

ANALYZING THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY'S ARTICLE OF FAITH ON THE BIBLE

By Pete Heisey
Church Planting among the ethnic Gypsies
Timisoara, Romania

II. ARTICLES OF FAITH

Acknowledging the Bible to be the inerrant, infallible, plenary and verbally inspired Word of God, among other equally Biblical truths, we believe and maintain the following: (...)

Note the use of the word “be” (present tense) in the statement above. This implies that “the Bible” (as described in the terms following the word “be”) is available to people today in its inerrant, infallible, plenary and verbally inspired form. Yet DBS never says exactly WHERE this “Bible” can be obtained. If said “Bible”, that is the inerrant, infallible, plenary and verbally inspired Word of God “be” in existence today, WHERE can one obtain it?

A. THE BIBLE

We believe in the plenary, verbal, Divine inspiration of the sixty-six canonical books of the Old and the New Testaments (from Genesis to Revelation) in the original languages, *[to be ethical, DBS should say “only in the original languages”]* and in their consequent infallibility and inerrancy *[in the original languages only, as far as DBS is concerned]* in all matters of which they speak (2 Timothy 3:16-17; 2 Peter 1:21; 1 Thessalonians 2:13). *[Here the present tense implications of the word “consequent” as well as the word, “speak”, indicate that these canonical books in their plenary, verbally, Divinely inspired form are available to people today, at least in the original languages. However, DBS never says exactly WHERE those plenary, verbally, Divinely inspired books/words, even in the original languages, can be obtained and read.]* The books known as the Apocrypha, however, are not the inspired Word of God in any sense whatsoever. As the Bible uses it, the term "inspiration" refers to the writings, not the writers (2 Timothy 3:16-17) *[to be ethical, DBS should have indicated here that said “inspiration” refers to correct copies as well, at least in the original languages, since in context, the passage referred to (2 Timothy 3:16-17) is NOT speaking of the original manuscripts nor the original giving of the original words]*; the writers are spoken of as being "holy men of God" who were "moved," "carried" or "borne" along by the Holy Spirit (2 Peter 1:21) in such a definite way that their writings were *[Note the past tense of the word, “were”, here, implying that such supernaturally,*

plenarily, and verbally inspired, free from error, infallible and inerrant writings are not, or may not be available to anyone today (despite DBS' earlier affirmations above). The consequence is that anyone since the original writing of the Bible books, who did not have the originals, or who did not have the original words in the original languages of the original books of the Bible, did not or does not have the true "words" of God.] supernaturally, plenarily, and verbally inspired, free from any error, infallible, and inerrant, as no other writings have ever been or ever will be inspired.

The omniscience required to make the latter statement ("as no other writings have ever been or ever will be inspired") does not exist among the members of the DBS. Furthermore, the affirmation PRESUPPOSES and ASSUMES that God COULD not and/or WOULD not do such a thing (contrary to the BIBLICAL accounts in Jeremiah that God DID do such a thing). Furthermore, the statement contradicts the usage of the word "scripture" in the scriptures.

We believe that the Texts which are the closest to the original autographs of the Bible are the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text for the Old Testament, and the traditional Greek Text for the New Testament underlying the King James Version (as found in "The Greek Text Underlying The English Authorized Version of 1611").

Here DBS implicitly admits that the published O.T. (probably referring to Letteris) and N.T. (Scrivener's text) received texts are NOT the exact readings of the originals (nor are they the exact readings underlying the KJB). It is said that "[they] are the closest". [Underlining added]

We, believe that the King James Version (or Authorized Version) of the English Bible is a true, faithful, and accurate translation of these two providentially preserved Texts *[Those three words, "true", "faithful", and "accurate" all either mean or imply "inerrant". Yet DBS is apparently unwilling to use the word "inerrant" of the KJB, and perhaps some members of the executive committee believe, in fact, that there are errors in the KJB.]*, which in our time has no equal among all of the other English Translations. The translators did such a fine job in their translation task that we can without apology hold up the Authorized Version of 1611 and say "This is the WORD OF GOD!" *[Ethically, and as far as integrity is concerned, if DBS members are going to say this, then they will have to admit what that same "WORD OF GOD" says about itself, i.e., it is "pure" (Psalm 119:140) and "perfect" [Psalm 19:7; James 1:25] among other terms. These words are words which at least the DBS executive committee denies are true of the KJB.]* while at the same time realizing that, in some verses, we must go back to the underlying original

language Texts for complete clarity, and also compare Scripture with Scripture. *[Thus, the priesthood of the believer who is not fluent in Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek is denied. This is ultimately a violation of Matthew 4:4; Luke 4:4; Acts 17:10-11; 1 Peter 2:2. The statement evidences an attitude of papalism. (Underlining added)]*

We believe that all the verses *[should read “words”!!]* in the King James Version belong in the Old and the New Testaments because they represent words we believe were in the original texts, *[this seems to imply that the exact readings underlying the KJB are the words of the originals]* although there might be other renderings from the original languages which could also be acceptable to us today. *[This may be a problem since DBS has resolved that no words of the KJB should be added to, subtracted from, nor changed. If in their various contexts the KJB words are the best, exact, correct, (yea preserved) words, and if the 47+ learned men were truly learned men, then how could “other renderings” be acceptable in those particular contexts?]* For an exhaustive study of any of the words or verses in the Bible, *[It is assumed that by the word, “Bible”, the KJB is meant.]* we urge the student to return directly to the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Traditional Received Greek Text rather than to any other translation for help. *[The problem here is that published editions of these texts do not exactly match the words underlying the KJB. Thus “return[ing] directly to [these] text[s]” would lead a person, or could lead a person, to teach or preach something different than what the KJB says, preaches and teaches. Consequently, which is correct? Are the published editions of the T.R. texts the correct words? Or are the exact words underlying the KJB (and the KJB itself) the correct words?]*

Conclusion:

The DBS statement of faith is weak and ultimately unbiblical. DBS should say just exactly WHERE “the Bible” which is inerrant, inspired, infallible, etc. can be obtained and read for the good and growth of God’s children (Matthew 4:4, Luke 4:4, 1 Peter 2:2).