

Dangers of the Inspired KJB Position

By Daniel Waite, M.A., M.Div.

July 27, 2011

Given at the Dean Burgon Society Annual Meeting

Thank you to the saints of the Bible Presbyterian Church for allowing us to use your beautiful facility. Thank you for praying for this conference up until the final hours. Thank you to the board who meet last night and prayed for all of the speakers by name.

The subject that is before us deals with a very precise and very technical doctrine. The doctrine of inspiration has been misused in these last days. It is dangerous to modify or alter the precise and technical doctrine term of inspiration. The doctrine of inspiration has been under attacked by the modernist and by the liberals both in our day and in days gone-by.

Some who abhor the tenants of modernism and liberalism are embracing a new type of inspiration. A style of inspiration that includes translations of Scripture. Like the neo-orthodox they have been making slight changes to the definition of inspiration. Some of our dearest friends whether directly or indirectly are teaching that translations of Scripture are inspired. This is a very touchy issue. This issue of inspiration of translations is a riveting subject. It was a riveting subject in past generations and it is a riveting subject in this present hour. It is wrong and misleading to teach that translations of Scripture are given by inspiration. It is wrong to teach the inspiration of the KJB, ASV, NIV, NKJV, ESV, or any other English or foreign language translation.

The authority of Scripture is always under attack. Many people want to remove any accountability that they have to the Words of God. The pagans want to remove the accountability, so they can be free to do what we want to do. Bible believing Christians should never act or behave like the heathen. This is why it is important to have a high standard, to have a proper standard, and to have an accurate and precise standard of inspiration. It is wrong to re-define inspiration, yet many of our dearest friends are doing so.

The issue today is the inspiration of a translation, a translation that we love and cherish. There are some today who say that the King James Bible is inspired. Perhaps some understand what they mean and, perhaps, some are confused as to what they mean. The reason why some might understand and the reason why some might be confused at the same time is because inspiration is a very precise and doctrinal word. When a precise doctrinal word is used in an imprecise manner it causes confusion.

Our friends who make these statements mean well. However, when one start altering definitions of doctrinal terms, one could begin to run into problems and to begin to set a precedent for other doctrinal terms, other doctrinal words to be slightly changed and altered. This completely destroy theology which is an exact study of different disciplines of the Bible.

There are ten major doctrines of the Bible. One of the ten major doctrines of the Bible is bibliology. The doctrine of inspiration falls under the umbrella of bibliology. The issue about the inspiration of the King James Bible, a translation we have rejoiced over for 400 years, a translation for which we thank God. We are grateful for the heritage of the faithful martyrs, persecuted translators and suffering saints who through the centuries God used to pave the way for the King James Bible. But is it accurate? Is it precise? Is it right to call a translation of the Scripture inspired? No it is wrong and imprecise to reference a translation of Scripture as inspired.

There many translations of the Scripture in many different languages. In fact, one could pile quite a few of them to the ceiling on a table. That table could be filled with Bibles from all the languages of the world. I am not sure how many tables we could fill with Bibles stacked to the ceiling-- but is it proper to call one of them or all of them inspired? No it is not proper! It is dangerously improper!

God is the one who gave particular exact words in a precise language at particular point in history that gave us our Bible. When God gave us the Words of Scripture, he gave them to us in Hebrew, in Aramaic and in Greek. And he did not give them to us over a short period of time either.

The King James Bible has been cherished by millions of people in the last 400 years. But as I mentioned before, it is dangerous to assert that other translations are inspired. There are signs that say, "Danger: The bridge is out." And so when one says it is dangerous to call the King James Bible inspired one could liken it to driving towards a bridge that is out, if one keeps on that path then one will fall into the river. If one insist on an inspired translation, then it will not be long until one will insist on altering other doctrinal terms.

Another example of danger is, "Danger: Falls ahead." If one does not want to fall over the doctrinal falls of apostasy then one must stop changing the definitions of doctrinal terms. It is certain that one does not want to drive into a ravine nor does one want to fall over the falls. But when one fails to use inspiration in an exact sense one could have just as tragic result as falling over the falls or diving off the bridge. The doctrine of inspiration must not be based on abstract feelings but entirely on the Scripture.

It is dangerous when individuals redefine what a doctrinal term means based on feelings or circles of associates. When people re-define the doctrinal word of inspiration, they act like the Neo Orthodox have done in the past. The Neo Orthodox, the liberals, and the moderates, use particular doctrinal words differently because those words have been re-defined without any ones knowledge. A list of doctrinal words from all areas of theology have been redefined by the Neo Orthodox. .

The term inspired should never be an attribute to translations: whether they be English translations, German translations, French translations, Spanish translation, or any translation from any language of the world. Anyone who alters or changes the definition of inspiration is behaving like the Neo Orthodox behave. If one is not careful the people in ones pews, the men and women who sit in ones classes will grow comfortable to ones use of words in a non-precise way. And so future generations will have a tendency to use other words in imprecise ways also.

Avoid gradual doctrinal drifts. Redefining doctrinal words is a drifting away from truth. One may start with the precise, accurate definition, but then when one gives a little bit of excuse, or gives a little bit of wiggle room to justify an acceptance of an imprecise definition – pretty soon one will be ready to adopt wrong theology. It is sloppy and wrong theology to redefine inspiration to include translations of the Scripture. It is dangerous to call a translation inspired because it will lead to wrong theology. It will create Neo Orthodox thinking.

Today we have the God preserved apographs from which translators can carry the words of the original languages into the vernacular of the peoples of the World. That is exactly what the King James Translators did – they translated. When the King James translation of 1611 was completed it included part of the Apocrypha. If one believes the King James Bible of 1611 was inspired then one must also accept the Apocrypha as inspired also.

It is wrong to label the King James Bible sixty-six canonical books of 1611 and the Apocrypha contained therein as inspired, it is dangerous to claim that God gave special revelation in 1611. It is misleading to claim that “God breathed” in 1611. Whatever synonym one wants to use for inspiration, it is very dangerous to say that inspiration occurred in 1611 because there are things that were included in the 1611 edition that do not belong in the Bible of a born again Bible believing Christian. Many of our friends, perhaps, do not realize that the King James Bible we hold in our hands, is the 1769 edition of the King James Bible and not the 1611 edition of the King James Bible.

This issue has caused confusion in the minds of people. It is dangerous for individuals to boldly assert that a translation is inspired, because it is a translation of God’s preserved apographs. The King James Bible is a literal, verbal and plenary translation of those preserved words that God has given to us. The translation itself was not given by inspiration.

When others say that a translation is inspired, do they consider the mistakes due to the process of the printing? No matter what one does, sometimes when you print a book, when you print a Bible, whether it is a small work or a large work, there will be some type of mistake. In the Ten Commandments when a “not” is removed from one of the Ten Commandments, or when a negative is made into a positive, the question must be asked, “Well, is that inspired? Or do we have a contradiction? Is it just one person’s edition, or another person’s edition? So will one say, I am going to take the edition that best suits my life – I like the other one better! Which of the two translations are inspired? If one does not like a particular commandment and one finds an edition of the King James Bible that doesn’t have a ‘not’ in it, then it is likely that one will accept the edition that is the least convicting. One is going to claim it is inspired just like someone else will claim another edition is inspired.

What authority do those people have to limit inspiration to one particular translation and which edition of that translation is actually the “all inspired one”? When they were printing the Bible, if it was a mistake was caught ahead of time and they made the correction. When the Bibles were shipped out, perhaps, one shipment -- the early editions came off the press read one way. But subsequent editions -- the later ones read some other way. These differences were not major difference, but yet in some small differences none-the-less.

Since inspiration is a very precise and very accurate term, how can you say dogmatically that a translation is inspired? Most if not all would not want that assertion made of a modern Bible translation, one that was made in the late 1900s. Pick whatever one you would like that came out in the late 1900s or early 2000s it would be very uncomfortable calling some of those inspired. One should be uncomfortable with calling the Bible that has been around 400 years inspired, too. The King James Bible is a translation of God’s preserved Word. It is an accurate translation, but it is dangerous to call it inspired because you change the meaning -- the doctrinal meaning of inspired. And it is dangerous to adopt Neo Orthodox thinking and apply it to our lives, because once that trend happens, if one does it with inspiration, what else will others do it with? And some people have already done it with other doctrines. We don’t want to have double speech in the vocabulary.

Doctrine is very important. The doctrine of inspiration is vitally important. When individuals or groups of churches fall away from sound doctrine, they set a course of theological destruction. Sound doctrine is essential. Today you are sitting in a building whose founders stood against modernism. It is literally a textbook example of one of many churches who lost their property to the denomination because they stood up for what was right. They stood up for sound theology. When the moderates started questioning

inerrancy of Scripture on the mission field, when they doubted the deity of Christ, the virgin birth, and other essential doctrines, they stopped supporting those missionaries, and established their own independent mission agency. The story is a long one, but the short end of the story is they lost their property because of the position they took. The people of this church left the denomination which stole their building. It was all about doctrine.

Inspiration is a doctrinal term. And the misuse of inspiration definition should not be tolerated. If one begins to tolerate a misuse of that definition what else will one begin to tolerate? Will one tolerate a misuse, a mis-definition of the virgin birth, or of the resurrection? One should not be comfortable when doctrinal terms are misapplied and wrongly defined. When inspiration is wrongly defined, it is very dangerous, because that means if our church can apply the inspiration to a particular Bible, we will say, for example, the King James Bible, then what is to prevent other church from applying the word inspiration to another Bible, perhaps a Bible that is not as long or to a translation that is condensed or just little bit shorter? Or what about to a translation that takes out what they would consider the offensive accounts, or the offensive rules. What is to stop the enemies of Scripture from using the term inspired? Even the people that would hold to the inspired King James Bible position would not like that. But yet that is what they are teaching. They are teaching a new doctrine of inspiration. They use the term inspired very loosely. And the term inspired cannot be used loosely. It has to be used in a very narrow or a specific, a very direct sense just like the virgin birth, just like the resurrection. One could go through a list of essential doctrinal terms, one could list all ten major doctrines and the key aspects of those ten major doctrines. All of them have to have a clear and definite definition and the position must be clear.

The Church of Rome, that institution has doctrine. You can acquire the theology books written by their own theologians and it is clear what their doctrine is – and is not! They do not change definitions. Standing against apostates, standing against liberalism, standing against those who misapply and mis-define Scripture is never wrong. Just like the founders of this church stood against higher critics who denied the inspiration of Scripture, who taught that the Bible merely contains the Word of God. Those who apply the term inspiration to an English translation are wrong, just as wrong as, perhaps, those who would question inerrancy, question infallibility, question preservation. You have to get it the doctrine of inspiration right. The people have to get inspiration right.

There is no anger towards those who say the King James Bible is inspired, but one must understand it is dangerous, it is a dangerous trend that is being set – because it is a confusing trend. It is a very confusing trend! We believe that the Bible is the Word of God and that we hold in our hands a faithful, true and accurate, verbal, plenary translation of God's preserved Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words. However, our highly treasured translation was not given by inspiration. One could take all the translations of the world and stack them on a table – and then would it be safe for us to say that they are all inspired? No! It is not safe and it would be a misuse of the term inspiration.

What would happen if it were true that the King James Bible of 1611 were inspired, apart from the problems that it contained the Apocrypha, the printers mistakes that sometimes removed “not” and other small things like that? What would happen? What would have happened 1600 years before that? Would there be no Bible? Or is it possible that in, perhaps, 100 years from now a new translation would come down the road that also could claim inspiration or even a few months down the road. Or would some people attribute that term to all the translations of the world?

The liberals and now some conservatives are causing confusion and they are confusing people by mingling truth with error. Don't let modern thinking redirect and redefine a crowning tenet of bibliology, namely

inspiration. It is wrong to redefine our terms. Our terms must be precise. Our terms must be accurate. And we must be honest and truly faithful. By redefining terms, we do a disservice to theology. We do disservice to the Scripture. We do disservice to our people, because if we start redefining terms, then what is to prevent them from start redefining terms and giving a “ends justify the means” way of thinking. In some spheres of Christendom today many Bible believers do not understand the importance of sound doctrine and certainly not the doctrine of inspiration. There are four places in Scripture where the term “sound doctrine” is used.

The first occurs in 1 Timothy 1:10. And, again, the passages here on the list, two are to Timothy and two are to Titus. In verse three of first Timothy chapter one the Bible tells us what Timothy was to teach. It talks about how he was encouraged to teach sound doctrine. “As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine” (1 Timothy 1:3). And by adding an altered or a modified definition of inspiration, that is an example of other doctrine. If you mutate something, if you change something, if you take a derivative of something it is different. It changes something.

There is a suggestion here that they were teaching other doctrine and they were to stop doing it. And later on in the passage in verse four, “Neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith: so do” (1 Timothy 1:4). We don’t want people to have questions about the authority of Scripture. We must use the terms in our vocabulary, theological terms, terms whose definitions have existed, have been unchanged for centuries, we should not change definitions or meanings of doctrinal terms.

Consider the passage in 2 Timothy chapter four in verse three. “For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables” (2 Timothy 4:3-4).

And in Titus, Titus is encouraged in Titus one verse nine he is to hold “fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers” (1 Timothy 1:9). If we do not have sound doctrine, then we cannot convince the gainsayers. If our doctrine is all fuzzy, if it is not absolute, yes, inspiration is one example, but if all aspects of our doctrine were just fuzzy, as some individuals view of inspiration, then how are we, how are they going to teach and convince the gainsayers?

Titus chapter two verse one. It says Titus was instructed to “speak thou the things which become sound doctrine” (Titus 2:1). In verse seven of that same chapter the Bible says, “In all things shewing thyself a pattern of good works: in doctrine shewing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity” (Titus 2:7). We cannot corrupt doctrine. If we corrupt doctrine, we are in a dangerous situation. Dear Christian, we must be zealous about sound doctrine. Sound doctrine is founded upon the truth and diligent study of God’s Word. Chafer states, “The greatest creatures, who have moved the hearts of men with divine power have been saturated with biblical truth secured through first hand study of this text, based upon sound doctrine.”

Yes, God’s hand of providence was upon this translation of the King James Bible, but it is dangerous to refer to the King James Bible as inspired because it adopts the tense of the Neo Orthodox. It is dangerous to call the King James Bible inspired because it endorses double mindedness. It is dangerous because it presents the possibility that sign gifts are still intact today. And it is dangerous because it is not sound doctrine.