

THE JUDGMENT OF

BART EHRMAN

copyright © 2009

Mr. Gary S. Dykes

First published in PDF format at:
www.Biblical-data.org

Some quotations are from: the New American Standard Bible®,
Copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975,
1977, 1995 by the Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.

I testify to everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: if anyone adds to them, God shall add to him the plagues which are written in this book; (Revelation 22:18)

If you are not careful to observe all the words of this law which are written in this book, to fear this honored and awesome name, the Lord your God, 59 then the Lord will bring extraordinary plagues on you and your descendants, even severe and lasting plagues, and miserable and chronic sicknesses. 60 And He will bring back on you all the diseases of Egypt of which you were afraid, and they shall cling to you. 61 Also every sickness and every plague which, not written in the book of this law, the Lord will bring on you until you are destroyed. (Deuteronomy 28:58-61)

Every word of God is tested; He is a shield to those who take refuge in Him. 6 Do not add to His words Lest He reprove you, and you be proved a liar. (Proverbs 30:5, 6)

Woe to the shepherds who are destroying and scattering the sheep of My pasture! declares the Lord. (Jeremiah 23:1)

The anger of the Lord will not turn back Until He has performed and carried out the purposes of His heart; In the last days you will clearly understand it. 21 I did not send these prophets, But they ran. I did not speak to them, But they prophesied. 22 But if they had stood in My council, Then they would have announced My words to My people, And would have turned them back from their evil way And from the evil of their deeds. (Jeremiah 23:20-22)

The above quotes indicate the value God attaches to His written/spoken Word, other Biblical quotations can be summoned, but these few make it clear that those who *willfully and deliberately* disrupt or alter the words from God will someday face the wrath of God. These warnings apply to Israelites, proselytes, Christians and especially to pagans, depending upon which passage is being referred to.

Bible believers, of course, tremble at these warnings, and they usually try to respect and reverence the very Words from God; accidental errors are not included in the warnings above. Whereas if a saint willfully adds words to or removes words from the Holy Writ, then they as saints will be disciplined, they will experience punishment or even suffering, which hopefully will bring about repentance. However, when a pagan willfully alters God's Word, they will *in the future experience* the judgment of God. The pagan typically does not experience any judgment or wrath during their earthly life, they simply go on their merry way serving the lords of darkness as members of the world-system. But woe to them in a future day!

Dr. Bart Ehrman strives to confuse and abuse the very written Words from God, the Bible. If he is an elected soul he will experience discipline, soon! However, as mentioned above, *if* he is an overt pagan, his frightening judgment is yet future. I cannot make this determination about Bart Ehrman, (as to his election status) only God knows the state of his soul. I can however,

evaluate his fruit, his writings. This we shall endeavor to accomplish, in a brief manner. Evaluation of the fruits, (what a person says, does, writes or produces) is a method whereby a reviewer may get some idea as to the nature of the person producing the "fruit".

And whoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, either in this age, or in the age to come. 33 Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or make the tree bad, and its fruit bad; **for the tree is known by its fruit.** 34 You brood of vipers, how can you, being evil, speak what is good? For the mouth speaks out of that which fills the heart. 35 The good man out of his good treasure brings forth what is good; and the evil man out of his evil treasure brings forth what is evil. 36 And I say to you, that every careless word that men shall speak, they shall render account for it in the day of judgment. 37 For by your words you shall be justified, and by your words you shall be condemned. (Matthew 12:32-37)

In this sense, I can appraise the works and writings of Dr. Bart Ehrman, as to the status of his soul, that is not for me or any human to appraise. Within these clarifications, I commence with the "Judgment of Bart Ehrman".

One is justified in supposing that Dr. Ehrman is a very angry man. His anger is fueled by his knowledge of what the Word from God (the Bible) says. The Word of God exposes his inner motives, it convicts him. (Hebrews 4:12). Though Dr. Ehrman may not believe or trust the Word, it still has the supernatural power to reveal his thoughts and intentions. This must really

anger him, I suspect he carefully wipes the foam from his mouth before his many public appearances. Removing all traces of anger, he puts on a face fit for the world to view. Who would suspect his inner rage? I suspect that his wrath against God and His Word began at Wheaton when he was a student there. Certainly he noted that there was a difference between him and the other students (whom we may suppose were and are Bible believers); they had that inner peace and joy which emanates from the indwelling Holy Spirit. It would seem that Dr. Ehrman has not this peace, nor joy, and perhaps lacks the indwelling Holy Spirit.

Whenever Dr. Ehrman's rage began, his attack upon the text of God's Word, makes him my enemy. His publications are aimed at the naïve public—readers who have very little insight into the science or study of Biblical textual criticism—who are awed by his credentials and are lulled into a false sense of being in the presence of some sort of an authoritarian scholar. Thus he can manipulate these folks. These same folks also support his attacks by buying his novelettes. Sadly, at least one of his printed assaults became a best-seller: *Misquoting Jesus*. It is this work which I shall attack, I will only select a few of Ehrman's fallacies and expose them. Albeit these few exposés should assist with convincing readers that rational defenses exist for all of his libelous charges. Thus I shall herein focus upon his sophistic appearing comments in his book, *Misquoting Jesus*.

Dr. Ehrman has, in a sick sort of way, accomplished a service as regards the study of Biblical textual criticism. He has forced numerous mundane practitioners to reevaluate their meth-

ods and views. He has challenged many textual critics by exposing their weaknesses. He has often made many critics appear incompetent. During a recent debate on the British radio program, *Unbelievable*, he somewhat neutralized the gifted, young Dr. Peter Williams. Williams unfortunately, like many other modern textual critics operates under out-dated and Enlightenment-based suppositions. Most neo-textual critics today have been led to believe that human rationalism trumps faith, so they fear expressing faith-based decisions. These men and women, weak and sickly as they are, are perfect prey for a Bart Ehrman. Yet, when he encountered a very mature saint (as for example in another debate, with the Oxford scholar, Richard Swineburne) Bart Ehrman was left muttering to himself. Swineburne led Bart along a path which he (Swineburne) laid out via Socratic methods, and in the end Ehrman was a dazed and confused objector to God's ways. Listeners to that *Unbelievable* radio program, like Swineburne, all hoped that Ehrman would "get the message" and repent or see-the-light, I still hope and pray for Dr. Ehrman.

MISQUOTING JESUS

This little book was first published in 2005 by Harper-Collins, the hard cover edition had a total of 242 pages. It begins with Ehrman explaining how he became an agnostic. Then his ramblings begin. His attack upon the Bible goes far beyond what Jesus said, he attacks the writings of Paul, and of each of the

Gospel writers. He presents HIS VIEW of textual criticism and HIS VIEWS of its methods and history. He presents HIS VIEWS upon the treatment of women, on the value of certain manuscripts, and even includes HIS VIEWS on supposed "social implications" of the texts he assails. Thus, instead of dealing with the words of Jesus Christ *per se*, he runs rampant, lashing out in anger at anything which seems to him to be a sign of contradiction or error or alteration within the text of the New Testament.

As stated above, he is proud of his credentials, and he uses these to lead the readers into thinking that his views are the typical or proper views shared by all Biblical textual critics. He pretends to speak as some sort of self-appointed spokesman dictating how others seemingly think or how they seemingly operate as textual critics. His very distorted opinions are presented as the typical views of others, actually many of his views are not reflecting the majority. A certain number of outsiders (non-professional) textual critics and Bible scholars are taken in by his credentials and by some of his reasonings, which themselves present nothing new.

Despite presenting HIS VIEWS, he contributes little *new* information. Typically he simply gathers together the observations made by others, and displays them. He uses these prior efforts and observations, as he himself apparently is incapable of adding new insight into the very Words from God. By presenting the observations others have made, he makes himself to appear as erudite. Which he is obviously not. But via this method (of wisdom by association) he attempts to appear as a wise critic or sagely

writer, when in fact he presents nothing new, EXCEPT that he then manipulates or contorts the data or observations made by others. He contributes nothing new or original; I believe he is incapable of perceiving the very design and intent of the Holy Scriptures. As a consequence he lacks originality, meaningful insight and freshness. For example, note this from his "novel"- *Misquoting Jesus*:

What, then, shall we say about our disputed verses? [Luke 22:43, 44] These are the only verses in the entire Gospel of Luke that undermine this clear portrayal. Only here does Jesus agonize over his coming fate; only here does he appear out of control, [!] unable to bear the burden of his destiny. Why would Luke have totally eliminated all remnants of Jesus' agony elsewhere if he meant to emphasize it in yet stronger terms here? Why remove compatible material from his source, [!] both before and after the verses in question? It appears that the account of Jesus' "bloody sweat," not found in our earliest and best manuscripts, is not original to Luke but is a scribal addition to the Gospel. (*Misquoting Jesus*, page 144. I added the exclamation marks in brackets.)

Before commenting upon the above, we should note that this is a favorite text for Ehrman-style attacks; below, a quote from his earlier (1993), *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*:

Several years ago, Mark A. Plunkett and I subjected the textual problem of 22:43-44 to a full-length analysis and concluded that the verses were secondary to the account, that they had been interpolated by second-century scribes who found their emphatic portrayal of Jesus experiencing real human agony useful for their repudiation of docetic Christologies. Very little has been done to change the status of this debate; here I can simply summarize the evidence that appeared then and still appears now to be compelling. (page 188).

When the student analyzes Ehrman's "investigations" absolutely nothing new is brought to light. Both Ehrman and Plunkett simply share statements and researches which were done before them. For example in 1985 in Joseph Fitzmyer's *The Gospel According to Luke*, in the Anchor Bible Commentary 28a, page 1444f.; we note that Fitzmyer rejects the passage for five reasons, one of which is that Luke does not elsewhere write of any agony or human sufferings experienced by Jesus. Many scholars in by-gone days have also noted that the passage was often used against the docetic oriented theologians. Nothing new here. So why did Ehrman devote several dozen pages to this text? He added absolutely nothing to what has already been said before. He makes no contribution to resolving his apparent problem with this text, other than to declare that it is, in his mind, spurious. In his presentation of the manuscript evidence (page 188, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*) he adds nothing new, and repeats what others have said before him, that the external manuscript testimony is not conclusive. Does repeating this evidence obtained by the labors of others add credence to his work? Well, it did fill some pages, and after all Bart does have a book to sell.

Dr. Luke was fond of giving descriptions concerning Jesus and his ministry which reveal details which a medical doctor would note. Details often not mentioned by Mark and John and Matthew. The profuse sweating of Jesus was recorded by Dr. Luke as he was moved by the Holy Spirit to include said detail into his Gospel. True, others did use the passage for various reasons, but there is definitely no good reason to remove the verses

from our Bibles. Nor is one justified to infer that Jesus was "out of control", or that He was "unable to bear the burden". Jesus clearly stated that He was willing to obey His father's will:

..."Father, if Thou art willing, remove this cup from Me; yet not My will, but Thine be done." (Luke 22:42)

This is not the prayer of a Person full of fear! Ehrman's rejection of these words, indeed all of verses 43 and 44, simply reflects his inability to pray and really examine the text in question; to examine it from a fresh perspective, not in a spirit seeking to disprove the text of God's Word or its veracity.

Nor did Luke rely upon Mark's Gospel as a source for his, Luke undoubtedly heard of other accounts, but did not rely upon any of them. This is a form of Bultmannism, something which Ehrman may have received from his liberal mentor, the late B. M. Metzger while he attended the exceedingly liberal institution known as "Princeton University". Whichever case be the cause of Ehrman's conjectures here, none are original, he just parrots and sells what others said before him.

The same is true for his rejection of the account of the "Woman Caught in Adultery", which he also would remove from our Bibles. He simply repeats prior reasons why it seems to not be genuine in his mind. And as in the above quote, he mentions that the "best manuscripts" omit the verses (John 7:53-8:12, s.v page 65, *Misquoting Jesus*). Here a sly and clever hand is revealed. Ehrman gathers support, nay rather focuses upon what others

have stated. Herein he bonds with other critics, as they read these words "the oldest and best manuscripts" they will nod in approval with Ehrman. Ehrman also states (concerning the "Woman Taken in Adultery"):

...scholars who work on the manuscript tradition have no doubts about this particular case...[to] nearly all scholars of every persuasion: the story is not found in our oldest and best manuscripts. (*Misquoting Jesus*, pages 64f.)

Sounds convincing, why he seems to even be in agreement with the majority of textual critics. Two issues need to be noted here:

(1) Ehrman does not know what the "best manuscripts" are. He certainly seems to think codex 05 is a "best manuscript". Elsewhere when he seeks support, he will follow some obscure minuscule or an apocryphal text in support of his heresy, yet would these not also be thus part and parcel of his definition of "best manuscripts". Again he simply parrots what others have prior suggested, that the "best manuscripts" are the oldest ones from Egypt. (Which is rarely true!)

and,

(2) Many respectful scholars and manuscripts retain the passage, for good reasons.

Dr. Maurice A. Robinson, in his article: *Preliminary Observations Regarding the Pericope Adulterae Based Upon Fresh Collations of Nearly All Continuous-Text Manuscripts and All Lectionary Manuscripts Containing the Passage*. (In *Filologia Neotestamentaria*, XIII, 2000, pages 35-59.), states that over 1,386 Greek New Testament manuscripts contain this text of John 7:53-8:12. Additionally 58 other Greek manuscripts contain the passage in other locations in John. The earliest evidence for the Pericope Adulterae is seen in the *Protoevangelium Jacobi* (of the second century, as noted by William Petersen [s.v. Robinson's article, page 41]). I have also added the Egyptian fragments of a canon table on papyrus from the late 500s, per Carl Nordenfalk (for more information visit: www.Biblical-data.org/NT_readings.html). Apparently the passage did exist in some Gospel texts in Egypt. In order for Ehrman to reject the passage he must give good reason why the manuscripts he thinks are superior are indeed superior here. He also needs to realize that many other explanations exist as to why the language and style appears different from the main body of John's Gospel. Ehrman also points out, as have many others before him, that the passage seems to intrude into the context. *However*, it should be seen as an important part of and conducive to the context, for example note the supporting comments seen in Lange's Commentary on John (Zondervan, pages 269f.). Ehrman simply rejects it because others have done so before him, in which case in the pages he devotes to repeating this information, he adds nothing new or contributes no new information or data. He also avoids mentioning why many scholars accept the

genuineness of the passage, which indicates his biased treatment of the information for the general reader. A few of the scholars who do accept the text here in John are: Augustine, Jerome (who mentions that it is seen in many OLD manuscripts), Mill, Whitby, Fabricius, Lampe, Juan Maldonatus, C. A. Lapede, Bengel, Michaelis, Storr, Kuiuoel, Cassidorius, Hug, Scholz, Klee, Maier, Horne, Owen, Stier, Lange, Webster, Ambrose, Sedulius, Dettmers, Winer, Schultess, Hilgenfield, Möller, Alford, G. Archer, Tregelles, M. Dods (who favors the passage), Maurice Robinson, Pacian, Gelasius, C. I. Scofield, Victorinus, Zane Hodges, and myself, G. Dykes. Ehrman is correct in that most *current* critics and scholars do not accept the passage, but this may be due to their lack of insight or to modern liberal agendas which have polluted the critical study of the Biblical texts. As a whole, the naïve readers never suspect that they are not receiving the full story!

Another text which is a favorite text of Ehrman's, is found in Mark 1:41, (s.v. *Misquoting Jesus*, pages 133-139):

And moved with compassion, He stretched out His hand, and touched him, and said to him, "I am willing; be cleansed."

Ehrman, objects to "compassion" and insists that the reading as found in codex 05 and a few Latin mss is reasonable. This alternative reading would state that Jesus was "angry". Ehrman

then repeats the opinions of others as to why "angry" seems reasonable. Again Ehrman adds no new information. But he does overlook some relevant information, information which answers his "sincere" question as to which reading is genuine, though on page 136 of *Misquoting Jesus*, Ehrman favors the variant of "angry". For some reason in this preference he does not give preference to the so-called "oldest and best" manuscripts. Here he behaves irrationally; irrational, in that in other complaints he often uses the "oldest and best" manuscripts to prove his point. He does not explain why the "oldest and best" are wrong here at Mark 1:41. But then that is not his point, his goal is to discredit the Word from God, and this variant reading seems to assist him in that endeavor. Readers need to keep this function in mind: *the readings which Ehrman demonstrates are important to him only in that they serve to assail and undermine confidence in the Holy Writ*; this is Ehrman's primary function or criterion as to which variants he chooses to support his claims.

Let us examine this passage in ways foreign to Dr. Bart Ehrman's techniques. Codex 05 (Codex Bezae) contains the four gospels in a Latin/Greek bilingual format. The manuscript has been studied often as it presents a rather unique text. Several notable scholars have suggested that the manuscript was originally written in Syria (Antioch, Edessa, and recently Beirut - per Dr. David Parker). Without going into details there are good reasons supporting why this Latin bilingual was produced in Syria for the Western Churches. In Mark 1:41 the Greek text appears as:

similar sounding Syriac word is: ܐܬܪܐܟܐ ethra-kam, which differs in that a harder breathing and a more guttural-type sound is exerted upon the suffix syllable. Now this second Syriac word ܐܬܪܐܟܐ means to be "angry" or "enraged"! So when codex 05 was created it seems plausible that a translation from a Syriac manuscript prompted this innocent and minor transcriptional/phonetic error. This translation error can and does explain the minor error seen in the Greek translation in codex 05, which was produced in Syria! In Metzger's commentary upon the Greek text as proposed in the Nestle/Aland editions—in the first edition at Mark 1:41—no mention is made of this observation of a translation error as stemming from Eberhard Nestle. In the second edition E. Nestle is given credit. Odd that Ehrman missed this. It amplifies the fact that Ehrman often does not take into account the ancient versions and their impact upon some Greek manuscripts.

Another one of Ehrman's pet variants (at Mark 1:41) is set to rest, which I hope gives Ehrman increased confidence in the text of God's Word. Ehrman's fabricated myth—that Matthew and Luke may have revised Mark's text—is a blasphemous fantasy, and not worth considering. That these words are not seen in the parallel texts in Luke and Matthew is no sign that they or anyone altered Mark's text. Matthew and Luke wrote under Divine Inspiration, not relying upon Mark's Gospel in any way; they are completely independent compositions! Ehrman is very troubled with the doctrine of verbal Inspiration, *if* there is no inerrant text via some unknowable god, how can these words be thus considered

inspired? If God is not known, how can His Words be known? Thus Ehrman's theological presuppositions plague and ensnare him. If he really knew the truth, he could be set free!

For example, on page 204 of *Misquoting Jesus*, Ehrman laments that when Jesus informs the High Priest (in Mark 14:62) that he (the High Priest) would see (future tense) the Son "sitting at the right hand of power...and coming with the clouds of heaven", that Jesus made an error, a false prediction, or that the text is here corrupt. Since Ehrman does not know God, does not understand the Scriptures, how can he have a grasp of the truth? Certainly Jesus is referring to His second coming, which "every eye" would see. Via Bart's restricted tunnel-vision, he thinks the High Priest dies and does not see the second coming, thus Jesus made an error when He told the man that he would see Him coming. Does not Bart know that even after this priest died, whether in heaven, or dead in Hades, that the priest would see the return (Revelation 1:7). Sadly, Ehrman again and again makes clear that he has no knowledge of the Bible's basic truths. This makes it all the more galling when this man attempts to tell Bible believers that their Bibles are wrong, and that Dr. Bart will help you really understand the book from a pagan perspective. The nerve!

My final foray into the madness which Dr. Ehrman fosters is a further revelation as concerns his apparent inability to understand God's written Word. Since Bart is a self-styled agnostic we are perhaps safe to conclude that he has no relationship with the good Lord Jesus Christ. In such a state he is totally unaware of

the intent of God's Word. Its deep and glorious meanings elude him. Instead of clearly seeing any edifying truths, he is like unto a man peering into a very dark glass, nothing is really clear. In this regard my heart goes out to him, the wonder and joy which God's Word gives, is not his to behold. When he encounters basic theological truths, he cannot grasp their meanings, he only sees the surface, some ink on parchment, some grammatical structure, some scribal mistake, some obvious alteration. He seizes upon the alteration, "LOOK!" he shouts, "look at what I have found!" In his naïveness, he seems to ignore the reality that such-and-such an alteration has been known for centuries by other scholars, he strives to add some new "twist" or complication.

And yes it is true, there have been some intentional alterations in numerous Biblical manuscripts, nearly all of which stand out as such in collation. Though aware that others have dealt with these apparent alterations, he shines his light upon them, tries to add new kinks into their presence and holds them up as proof that God's Word is **just and only a human creation**. These trivial pursuits engage the mind of Ehrman, in fact he seems addicted to this perverted form of criticism. His view of Paul and of Paul's view of women, demonstrates clearly this sad behaviour of Dr. Bart Ehrman.

On page 184 of *Misquoting Jesus*, we read:

Not only do the verses [i.e. I Corinthians 14:34, 35] seem intrusive to the context of chapter 14, they also appear anomalous with what Paul explicitly says elsewhere in I Corinthians.

For earlier in the book, as we have already noticed, Paul gives instructions to women speaking in the church: according to chapter 11, when they pray and prophesy—activities that were always done aloud in the Christian services of worship—they are to be sure to wear veils on their heads (11:2-16). In this passage, which no one doubts Paul wrote, it is clear that Paul understands that women both can and do speak in the church. In the disputed passage of chapter 14, however, it is equally clear that "Paul" forbids women from speaking at all.

Thus in Ehrman's mind there seems to be a contradiction. Granted others before him have noted this as well, Bart is not the first to not-see-the-light here. He also uses this apparent contradiction as a prime excuse to omit verse 34 and 35 of chapter 14 (as have others). Another gallon of gasoline is poured onto the fire blazing with Bart's proofs that God's Word is full of un-resolvable errors, and that folks ought to begin cutting out passages from their Bibles.

In I Corinthians 11, Paul urges women to keep their hair, to not excessively trim it, as it serves as a covering. No added "veil" of cloth or whatever is intended. In the Corinthian church, unlike all of the other known Pauline churches, next door was a Jewish synagogue (Acts 18:7, 11 the house of Titius Justus). Consequently this church in Corinth was demonstrating to the Jews via signs and wonders that God was next door. Jews for centuries have been given signs by God to validate His will for them (recall Moses and I Corinthians 1:22). The Jews certainly heard these uncircumcised Gentiles praying and speaking in various foreign languages. These temporary sign-gifts were thus in

operation in Corinth. They were serving a special purpose which God had in mind. These gifts or these miraculous abilities fell upon both men and women, thus in this special situation the women were definitely permitted to prophesy and proclaim God's Words. Unique and special, and a sight to both see and hear! These are obvious *exceptions*, as elsewhere Paul, speaking for Christ (I Corinthians 4:17, 7:40, 14:37) commands that women keep silent in the worship service, and not to teach in the church. (I Timothy 2:11, 12). When Paul gives his own personal opinions, he usually identifies each as such. So a basic grasp of Paul's teachings, removes any supposed contradiction, and without the apparent contradiction, Ehrman's primary objection to this portion of God's Word evaporates.

I cannot prove to Ehrman, or anyone for that matter, that I Timothy or II Timothy is actually God's Word as dictated by Paul. The indwelling Holy Spirit gives that type of "sealing" or "assurance", and "establishes" each elected soul:

Now He who establishes us with you in Christ and anointed us is God, 22 who also sealed [σφραγισαμενος] us and gave us the Spirit in our hearts as a pledge [αρραβωνα].(II Corinthians 1:21, 22)

Basic theology 401, well perhaps it is somewhat deep for beginning Bible students, but then we each grow as we study and meditate upon the powerful and living Word of God. However, for a pagan critic, simple Holy Spirit insights are lacking. Instead some vague human rationalism as generated by the flesh kicks in and the actual truth lies hidden.

On page 15, in his introduction to *Misquoting Jesus*, Ehrman states:

...the kind of book this is—to my knowledge, the first of its kind. It is written for people who know nothing about textual criticism but who might like to learn something about how scribes were changing [S]cripture and about how we can recognize where they did so.

If he meant that this book (*Misquoting Jesus*) is the first of its kind to introduce textual criticism to the masses, then he is grossly mistaken, or he has never visited a library. How could Ehrman miss Wegner's 1999 book titled: *The Journey from Texts to Translation?* or Greenlee's 1964 book - *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism?* or half-a-dozen other popular tomes, some even by Ehrman's former teacher, Dr. Bruce Metzger. Obviously he does not mean it is a volume about introducing textual criticism; it is a work which presents a very narrow view, a caustic approach towards the text of God's Word so as to discredit its integrity and to truly harm the innocent readers. Dr. Ehrman uses his title and position wrongly. Is he using it for monetary gain, for wealth, for status, to fuel his pride, or to support his demented state? Who knows. He did once state that his wife is a Christian, and that they have major disagreements. I find it amazing that she can tolerate supporting him. But, like his hidden anger, we outsiders cannot know all aspects of his personal life; yet we should, as anyone who claims to be a guide, teacher or leader, must live an open life, as an example and as a courtesy.

In closing, I realize that I have been somewhat brutal in this review of Ehrman's novel and of his thinking. I hope that Dr. Bart Ehrman (if he is enabled) will repent, openly. Until he does repent, I must see him as a criminal engaged in criminal activity, and as such he deserves to be realistically evaluated. His crimes are heinous, and in my mind, retaliation should be severe.

For we (believers), are truly engaged in a very real spiritual **WAR**. Why play games, why not oppose obvious and dangerous works of darkness? Satan certainly shows no mercy, he is serious, should we not also be? Are most critics acting as if they are truly at war, are we DESTROYING speculations? There is a time for peace and love, and a time for action; Satan prefers that we lay down our sword (the Word) and smile passively as he humiliates the text of God's Word. (Oh for more Luthers and Tyndales!).

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, ⁴ for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but divinely powerful for the destruction of fortresses. ⁵ We are destroying speculations and every lofty thing raised up against the knowledge of God, and we are taking every thought captive to the obedience of Christ, (II Corinthians 10:3-5).

Despite Ehrman's evil intent he is nicely cared for in this world-system, and will most likely gain support from the world-system as he trudges along; but he will face the good Lord on judgment day and *that* will truly be,

THE JUDGMENT OF BART EHRMAN.