

REFUTATION OF D.A. WAITE'S PAPER ON "ADDING TO GOD'S WORDS"

By Pete Heisey

Adding Unto The Bible's Words—What Does It Mean?

By Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.
Pastor of the Bible For Today Baptist Church
900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, NJ 08108
Phone: 856-854-4747; Fax: 856-854-2464

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book:" (Revelation 22:18)

It is my strong conviction that any person (whether a follower of ***[it is interesting that Waite has never defined the term "follower"]*** Peter Ruckman, Gail Riplinger, or a non-follower) who identifies the King James Bible (or any other of man's translations) as being either (1) "given by inspiration of God," (2) "God-breathed," (3) "inspired of God," (4) "verbally inspired," or (5) "inspired in any sense" is "adding" to the Words of God. ***[Of course if Waite presuppositionally defines "Words [sic, note the upper case "W" on "Words"] of God" as being ONLY the words in Hebrew, "Aramaic", and Greek (an unproven and unbiblical assumption and presupposition on Waite's part), then he is simply assuming what he is trying to prove. And with that (unbiblical) assumption and presupposition, he will naturally come to the conclusion that believing anything other than Hebrew, "Aramaic", and Greek would be "adding to God's 'W'ords.]***

That being the case ***[Waite's continues his whole illogical argument based on an unbiblical and unproven presupposition and assumption that God's 'W'ords are only in Hebrew, "Aramaic", and Greek. The scriptural evidence (See Gipp and O'Reilly for example), is contrary to Waite's assumption/presupposition.]*** I believe that he or she is under God's judgment spoken of here in Revelation 22:18. The reasons for this conviction are explained in the pages that follow. (Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.)

The purpose of this article is to examine the meaning and applications of the words: "If any man shall ADD unto these things, God shall ADD unto him the plagues that are written in this book." The verse is referring to "WORDS" ***[no, "words", if one wishes to be***

biblical] that might be added to God's Words *[Actually, a careful reading of the verses as well as the whole Bible will reveal that Waite engages in an unbiblical affirmation of using "W"ords rather than the scriptural "w"ords. And it is this unbiblical approach that actually results in the heresy Waite promotes that God's pure, perfect, preserved inspired words (or, accommodatingly, "W"ords, since that is Waite's "code" for referring to only the Hebrew, "Aramaic", and Greek words) are only in Hebrew, "Aramaic", and Greek.]*

Though this verse is referring to God's Words *[sic – words]* of the New Testament, by extension, it could also be applied to God's Words *[sic – words]* of the Old Testament.

I. What Was The Exclusive, Never-To-Be-Repeated *[book, chapter and verse for this, and especially in light of Jeremiah's situation and others from the Bible]*, Method God Used To Inspire And Breathe Out *["and breathe out", is found nowhere in scripture; thus it is at best an un-biblical concept, if not downright anti-biblical (cf. Job 32:8)]* His Words Of "Scripture"? *[What does Waite wish to say or imply by putting the word "Scripture" in quotes? Based on his comments in a video presentation, he could be implying that the KJB is not "Scripture", but at best "scripture", i.e., merely the words of men and not the words (or accommodatingly, "W"ords) of God.]*

A. First, God Selected Certain "Holy Men Of God." God Himself picked certain special Old Testament and New Testament writers—not translators. They were called "*holy men of God.*" *[Yet the "holy men of God" engaged in translating, and were indeed translators, in numerous instances in the scriptures, for example when writing down the words which God wanted, even though those words were a translation (See numerous examples from Gipp and O'Reilly on the matter. And it is interesting that Waite has nowhere addressed nor refuted the biblical examples adduced by Gipp and O'Reilly.). Thus the fact of translation does not necessarily scripturally nor logically negate the possibility of inspiration.]*

"For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but *holy men of God* spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Peter 1:21)

B. Second, These "Holy Men Of God" Spoke The Inspired Words That God Revealed To Them. Once God revealed His inspired Words to these "*holy men of God,*" (not to translators) they (not translators) "*spake*" those Words to others. *[Biblically speaking, Waite is INCORRECT here in saying that the "holy men of God" were not translators and did not act as translators, even when communicating the words, or accommodatingly "W"ords of God. See the examples to the contrary of Waite mentioned in the above note.]*

"For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but *holy men of God* spake as

they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Peter 1:21)

C. Third, These "Holy Men Of God" Could Only Speak These Inspired Words When They Were Specially And Uniquely "Moved By The Holy Ghost." **[AND when they wrote them down, translating, at times, what was originally spoken. A significant and convenient omission on Waite's part.]** These inspired

2 Adding Unto The Bible's Words—What Does It Mean? By Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.

Words were given to "*holy men of God*" (not to translators) **[Biblically speaking, Waite is in the wrong here since those men, in numerous instances in the O.T. as well as the N.T., were indeed translating what was originally said. Waite has yet to explain logically, practically, and biblically why inspiration in translation is only valid when translation is made into Hebrew, "Aramaic", or Greek. I.e., book, chapter and verse, Dr. Waite! A significant omission on Waite's part. One should listen carefully for the absent note.]** who "*spake*" as they (not translators) **[Biblically speaking, Waite is in the wrong here since those men, in numerous instances, were indeed translating what was originally said. Waite has yet to explain logically, practically, and biblically why inspiration in translation is only valid when translation is made into Hebrew, "Aramaic", or Greek. I.e., book, chapter and verse, Dr. Waite!]** were "*moved by the Holy Ghost.*"

"For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were *moved by the Holy Ghost.*" (2 Peter 1:21)

D. Fourth, The Specific Term Used For These Words of "Scripture" Is That They Were "Given By Inspiration Of God." When these "*holy men of God*" (not translators) **[Biblically speaking, Waite is in the wrong here since those men, in numerous instances, were indeed translating what was originally said. Waite has yet to explain logically, practically, and biblically why inspiration in translation is only valid when translation is made into Hebrew, "Aramaic", or Greek. I.e., book, chapter and verse, Dr. Waite!]**

were "*moved by the Holy Ghost,*" they (not translators) **[Biblically speaking, Waite is in the wrong here since those men, in numerous instances, were indeed translating what was originally said. Waite has yet to explain logically, practically, and biblically why inspiration in translation is only valid when translation is made into Hebrew, "Aramaic", or Greek. I.e., book, chapter and verse, Dr. Waite!]** "*spake*" the Words of "*Scripture*" that were "*given by inspiration of God.*"

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Timothy 3:16-17)

1. What Is The Meaning Of The Word, "Scripture," In This Verse?

a. The Greek word used for "Scripture" **[sic – "scripture"]** here is GRAPHE. It is used 51 times in the Greek New Testament that underlies the King James Bible. **[To what exactly is Waite referring here? Scrivener's text or the EXACT readings/texts underlying the KJB? Where can I obtain what Waite calls "the Greek New**

Testament that underlies the King James Bible”? Waite implies that he has one. Does he have one in hand?] In each of these 51 times, it is a reference to Words [sic – “words”] taken from an Old Testament Hebrew verse. Therefore, it does not refer to any translation given by a man, but exclusively to the Hebrew Words which were given by God Himself in the Hebrew language. ***[Yet the translation is inspired, i.e., the Greek N.T. references; thus from Hebrew to Greek is an inspired translation. There is no Bible verse which limits inspiration to just this situation.]***

b. Here is the list of the 51 New Testament uses of GRAPHE. The King James Bible translates GRAPHE either as “**scripture**” or “**scriptures**.”

1. Matthew 21:42 “never read in the **scriptures**”
2. Matthew 22:29 “not knowing the **scriptures**”
3. Matthew 26:54 “the **scriptures** be fulfilled”
4. Matthew 26:56 “**scriptures** of the prophets”
5. Mark 12:10 “read this **scripture**; The stone”
6. Mark 12:24 “know not the **scriptures**”
7. Mark 14:49 “the **scriptures** must be fulfilled”
8. Mark 15:28 “And the **scripture** was fulfilled,”
9. Luke 4:21 “this **scripture** fulfilled in your ears.”
10. Luke 24:27 “in all the **scriptures** the things”
11. Luke 24:32 “He opened to us the **scriptures**”
12. Luke 24:45 “might understand the **scriptures**”
13. John 2:22 “they believed the **scripture**,”
14. John 5:39 “Search the **scriptures**”
15. John 7:38 “as the **scripture** hath said,”
16. John 7:42 “Hath not the **scripture** said,”
17. John 10:35 “the **scripture** cannot be broken;”
18. John 13:18 “the **scripture** may be fulfilled,”
19. John 17:12 “the **scripture** might be fulfilled.”
20. John 19:24 “the **scripture** might be fulfilled,”
21. John 19:28 “the **scripture** might be fulfilled,”
22. John 19:36 “the **scripture** should be fulfilled,”
23. John 19:37 “another **scripture** saith,”
24. John 20:9 “knew not the **scripture**”
25. Acts 1:16 “this **scripture** must needs have been fulfilled”
26. Acts 8:32 “The place of the **scripture**”
27. Acts 8:35 “began at the same **scripture**”

Adding Unto The Bible’s Words—What Does It Mean? By Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D. 3

28. Acts 17:2 “out of the **scriptures**”
29. Acts 17:11 “searched the **scriptures**”
30. Acts 18:24 “mighty in the **scriptures**”
31. Acts 18:28 “shewing by the **scriptures**”
32. Romans 1:2 “in the holy **scriptures**”
33. Romans 4:3 “what saith the **scripture**?”
34. Romans 9:17 “the **scripture** saith”
35. Romans 10:11 “the **scripture** saith,”
36. Romans 11:2 “what the **scripture** saith”
37. Romans 15:4 “comfort of the **scriptures**”
38. Romans 16:26 “the **scriptures** of the prophets.”
39. 1 Cor. 15:3 “according to the **scriptures**”

40. 1 Cor. 15:4 “according to the **scriptures**”
41. Galatians 3:8 “And the **scripture**,”
42. Galatians 3:22 “the **scripture** hath concluded”
43. Galatians 4:30 “what saith the **scripture**?”
44. 1 Timothy 5:18 “the **scripture** saith,”
45. 2 Timothy 3:16 “All **scripture** is given by inspiration”
46. James 2:8 “according to the **scripture**”
47. James 2:23 “the **scripture** was fulfilled”
48. James 4:5 “the **scripture** saith in vain”
49. 1 Peter 2:6 “contained in the **scripture**,”
50. 2 Peter 1:20 “prophecy of the **scripture**”
51. 2 Peter 3:16 “do also the other **scriptures**” [See below.]

c. GRAPHE is used exclusively for quotations of Hebrew Words of the Old Testament. It is clear that GRAPHE, as used in the New Testament, refers exclusively to the original Old Testament Hebrew Words. ***[Here Waite is decidedly wrong. Though the word “graphe” MAY be limited to the OT in II Peter 3:16, that is not necessarily so, since in context Paul’s “epistles” are referred to as scripture.]*** It is also clear that GRAPHE does not refer to any translation of those original Words [sic – “w”ords] that God gave us. ***[How so? The N.T. is inspired scripture (“those original ‘W’ords that God gave us”, and is in a number of places a TRANSLATION. Also to be noted is Waite’s use of the past tense “gave” here, when the implication and teaching of II Tim. 3:16 is present tense.)]***

d. In one place, GRAPHE was also used for quotations of Greek Words of the New Testament. 2 Peter 3:15-16 refers to Paul’s New Testament Greek epistles as “**scripture**” thus bringing the meaning of GRAPHE or “**scripture**,” by extension, as a reference to the New Testament Greek Words as well. ***[Indeed. But what Waite conveniently fails to mention is the fact that in other passages those Greek Words [sic – “words”] are in fact a translation. There is no scripture which indicates that God would limit preserved inspiration to only Hebrew, “Aramaic”, and Greek words. His power and His will are far greater than that. This is not an argument from silence given that Gipp and O’Reilly have given lengthy lists of examples of inspired translations. Waite needs to publically refute their findings in order to even begin to build a case for his own position. Fundamentally, Waite’s “God” is too small to preserve His word(s) even in a translation.]***

3:15 *And account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother PAUL also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; 3:16 As also in ALL HIS EPISTLES, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the OTHER SCRIPTURES, unto their own destruction. (2 Peter 3:15-16)*

This clearly labels all of Paul’s “**epistles**” as “**scriptures**” by his use of the phrase, “**the other scriptures.**” ***[Of course Waite has not proven that all of Paul’s epistles were originally written in the Greek language. And there is evidence to the contrary. That misguided assumption on Waite’s part has given rise to his further heresy of limiting the promise of preservation to only fluent Hebrew,***

“Aramaic”, and Greek speakers, and leading to the sort of popishness promoted by Waite who says that certain truths from the Bible can only be learned from the Hebrew and the Greek.]

2. What Is The Meaning Of The Phrase, “Given By Inspiration Of God”?

These five words used in the King James Bible, “*given by inspiration of God*,” are the translation of only one compound Greek Word. ***[Is Waite implying here that there is a problem with the KJB translation? Is he implying that the KJB translation is mistaken here? He doesn’t ever answer that question.]*** The compound Greek Word is THEOPNEUSTOS. ***[And of course all the non-fluent Greek and Hebrew speakers, as well as some who do “know” Greek and Hebrew, are now awed by the foregoing. But there are others, some of whom know Hebrew and Greek, who are not at all awed. They simply believe the KJB is scripture. Waite is here taking a backhanded popish slap at the priesthood of every believer and the ministry of the Holy Spirit in the believer to teach the believer the word(s) of God – Mt. 4:4; Lu. 4:4; II Tim. 2:15; Acts 17:11; II Tim. 3:17(!!)]***

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Timothy 3:16-17)

a. The two Greek Words making up the compound word,

4 Adding Unto The Bible’s Words—What Does It Mean? By Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.

THEOPNEUSTOS. [It is more than a little interesting that Waite does not address the other usage of the word “inspiration” in the Bible. It is a convenient omission on Waite’s part of a verse which pokes some serious holes in his thesis.]

(1) “THEO” comes from “THEOS” which means “God.”

(2) “PNEUSTOS” is an adjective coming from the verb, PNEO, which means “to breathe.”

b. The resultant meaning of THEOPNEUSTOS. This word, THEOPNEUSTOS

means literally, “*God-breathed*.” ***[PERHAPS it does “literally” mean that in some places in Greek literature or in some contexts – Waite has not shown even that; but the REAL issue is what does it mean in the context of II Timothy 3:15-17 as well as in the context of the WHOLE Bible (which would include Job 32:8)? A further issue is whether or not Waite thinks the translation “is given by inspiration of God” is a mistake or not, or to be more precise, whether or not Waite thinks that the translation SHOULD BE (as did the learned men) “is given by inspiration of God”.]***

c. What is referred to as being “given by inspiration of God” or “Godbreathed”?

It is very clear that the “given by inspiration of God” (THEOPNEUSTOS) refers exclusively to the “all scripture” (PASA GRAPHE) mentioned in the verse. We have shown clearly that the GRAPHE refers exclusively to Old Testament Hebrew verses and Words ***[sic – words]*** as well as New Testament Greek verses and Words ***[sic – words]***. It does not and cannot ***[AHA! Here is Waite’s presuppositional problem. He assumes what he is trying to prove. He wouldn’t even believe that it is possible for God, or desired by God, to provide a vernacular translation which is pure, perfect, preserved inspired scripture.]*** refer to any translation of those original Hebrew, Aramaic, and

Greek Words [*sic – words*]. [*What Waite seems to ignore here is the fact that a large number of verses in Greek are indeed translations of Hebrew words/verses. Thus the concept of an inspired translation is not so impossible or un-God-ly as Waite believes.*]

II. What Three Languages Did God Use Exclusively To Write His Words?

The only languages that God used to write His Words were Hebrew, a little Aramaic (in the Old Testament), and Greek (in the New Testament.) [*Where's the proof?*] There were no other languages in the world that God made use of to put His Words into writing [*Where's the proof?*] for people [*Waite means “fluent Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek speaking people”*] to see, to read, to understand, and to follow. [*It seems logically speaking, that Waite is arguing for the necessity of learning Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek in order “to see, to understand, and to follow” the real, true, authentic, genuine words (or to accommodate Waite, “W”ords) of God. His assertion also makes very little sense when the lack of fluency in Greek in various regions to which Paul wrote, and God’s desire to communicate His truth, is taken into consideration.*] The Bible is clear [Where?] that God’s original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words were the only [*Where does scripture say or indicate this? The argument from only the N.T. use of “graphe” does not stand up to close examination and remains a rather assailable and refutable “proof” given the number of instances of preserved inspired translation in the Bible.*] Words [*sic – words*], among all the various languages in the world, that can ever be rightfully said to be (1) “given by inspiration of God,” (2) “God-breathed,” (3) “inspired of God,” (4) “verbally inspired,” or (5) “inspired.” These five terms can genuinely refer exclusively to the original preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words [*sic – words*] underlying the King James Bible. [*What Waite is really saying here is that unless one has all of the exact Hebrew, “Aramaic”, and Greek words (“W”ords would be Waite’s term) bound in one volume, one has no Bible; one has no real, genuine, authentic, plenary word(s) or “W”ord(s) of God. Waite is actually (intentionally or unintentionally) promoting the neo-orthodox view of scripture by saying that in-hand Bibles only contain the word(s) or “W”ord(s) of God, but are not in their entirety and in that language all the genuine, authentic, plenary word(s) or “W”ord(s) of God. In fact, Waite’s use of the upper case “W” on “Words” reminds this author of the antics with semantics and words for the birds tactic used by neo-orthodox seminary professors. Furthermore, Waite nowhere states unequivocally, in fact he refuses to say, just WHERE one can obtain all of the “W”ords of God, i.e. only all the exactly correct Hebrew, “Aramaic”, and Greek “W”ords, in the correct word order, to read, study, etc.]*

III. Use Of These Five Terms For Any Other Language Than Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek Is Unbiblical. [*If this is so clear, where is the book, chapter, and verse for such a thing – despite the biblical examples to the contrary? If the N.T.*

(only) study of “graphe” be all the “proof” that exists, Waite’s theory remains unproven; especially since some significant evidence to the contrary (Job 32:8 and O.T. examples of inspired translation) is conveniently ignored and/or omitted by Waite.]

If [*Ah, now there is the rub!*] God has indeed [?? – unproven] used these terms exclusively to describe His own Words [*i.e., ONLY in Hebrew, “Aramaic”, and Greek*] that He gave to mankind [*How so “mankind”, if those who do not know Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek cannot read His own “W”ords? Or can (!!) other languages only have, IN THEIR LANGUAGE, something less than the pure, perfect, preserved inspired words, or to use Waite’s (unbiblical) term, “W’ords”, of God? – thus being unable, presuppositionally on Waite’s part, to have scripture which is given by inspiration of God. Consequently, those languages would have no promise or possibility, IN THEIR LANGUAGE, of ever growing as they should (Mt. 4:4; Lu. 4:4) nor of ever being able to be “perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (II Tim. 3:16-17.)*] in the Old and New Testaments of the Bible, they should not be used to describe any translation of these Words into the words of the many other languages that are used all around the world.

[See previous note.] Some well-meaning pastors, teachers, and their followers have tried to compromise this clear position by attempting to change the true meaning of “inspiration” or “inspired” by the use of descriptive phrases such as “derivative inspiration,” “indirect inspiration,” “having the mark of inspiration,” “inspired in a general or generic sense,” or similar phrases. [*Actually, their intent ended up being more biblical than Waite’s “God-breathed” because it took into account Job 32:8 and other passages.*] To do this is to elevate the translations and words of men and put them on equal terms with the original Words [*sic – words; notice that God makes no such distinction as Waite makes*] of God. [*Why is it assumed on Waite’s part that any language/ Bible other than one in Hebrew, “Aramaic”, and Greek, MUST BE merely the words of men only, and not the words, or “W’ords” of God. There is no biblical or logical reason why what Waite affirms MUST be so.*] This is unbiblical, a serious error, and could even be called a heresy! [*Actually, because Waite does not take into account all the biblical evidence, it is his position which is unbiblical, a serious error, and could even be called a heresy!*]

IV. Making Translations On A Par With God’s Hebrew, Aramaic, And Greek Words By Using Any Of These Five Terms Is, In Effect, Adding to The Words Of God. [***This is assuming what he is trying to prove. Waite begins with the unbiblical presupposition/assumption that a translation CANNOT ever itself be the pure, perfect, preserved inspired words, or “W’ords” to use Waite’s term, of God.***]

As true, faithful, and accurate as a translation might be (even the King James Bible), no translation of the Bible should not and must not be elevated and put on a par with God's Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words by claiming that such translations partake in some kind of "inspiration by God" no matter which of these many expressions are used. *[Waite here redefines, to suit his purposes, the words "true", "faithful", and "accurate"; all of them imply "pure", "inerrant", etc. Waite needs to learn to use the dictionary instead of defining things according to his own preconceived notions.]* Using the same, or similar, terms for a translation as [for] that which should be properly and exclusively used for the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words is, in effect, adding to the Words of God. *[Remains unproven. But Waite's position begs the question: How does one determine what and which are the "Words" of God? Must one go to Waite (popishly) to get an answer to that question? Furthermore, Waite refuses to say specifically WHERE all those exactly correct words/Words can be found or obtained. He especially is unable to say, or refuses to unequivocally say, just WHERE one can obtain a BIBLE (book, The Book) which has all of the exactly correct Hebrew, "Aramaic", and Greek words, in the correct word order, which are "the" 'Words' of God'.]*

Adding Unto The Bible's Words—What Does It Mean? By Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D. 5

V. A Few Verses That Condemn Adding To God's Words

A. Deuteronomy 4:2

Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye **diminish** *ought* from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you."

B. Deuteronomy 12:32

"What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: **thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish** from it."

This is as clear as crystal. Do **not add**. Do **not subtract**. *[Indeed. WHERE then can one obtain all the exactly correct words/Words of God in Hebrew, "Aramaic", and Greek so as to be sure that one is not, and that others are not, "add[ing] thereto, nor diminish[ing] from it"? Waite has to this point refused to answer that question "clear as crystal".]*

C. Proverbs 30:6

"**Add thou not unto his words**, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."

D. Revelation 22:18

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, **If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book:**"

VI. Examples of Groups That Add To God's Words

Groups that come to mind readily who add to God's Words are as follows *[This is really a straw man and an ad hominem argument, since Waite knows quite well that these groups have not the Spirit of God and do not claim that the King James Bible is pure, perfect, preserved inspired scripture which should not be added to nor subtracted from. THAT is the REAL issue.]* : (1) Christian Science; (2) The Muslims; (3) The Mormons; (4) Hinduism; (5) The Jewish addition notes; (6) Buddhism; (7) Jainism; (8) Sikhism; (9) Zoroastrianism; (10) Confucianism; (11) Shintoism; (12) Taoism; (13) Many, many other religions of the world.

- A. Christian Science Adds To God's Words. Their "holy book" is *Science and Health With Key to the Scriptures* by Mary Baker Eddy in 1867. This is an addition to the Words of God in the Bible.
- B. The Muslims Add To God's Words. Their "holy book" is the *Qur'an* which was by Muhammad. This is an addition to the Words of God in the Bible.
- C. The Mormons Add To God's Words. Their "holy book" is *The Book Of Mormon* which was published by Joseph Smith in 1830. This is an addition to the Words of God in the Bible.
- D. Hinduism Adds To God's Words. Their "holy book" is *The Veda*. This is an addition to the Words of God in the Bible.
- E. The Jews Add To God's Words. Though their "holy book" is *The Old Testament Bible*, they follow such other sources as *The Mishnah*, *The Talmud*, *The Haggadah*, and other materials. The Lord Jesus Christ said "*Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition.*" He was referring to these and other writings. This is an addition to the Words of God in the Bible.
- F. Buddhism Adds To God's Words. Their "holy book" is the *Dhamma* as told by Buddha. This is an addition to the Words of God in the Bible.
- G. Jainism Adds To God's Words. Their "holy book" is the *Kalpa Sutra*. This is an addition to the Words of God in the Bible.
- H. Sikhism Adds To God's Words. Their "holy book" is the *Guru Granth Sahib*. This is an addition to the Words of God in the Bible.
- I. Zoroastrianism Adds To God's Words. Their "holy book" is the *Avesta*. This is an addition to the Words of God in the Bible.
- J. Confucianism Adds To God's Words. Their "holy book" is the *Analects of Confucius* if you select the main one. Actually there are nine "holy books" of Confucianism, five of "the Confucian Classics," and four other books. This is an addition to the Words of God in the Bible.
- K. Shintoism Adds To God's Words. Their "holy book" is the *O'dno Jing*. This is an addition to the Words of God in the Bible.

6 Adding Unto The Bible's Words—What Does This Mean? By Pastor D. A. Waite

- L. Taoism Adds To God's Words. Their most recognized "holy book" is the *Tao Te Ching*. This is an addition to the Words of God in the Bible.
- M. Other Religions In The World Add To God's Words. I have listed only the preceding twelve more prominent religions and their "holy books." There are scores of other religions listed in 23 pages of the article as found in Wikipedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Religions_of_the_world).

Narrative Applications And Conclusions

Based on the above Biblical facts and details, here are some of my applications and conclusions in a narrative manner as I have written about this subject in my recently published book of *Revelation—Preaching Verse By Verse* (BFT #3495, 1030 pages @ \$50.00 + \$8.00 S&H).

1. On Page 23, I wrote:

"Then there are the fundamentalists. Some of us stand on the King James Bible in the right way. **[Define what that means please – e.g., Is the King James Bible without error as it stands in English?]** But some stand in a false way on the King James Bible. Peter Ruckman, Gail Riplinger, and their followers **[It is interesting in that in Waite's ad hominem "argumentation" here, he fails to ever define what "follower" means.]** say that the King James Bible is "inspired of God" and

“God-breathed” [NONE of those folks would ever say that the King James Bible is “God-breathed”. That is a lie on Waite’s part. Inspired, yes; is given by inspiration of God, yes. Otherwise, what English speakers hold in their hands is not, in fact, entirely “profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:” nor can the “man of God ... be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.” Those are things which result from scripture which is given by inspiration of God and not from “the words of men” or from some “scripture” which is not “given by inspiration of God.”] rather than being the only true, reliable, and accurate English translation of the “inspired” and “God-breathed” Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie it. [Here Waite fails to understand the meaning of “true”, “reliable”(faithful – KJB), and “accurate” (pure – KJB) as they are used in the Bible and defined by standard English dictionaries.] Their teaching on this doctrine is a serious heresy. These false teachers teach that the King James Bible is just like the originals and therefore that it supersedes the Hebrew, Aramaic, and the Greek Words from which it was taken. They even say that the King James Bible “corrects” the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words and that we should never use these languages. No. How can something that is the result and the product correct its source?[How does Waite (omnisciently????) know the exact words, “the source” text, without the KJB to confirm/determine those exact words?]

That’s heresy. Peter Ruckman, Gail Riplinger, and their followers say that the King James Bible is a direct revelation from God, [I think this is a lie since I’ve never heard a one of them say that.] not simply an excellent translation and that the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words should be trashed as unneeded.” [If they are “needed”, then every believer, from jungle tribes to city dwellers, would “need” to learn Hebrew, “Aramaic”, and Greek in order to have and to know God’s “W”ords. Now THAT is heresy based on I Cor. 2:10-13, I Jn. 2:27, and Rev. 1:5-6. Furthermore, it assumes presuppositionally, and without proof, that all first century pastors and believers were fluent speakers of Hebrew, “Aramaic”, and Greek (and there is no proof of that whatsoever). Even were it true of pastors, it would still violate the afore-mentioned verses and would in fact be “popish” approach to things – a charge which could easily be laid to Waite’s account. Waite is actually promoting the concept of what Spurgeon called, “a horde of little popelings”.]

“There are some fundamentalist pastors and teachers who don’t go as far as either Ruckman or Riplinger, but say the King James Bible is “inspired” or “God-breathed” in some way. This also is confusing and a serious error. Because of the King James Bible’s true, faithful, and accurate translation into English of the proper Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words, I have called the King James Bible, in the sub-title of my book, Defending the King James Bible, “God’s Words Kept Intact In English.” But it should never be called “inspired.” That term must be confined to the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that God gave us.” [This, of course, begs the question of just WHY that term “must” be confined to only those languages.]

2. On Pages 930 and 931, I wrote:

“We have to have a gracious spirit if we are genuinely saved and born-again. We must

remember that in this last chapter of Revelation, especially in verses 18 and 19, there is a terrible peril to those who are Bible-perverters, who **change, add, or subtract** from God's Words. God has pronounced a judgment on them. I have not pronounced that judgment. This is in the Book. You may ask, "Is this only for the people who add to the book of Revelation?" Revelation is the last book of the Bible. If anyone presumes to have God's revelation and **adds** to any of the books of the Bible, they are under the **curse.**" **[If Waite has it,**

WHERE can one obtain a copy? Waite refuses to say unequivocally.]

"The Book of Mormon is an addition. That is under this **curse.** Mary Baker Glover Patterson Fry Eddy's *Science and Health, With Key to the Scriptures* is under the **curse.** There are all kinds of wrongful additions. The charismatic movement adds words to the Bible. They claim to get special gifts of prophecy from the Lord and say, "This is what the Lord told me." That is under the **curse.**"

I believe that those who say that the King James Bible is a "**revelation** from God" rather than a "**translation**" of the Words of God are also under God's **curse.** That is the Adding Unto The Bible's Words—What Does This Mean? **By Pastor D. A. Waite 7**

position of Peter Ruckman, Gail Riplinger, and all of their dupes and followers. **[It is THE**

revelation from God because it is all HIS exact word(s) which He wants

English speakers to have, believe, rely on, and obey.] They repudiate the Hebrew,

Aramaic, and Greek Words that God has revealed to us **[Where, pray tell, can one**

obtain a copy of all of those exact words/Words so as to have "the" Hebrew,

Aramaic, and Greek "Words" that God has revealed to us, and not the mere

words of men? Waite refuses to say. There are many, like this author, who

refuse to be "dupes" and accept such vagaries and vacillations.] and substitute

for those Words man's translation of those Words as given in the King James Bible. **[This**

begs the question as to why God's power and preservation in "man's

translation" could not or would not be able to be operative. Waite never

answers this.] They wrongly claim that the King James Bible was a new God-breathed

[None of them would ever use this unbiblical term; thus Waite lies here.] and

God-inspired revelation in 1611. They teach that there is no more need for God's Words that

He has preserved in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. **[IF there is a "need" for them,**

then ALL believers must learn Hebrew, "Aramaic", and Greek in order to

grow properly, to correctly understand doctrine, reproof, correction,

instruction in righteousness, and in order to be perfect and thoroughly

furnished unto all good works.] Therefore, no one should ever look up any of these Words in any lexicon or dictionary since they are no longer needed or even relevant.

This is one of the most serious errors of Ruckmanism, Riplingerism, and their blind and

unscriptural followers. **[What is true blindness is the "need" to follow a man**

rather than an in-hand BIBLE (the KJB in the case under consideration),

like Waite or a lexicon or a dictionary, in order to learn the truth of God. I

John 2:27 says clearly, and it is most certainly applicable to English and

English speaking believers who believe the KJB, "... and ye need not that any

man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things ..."] The

King James Bible is not a new revelation. It is the only accurate, true, and reliable English

translation of God's preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie it. **[How**

does Waite know for sure what all those exact words are? Does he have an in-

hand copy of all the exact preserved correct “W”ords of God in Hebrew, “Aramaic”, and Greek? If not, then all his blustering and blathering is just so much hot air. If he does, then how does he KNOW FOR SURE that those are all the exact “W”ords of God? It’d be interesting to hear Waite’s answer to that! Furthermore, will he continue to refuse to tell us where one can obtain all those exactly correct words/”W”ords?] I believe that in the King James Bible, because of its excellent translation of the preserved underlying Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words, we have God’s Words [which, for Waite, are ONLY the Hebrew, “Aramaic”, and Greek language words] kept intact in English.” [It is more than a little interesting that Waite never concretely defines “intact” and especially in its relationship to the KJB (not even in his “Defending the King James Bible”). Quite significant. Will he do so as a result of this paper? That remains to be seen, but it is doubtful. Does he mean by “intact”, the idea of, “correct”? Probably not, because Waite would refuse to say that the KJB is “without error”. THE END RESULT OF WAITE’S CONCLUSION IS THAT THE KJB IS NOT GOD’S WORD(S), AND ESPECIALLY NOT GOD’S INSPIRED OR GIVEN-BY-INSPIRATION WORD(S); IT IS, CONSEQUENTLY, NOT SCRIPTURE (HE ACTUALLY SAID THAT AT ONE OF THE DBS MEETINGS). THUS THE KJB IS NOT SOMETHING BY WHICH ONE CAN GROW COMPLETELY PROPERLY (MT. 4:4; LU. 4:4), SEARCH (ACTS 17:10-11), OR STUDY COMPLETELY (II TIM. 2:15). IT IS NOT SOMETHING WHICH IN ITS ENTIRETY IS “PROFITABLE FOR DOCTRINE, FOR REPROOF, FOR CORRECTION, FOR INSTRUCTION IN RIGHTEOUSNESS”, AND IS THEREFORE NOT ABLE TO MAKE THE MAN OF GOD “PERFECT, THOROUGHLY FURNISHED UNTO ALL GOOD WORKS” (II TIM. 3:15-17). THAT POSITION (OF WAITE’S), DEAR FRIEND, IS TRULY HERESY.]