCRIVENER’S TEXT; BEZA 1598). IF WAITE IS SO WILLFULLY AND WOEFULLY IGNORANT THAT HE EITHER DOESN’T KNOW OR REFUSES TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THOSE THREE TEXTS DIFFER FROM EACH OTHER, THEN IT CAN BE SAFELY CONCLUDED THAT WAITE IS NEITHER SCHOLAR NOR STUDENT. HE HIMSELF HAS ADMITTED TO THIS AUTHOR THAT HE HAS NOT COLLATED SCRIVENER AND/OR BEZA 1598 WORD BY WORD WITH THE KJB (OR IF ONE PREFERS, HE HAS NOT COLLATED THE KJB WORD BY WORD WITH SCRIVENER OR BEZA 1598). THIS AUTHOR HAS NOT DONE A FULL COLLATION, BUT HAS COLLATED A SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF PASSAGES, AS WELL AS OBSERVING SCRIVENER’S OWN COMMENTS AND NOTATIONS (\*) REGARDING BEZA, TO COME TO THE STUDIED CONCLUSION THAT NONE OF THE THREE TEXTS MENTIONED ABOVE MATCH, AND FURTHER THAT NEITHER SCRIVENER’S TEXT NOR BEZA’S 1598 TEXT MATCH THE EXACT READINGS UNDERLYING THE KJB.**

11. He said Stevens, Erasmus, and Beza’s texts were the texts that were used for the KJB. It was principally Beza’s 5<sup>th</sup> edition of 1598 that was used, not the other two. **HERE WAITE SAYS CLEARLY (OR SO IT SEEMS) THAT BEZA’S TEXT/SCRIVENER’S TEXT WERE “PRINCIPALLY” THE EDITIONS USED FOR THE KJB. ABOVE HE SAYS THAT “THE” TR IS BEZA/SCRIVENER. THUS, WAITE IS SAYING IS THAT WHEREVER THE KJB DOES NOT MATCH BEZA/SCRIVENER (AND THERE ARE UPWARDS OF 40 PLACES THAT THIS AUTHOR HAS FOUND AND WAITE AGREED WITH ABOUT 15 OF THOSE AS INDEED NOT MATCHING THE EXACT READINGS UNDERLYING THE KJB), THE KJB IS NOT A “TR” TEXT AND CONSEQUENTLY IS IN ERROR (AND THAT DESPITE WAITE’S TIPTOEING THROUGH THE TULIPS WITH HIS STATEMENT ABOUT “NOT FINDING ANY” ERRORS IN THE KJB).**

(...)

18. He pointed to his Stevens and his Erasmus Greek texts he had and said they don't agree always. But the KJB translators used Beza's 5<sup>th</sup> edition 1598, 82 years after Erasmus and 48 years after Stevens. **WAITE IS NOT VERY PRECISE HERE (AT THE VERY LEAST). THE KJB TRANSLATORS MAY HAVE "MOSTLY" USED BEZA'S 5<sup>TH</sup> EDITION, BUT THEY CERTAINLY DID NOT "EXCLUSIVELY" USE IT. BEZA'S 5<sup>TH</sup> EDITION (1598) DOES NOT MATCH THE EXACT READINGS UNDERLYING THE KJB.**

(...)

22. In his 2-minute summation, White gave an erroneous statement when he talked about the real issue here which is: "*What did the inspired apostles originally write?*" The apostles were not "*inspired.*" This shows White's total ignorance of what "*inspiration*" really means. While Job 32:8 uses this word, 2 Timothy 3:16 is the only place in the New Testament where the word, "*inspiration*" occurs. Here it is defined exactly. **WAITE IS PRETTY DISMISSIVE OF THE JOB PASSAGE. WONDER WHY. FURTHERMORE, WHY LIMIT THE DISCUSSION OF "INSPIRATION" TO JUST THE NEW TESTAMENT? SHOULDN'T ONE CONSIDER ALL BIBLICAL REFERENCES TO A GIVEN WORD/CONCEPT?! JUST GOES TO SHOW WHAT KIND OF A [NON-] STUDENT OF THE BIBLE WAITE REALLY IS.** It makes "*inspiration*" limited to PASA GRAPHE ("*every word*") in the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek which were "*given by inspiration of God*" or "*God-breathed.*" **NOTE THAT WAITE CHANGES THE WORD OF GOD HERE AND SAYS "WERE 'GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD'" RATHER THAN THE PRESENT TENSE "IS" ["ARE"] GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD.** It is ridiculous to have MEN GOD-BREATHED. God did not breathe out MEN, but WORDS. **ACTUALLY WAITE MISSES THE POINT OF II TIMOTHY 3:16. THE POINT IS THAT ANYTHING THAT IS TRULY SCRIPTURE IS "GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD". THAT APPLIED TO THE COPIES THAT TIMOTHY HAD AND EVEN TO TRANSLATIONS THAT MET THE CRITERIA (IT CANNOT BE ABSOLUTELY ASSUMED THAT TIMOTHY WAS COMPLETELY FLUENT IN HEBREW, ESPECIALLY GIVEN THAT HE ONLY GOT CIRCUMCISED LATER IN LIFE). WAITE'S INCONSISTENCY (YET ANOTHER ONE) IS THAT HE DOESN'T SEEM TO HAVE A PROBLEM CALLING THE KJB "SCRIPTURE", YET HE REFUSES TO SAY THAT THE KJB CAN BE CONSIDERED "INSPIRED" OR "GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD" [OR EVEN "PRESERVED", "INERRANT", "PERFECT", OR "PURE"] (THOUGH AT THE 2010 DBS MEETING HE DID COMMENT THAT "TECHNICALLY" THE KJB SHOULDN'T BE CALLED "SCRIPTURE" – A HANDY DISCLAIMER FOR HIM). WAITE'S CONCLUSION IS THAT THE WORDS OF THE KJB ARE MERELY THE WORDS OF MEN AND NOT THE WORDS OF GOD [ONLY "THE" TR OF HEBREW AND GREEK ARE THE GENUINE WORDS OF GOD ACCORDING TO WAITE]. YET ANOTHER INCONSISTENCY IS THAT WAITE PROBABLY HOLDS UP THE KJB AND SAYS THAT IT IS THE WORD OF GOD. BUTH THEN AGAIN MAYBE HE DOESN'T. WHO KNOWS WITH HIM ANYMORE?**

23. He brings up Revelation 16:5 again as a distraction.

24. White said that if Pastor Moorman's position is correct on the KJB, "*Christians for 1600 years could not claim to have had the full word of God. How can that be? That's simply not a viable alternative.*" (simply because of his Revelation 16:5 and a few other verses).

25. White gives a horrific lie about the Greek Words underlying the KJB when he said, the New Testament was preserved, but "*It was not preserved in one particular text that had to*

*come into existence in 1611.*” In this statement he repeated his lie mentioned before, that Dr. Frederick Scrivener translated his Greek text from the King James Bible. This is false to history and fact. In truth, Dr. Scrivener used the Greek edition of Beza’s 5<sup>TH</sup> edition of 1598. **WAITE IS LYING HERE. SCRIVENER’S TEXT IS NOT BEZA’S 1598 EDITION. SCRIVENER HIMSELF IN THE PREFACE (P.IX) STATES THAT THERE ARE AROUND 190 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HIS TEXT AND THAT OF BEZA 1598.** Scrivener did not “*back-translate*” from the KJV to Greek as White, James Price, and heretic Gail Riplinger have all falsely claimed.