

## Academia's Asinine Assault on the Bible

Dave Miller, Ph.D.

The professor, age 50, wearing casual slacks and a sport coat over a sweater, arrived at the lecture auditorium to teach his afternoon class, as some 350 students streamed in for Religion 202—one of the most popular classes on the campus of the large state university. Exuding an energetic, intellectually sophisticated manner, and projecting an endearing personality, the professor proceeded to propound a “problem” pertaining to the Bible. Pacing back and forth across the stage, he launched a ruthless but passionately eloquent tirade against the Bible’s alleged “anomalies,” “contradictions,” and “discrepancies.” It went something like this:

Entire stories have been added that were not in the original gospels. The woman taken in adultery is nothing other than a bit of tradition added by the Catholics 300 years after the New Testament was written. In contrast with Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in the book of John Jesus wasn’t born in Bethlehem, he did not tell any parables, he never cast out a demon, and there’s no last supper. The crucifixion stories differ with each other. In Mark, Jesus was terrified on the cross, while in John, he was perfectly composed. Key dates are different. The resurrection stories are different. In Matthew, Mark, and Luke, you find no trace of Jesus being divine, while in John you do. It’s time for you to think for yourself. You need reasons. That applies to religion. That applies to politics. Just because your parents believe something—isn’t good enough.

So it goes, week after week, a relentless, rapid-fire barrage of bombastic barbs intended to overwhelm, intimidate, and bully their young, uninformed, ill-equipped victims. This scenario has been repeated thousands of times over the past half century in universities all across America. **The result has been catastrophic.** One heartbroken mother’s recent remarks are typical: “My 22-year-old son just graduated from \_\_\_\_\_ University where he lost his faith in God and His Word. My husband and I did the best we knew how to raise him to love the church and God’s Word. But he has allowed the world to sway his beliefs.” Like toxic waste, sinister propaganda has been dumped on the youth of the nation by biased, dishonest professors who have no interest in allowing the so-called “academic freedom” they tout in the form of equal time for reputable rebuttal. As a result of their decades’ long labor, a liberal, anti-Christian academic atmosphere now thoroughly permeates the university system of America.

Never mind the fact that these guys have nothing new to say that has not already been said by skeptics over the centuries. Their claims are merely a repackaged version quickly seized upon by a complicit liberal media that eagerly creates instant credibility by thrusting the new “prophet” before a larger audience—as if what

he is saying is fresh and newly discovered. The fact of the matter is that all their points have been made and answered long ago. For those who have taken the time to examine the evidence, it is readily apparent that their accusations are slanted, overstated, exaggerated, and transparently biased.

Observe that the above professorial tirade issues two charges: (1) the text of the Bible is tenuous and uncertain, and (2) the gospel records contradict each other. The latter claim has been soundly refuted in detail by biblical scholars over the centuries. The Apologetics Press Web site is loaded with articles and books that defeat accusations of alleged discrepancy (see, for example, Eric Lyons’ *Anvil Rings 1 & 2*). Regarding the former claim, Textual Criticism is a longstanding discipline that long ago yielded abundant evidence for the trustworthiness of the text of the New Testament. Over the last two centuries, the manuscript evidence has been thoroughly examined, resulting in complete exoneration for the integrity, genuineness, and accuracy of the Bible. Prejudiced professors refrain from divulging to their students that the vast majority of textual variants involve minor matters that do not affect salvation nor alter any basic teaching of the New Testament. Even those variants that might be deemed doctrinally significant pertain to matters that are treated elsewhere in the Bible where the question of genuineness is unobscured. **No feature of Christian doctrine is at stake.** When all of the textual evidence is considered, the vast majority of discordant readings have been resolved (e.g., Metzger, 1978, p. 185). One is brought to the firm conviction that we have in our possession the Bible as God intended.

The world’s foremost textual critics have confirmed this conclusion. Sir Frederic Kenyon, longtime director and principal librarian at the British Museum, whose scholarship and expertise to make pronouncements on textual criticism was second to none, stated: “Both the authenticity and the general integrity of the books of the New Testament may be regarded as finally established” (Kenyon, 1940, p. 288). The late F.F. Bruce, longtime Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism at the University of Manchester, England, remarked: “The variant readings about which any doubt remains among textual critics of the New Testament affect no material question of historic fact or of Christian faith and practice” (1960, pp. 19-20). J.W. McGarvey, declared by the *London Times* to be “the ripest Bible scholar on earth” (Brigance, 1870, p. 4), conjoined: “All the authority and value possessed by these books when they were first written belong to them still” (1956, p. 17). And the eminent textual critics Westcott and Hort put the entire matter into perspective when they said:

Since textual criticism has various readings for its subject, and the discrimination of genuine readings from corruptions for



R&R RESOURCES

its aim, discussions on textual criticism almost inevitably obscure the simple fact that variations are but secondary incidents of a **fundamentally single and identical text**. In the New Testament in particular it is difficult to escape an exaggerated impression as to the proportion which the words subject to variation bear to the whole text, and also, in most cases, as to their intrinsic importance. It is not superfluous therefore to state explicitly that **the great bulk of the words of the New Testament stand out above all discriminative processes of criticism, because they are free from variation**, and need only to be transcribed (1964, p. 564, emp. added).

Noting that the experience of two centuries of investigation and discussion had been achieved, these scholars concluded: “[T]he words in our opinion still subject to doubt can hardly amount to more than **a thousandth part of the whole** of the New Testament” (p. 565, emp. added).

Think of it. Men who literally spent their lives poring over ancient Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, devoting their lives to meticulous, tedious analysis of the evidence, conversant with the original languages, without peer in their expertise and qualifications, have

concluded that the Bible has been transmitted accurately. Then a prejudiced professor of religion has the unmitigated gall to brush aside the facts and pummel students with a slanted, half-baked viewpoint that flies in the face of two centuries of scholarly investigation? It is nothing short of inexcusable and intellectually dishonest. It’s time for parents to rise up and make universities accountable, or else cease sacrificing their children on the altar of pseudo-education.

REFERENCES

Brigance, L.L. (1870), “J.W. McGarvey,” in *A Treatise on the Eldership* by J.W. McGarvey (Murfreesboro, TN: DeHoff Publications, 1962 reprint).  
 Bruce, F.F. (1960), *The New Testament Documents: Are They Reliable?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans), revised edition.  
 Kenyon, Sir Frederic (1940), *The Bible and Archaeology* (New York, NY: Harper).  
 McGarvey, J.W. (1956 reprint), *Evidences of Christianity* (Nashville, TN: Gospel Advocate).  
 Metzger, Bruce M. (1978 reprint), *The Text of the New Testament* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press), second edition.  
 Westcott, B.A. and F.J.A. Hort (1964 reprint), *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (New York, NY: MacMillan).

IN THE NEWS

Paleolimnology is “the study of past freshwater, saline, and brackish environments” (Sweets, 1997). According to a recent report in the *Journal of Paleolimnology*, a naturalistic explanation has been uncovered that may reveal why Jesus was able to walk on water. Researchers Doron Nof, Ian McKeague, and Nathan Paldor have proposed that “unique freezing processes probably happened in that region several times during the last 12,000 years” (2006, 35:418). Thus

the unusual local freezing process might have provided an origin to the story that Christ walked on water. Since the springs ice is relatively small, a person standing or walking on it may appear to an observer situated some distance away to be “walking on water” (35:417).

...With the idea that much of our cultural heritage is based on human observations of nature, we sought a natural process that could perhaps explain the origin of the account that Jesus Christ walked on water (35:436).

The same gentleman who proposed more than a decade ago that the parting of the Red Sea was the result of “a wind set-down which exposed a usually submerged ridge” (see Nof and Paldor, 1992), has now taken the lead in attempting to explain away another Bible miracle.

Countless man hours and untold thousands of dollars from various grants and universities have been spent by these three men in an attempt to explain that there **may** be a possible naturalistic explanation to the account of Jesus walking on water. Unbelievable! Why not just say that it is possible Jesus floated on some drift wood, hopped on rocks, walked on the backs of

turtles, or wore inflatable wine skins around his feet? Anyone can concoct unusual, naturalistic explanations for various Bible miracles. But, that does not prove the miracle did not happen.

In truth, the only reason people even know that Jesus was at the Sea of Galilee 2,000 years ago is because the gospel writers said that He was. Why accept this detail as factual but not the miracle Jesus performed? And what about Peter? The Bible claims that he “walked on the water,” too (Matthew 14:29). Where is the researched “rationalization” for this miracle? For a trio of scientists living 2,000 years this side of Jesus to assert that they have a better understanding of this event than Jesus’ own disciples, who witnessed it (some of whom were experienced Galilean fisherman, including the apostle John who wrote about the miracle—John 6:14-21), is the height of “academic” arrogance (i.e., foolishness!—cf. 1 Corinthians 1:20-31). Moreover, the New Testament possesses attributes of supernatural inspiration, hence its reporting of the incident is factual.

REFERENCES

Nof Doron, Ian McKeague, Nathan Paldor (2006), “Is There a Paleolimnological Explanation for ‘Walking on Water’ in the Sea of Galilee?” *Journal of Paleolimnology*, 35:417-439, April.  
 Nof, Doron and N. Paldor (1992), “Are There Oceanographic Explanations for the Israelites’ Crossing of the Red-Sea?” *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 73[3]:305-314.  
 Sweets, P. Roger (1997), “The Paleolimnology Home Page,” [On-line], URL: <http://www.indiana.edu/~diatom/paleo.html>.

Eric Lyons