

degree is the fact that the Second Coming of Christ can be proven from the Scriptures. If there was nothing else, the Scriptures are a weightier source of affirmation than mere experience due to the probability that the synoptic Gospel accounts (Matthew 17; Mark 9; Luke 9) had been written by this time, and Peter could very well have returned to the mount of Transfiguration through the blessed words of God. On top of that, Peter's testimony could have been corroborated in this manner to boot. Furthermore, we know that not only was Peter referring to Paul's epistles as Scripture (2 Peter 3:15-16) at the time, but Paul referred to Luke 10:7 as Scripture along with Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Timothy 5:18. Taking either angle, experiences are substantiated or unsubstantiated by the words of the Lord, but he is the Lord.

Finally, our sixth reason for refusing Dr. Daniel Wallace's suggestion that a true comparative interpretation of the adjective is not warranted in 2 Peter 1:19 is as follows: The translation of the A.V. 1611 text in this passage rids us of a proof text for the Scriptures being the Christian's sole and final authority. 2 Peter 1:19 says, "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, *UNTIL THE DAY DAWN*, meaning that you are to follow the Scriptures and judge all experiences by the Scriptures from now until the Second Coming of Christ. One reason that the translation of 2 Peter 1:19 in the modern, English Bible versions that oppose the A.V. 1611 is that the Scriptures are not promoted as the absolute standard in separating truth from error.

Conclusively, Daniel Wallace has been evaded and found wanting on all counts. He failed to prove that the comparative adjective couldn't be treated attributively in the passage contextually or lexically, even though there is a paucity of these examples in the NT syntactically. What he termed "virtually impossible" grammatically turned out to be completely possible by some very striking parallels that we examined earlier in this treatise. Professor Wallace failed to acknowledge a virtually all of Peter's seven other uses of a comparative adjective, none of these instances are rendered as an elative functioning by means of a comparative. While he aptly rebutted the verbal predicative interpretation of βεβαιότερον as seen in the NASB, his reason for denying the authenticity of the basal predicative understanding (which carries the same meaning as the A.V. 1611) has been dealt with above on six points. Dr. Wallace's accusation toward the ESV that it has "erred" in two instances is a straw man, since the substantive use of the adjective can function without the Greek article. The reason for this point is that the appositional approach, though not as idiomatic as the attributive foundation, still carries the same interpretative force as the A.V. 1611 (i.e. the word of God is more sure than any other word). To the contrary, the A.V. 1611 as well as the sectarian Authorized Standard Translation; the Douay Rheims; the World English Bible; Webster's translation; Rotherham's Emphasized Bible (though closer to appositional than attributive); Green's Literal Translation; Young's Literal Translation; the New King James Bible; Mace's 1729 NT; and the 1560 Geneva Bible (though βεβαιότερον is translated as a superlative [most sure] instead of as a comparative [more sure]) all treat the comparative adjective attributively or the like, which upholds the words of God as the sole authority to which we must all submit in order to bring us to faith and practice.

N.T. GREEK EXEGESIS BEYOND THE BASICS SEVENTEEN (17) BRILLIANT ARTICLES OF JEFFREY D. NACHIMSON ON ADVANCED NEW TESTAMENT GREEK TRANSLATION AND EXEGESIS THAT DEFENDED THE KING JAMES BIBLE AGAINST SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM CRITIQUING THE CRITICS OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE:

KENNETH WUEST, DANIEL WALLACE,

GARY HUDSON, JAMES MAY, FRED BUTLER,

RICK NORRIS, JAMES WHITE, DOUG KUTILEK, ETC.

1 Glenny, W. Edward, et al. The Bible Version Debate: The Perspective of Central Baptist Theological Seminary (Plymouth: Central Baptist Theological Seminary, 1999).

2 Streeter, Lloyd L. Seventy-five Problems with Central Baptist Seminary's Book The Bible Version Debate (Kearney: Morris Publishing, 2001).

3 Glenny, 121-122.

4 Glenny, 42.

5 Windham, Neal. New Testament Greek For Preachers and Teachers (Lanham: University Press of America, 1991), 15.

6 Glenny, 122.

7 Glenny, 124.

8 Wallace, Daniel. Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996).

9 Burgon, John William. The Revision Revised (Collingswood: Dean Burgon Society Press, 2000), 197.

COMPILED BY PERIANDER A. ESPLANA

**N.T. GREEK EXEGESIS BEYOND THE BASICS:
SEVENTEEN (17) BRILLIANT ARTICLES OF JEFFREY D. NACHIMSON
ON ADVANCED NEW TESTAMENT GREEK TRANSLATION
AND EXEGESIS THAT DEFENDED THE KING JAMES BIBLE
AGAINST SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM**

COMPILED BY PERIANDER A. ESPLANA
www.geocities.com/perianthium786

CRITIQUING THE CRITICS OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE

A Critique of Kenneth Wuest
A More Sure Word of Prophecy than Greek Scholarship
John 1:1 in the NWT: A Blasphemous Demonstration of Defunct Greek Scholarship
The Greek Grammatical Desperado
An Apocryphal Amalgamation
The Case of the Alleged Perpetual Misprint
Rick Norris: The Independent Fundamental Immersionist
1 Peter 3:19 and "The Spirits in Prison"
Evangelical Outreach: A Parroted Case of Scholastic Ignorance
The Rudimentary Factor Underlying Infallibility
"Dirty" Dirk Wood in a Tainted Meat Locker
These Being Dead Yet Speaketh
A Critique of Goethe's Faustian Rendition of Ο Λόγος in John 1:1
Matthew 23:14
Butler's Bumbling Bunk Concerning Final Absolute Authority
2 Timothy 3:16 - Which Bible Constitutes the Scriptures?
May In Fiction

Note: In this compilation, I have not included his amazing article on Verbal Plenary Inspiration of the Bible entitled "An Inquiry Into the Interpretation of Translational Inspiration." I will publish it together with his other articles on textual criticism, linguistics, science, philosophy, politics, and other issues.

JEFFREY D. NACHIMSON is an educator, polemic/apologetic writer, conference/seminar speaker, and researcher in the areas of textual criticism, manuscript evidence, and Greek grammar/syntax.

He graduated with Greek award at Pensacola Bible Institute in May 2005.

He is presently studying B.S. in Political Science at Troy University online.

By God's will, he is planning to pursue M.Div. through distance learning program and an accredited Ph.D. after his graduation.

He is now the administrator of Victory Bible Institute.

A.V. 1611 critics admitted that J.D. Nachimson is the King James Version defender extraordinaire.

A Critique of Kenneth Wuest

This critique was written by Bro. Nachimson in partial fulfillment for the Advanced Greek class offered at the Pensacola Bible Institute. Mr. Nachimson would like to stress that he feels honored that he was able to study Greek under one of the finest teachers he has ever known, Dr. Laurence M. Vance. In many ways, Dr. Vance is much more meticulous than even Dr. Peter Ruckman, who himself is a wonderful Bible teacher. Notwithstanding, Dr. Vance provided the following comments on Mr. Nachimson's project:

"...probably the best one I have ever read. Better than mine from 1990..."
- Dr. Laurence M. Vance

Introduction
Verbs
Lexicography & General Syntax
The Greek Article
Textual Considerations
Bibliography

Introduction

Kenneth Wuest commences his work entitled, "Mark in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader" (which is but volume x in a series labeled, "Word Studies in the Greek New Testament"), with the statement that, " *every book ought to have a reason for its existence.*" (Wuest, Preface). Although Mr. Wuest claims that this volume " *is a simplified commentary on the Greek text of the Gospel according to Mark, written for the Bible student who is not conversant with the Greek language* " (Wuest, Preface), upon a critical examination of the subsequent contents it is ever so apparent that Mr. Wuest's ultimate purpose is to expose what he considers fundamental textual, lexicographical, and syntactical flaws in the Authorized Version of the Holy Bible. Hence, if this work is only studied by those " *not conversant with the Greek language,*" then this book might " *prove useful* " (Wuest, Preface) indeed. However, once this commentary is inspected by the most careful of eager Greek students, its contents will prove most detrimental, mundane, and disappointing through Mr. Wuest's constant solecisms concerning New Testament Greek.

Following Mr. Wuest's comments above, namely, that every book ought to have a reason for its existence, the reason for the existence of this paper is to show the Bible-Believer that the pontificating antics of Greek grammarians are utterly subjective, and many times without a definitive foundation when it comes to a surety of translating. Therefore, the most useful method of demonstrating this task is by

using one grammarian's sources against another's sources of the same. By this, it should become completely apparent that when an individual seeks to correct the blessed text of the Authorized Version, that he is doing so based on his finite knowledge of syntax, and not on the established principles of adequate translation.

Arthur Cleveland Coxe stated in 1857,

We believe, therefore, that the time has gone by for the radical improvement of the English Bible, even in England. But if it cannot be done, at the fountain, in the mother land, it surely cannot be done elsewhere: (Coxe 11)

It is therefore the position of this humble author, as with Mr. Coxe above, that there is absolutely no place for any improvement upon that old and hoary book which we call our Authorized Version. Ultimately, this critique will examine the confines of Mr. Wuest's commentary on the Gospel according to Mark (εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον), categorizing various Greek syntactical points, thus allowing the reader to use this work as a basis for defending the Authorized Version against other critical examinations of the King James Bible in general.

Verbs

Perhaps one of the most prevalent grammatical proclivities advocated by Mr. Wuest is in regard to the Greek verb. Specifically, he often places an overemphasis on the general aspect and usage of the Imperfect Indicative, which is essentially linear action in past time (i.e. "was speaking," "was walking," "were fighting," etc.). This obvious overemphasis is easily demonstrable by a brief perusal of Mr. Wuest's comments on the imperfect usage in Mark. First, in his preface he states,

...the imperfect tense, so frequent in Mark, for instance, which draws a picture, is regularly rendered in the standard translations as the aorist is, referring to the mere fact of an action. Consequently, the vivid picture which Mark paints, is lost. (Wuest, Preface)

Secondly, the following examples make the aforementioned point completely undeniable: on page 119, *"the verb (ἐκπλεσσω) is imperfect, showing that this condition of being beside themselves with amazement continued for some time;"* page 97 (ἐπιβαλλω), *"The waves were throwing themselves into the boat. The tense is imperfect. They were repeatedly doing so;"* page 64, *"The verb is imperfect. They kept on being quiet;"* page 166, *"Saith is ἐπηρωτω 'to ask, to question,' imperfect in tense, 'He kept on questioning them;"* page 43, *"Came is ἐρχομαι, an imperfect, 'They kept on coming;"* page 271, *"The verbs are imperfect, showing that repeated attempts were made to bring testimony that would warrant conviction;"* page 264, *"The verb is imperfect, speaking of two things, the fact that the disciples saw Him falling upon (ἐπὶ) the ground, and also, of the fact that He did it repeatedly, showing the desperateness of the struggle in which our Lord was engaged at the time. 'Prayed' is also imperfect, 'kept on praying.' It was continuous prayer."*

Nevertheless, before delving into the usages of the Imperfect that will otherwise vindicate the A.V. 1611 as rendering the Imperfect as a simple Aorist, contrary to the bold assertions of Mr. Wuest, it is interesting to note that the Oxford scholar, John William Burgon, criticized the Revisers who fabricated the Revised Version for their similar unidiomatic splurging of the Imperfect, thrust upon English speaking Christendom, in 1883:

Besides this offensive pedantry in respect of the Aorist, we are often annoyed by an unidiomatic rendering of the Imperfect. True enough it is that 'the servants and the officers were standing, and were warming themselves:' Peter also 'was standing with them and was warming himself' (S. John xviii.18). But we do not so express ourselves in English, unless we are about to add something which shall account for our particularity and precision. Any one, for example, desirous of stating what had been for years his daily practice, would say--- 'I left my house.' Only when he wanted to explain that, on leaving it for the 1000 th time, he met a friend coming up the steps to pay him a visit, would an Englishman think of saying, 'I was leaving the house.' A Greek writer, on the other hand, would not trust this to the imperfect. He would use the present participle in the dative case ('To me, leaving my house, &c.). One is astonished to have to explain such things.' If therefore thou art offering thy gift at the altar' (Matt. v.23), may seem to some a clever translation. To ourselves, it reads like a senseless exaggeration of the original. It sounds (and is) as unnatural as to say (in S. Luke ii.33) 'And His father [a depravation of the text] and His mother were marveling at the things which were spoken concerning Him:--- or (in Heb. xi.17) 'yea, he that had received the promises was offering up his only-begotten son:--- or, of the cripple at Lystra (Acts xiv.9), 'the same heard Paul speaking.'" (Burgon 161)

Interestingly enough, after all of the many instances of reiteration concerning the continuous action of the Imperfect dictated by Mr. Wuest, he casually fails to comment on the Imperfect ἐβαλλον (Imperfect Active Indicative, 3rd Plural) in Mark 12:41. However, this omission is very distinguished because of Mr. Wuest's own translation of the passage:

And having sat down opposite the treasury, he was viewing with a discerning eye how the crowd throws money into the treasury. And many wealthy ones threw in much. (Wuest 242)

As such, it is clear to see that even Mr. Wuest himself obviously is aware of the fact that in order to promote the best translation in the receptor language, the imperfect must oftentimes be given as a simple aorist as seen here.

In Mark 16:3, the Scriptures state in part, "And they said among themselves." This is the A.V. rendering of the Greek, καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς αὐτάς. Even though it has just been demonstrated that Mr. Wuest will condone a translation of the imperfect other than simple continuous action in the past, in this particular passage he resorts to his usual explanation of the imperfect indicative:

The verb is imperfect. 'They kept on saying among themselves.' It was the chief topic of conversation. (Wuest 289)

Since there are several contextual usages of the imperfect, it is shocking, to say the least, that Mr. Wuest did not go into great lengths to communicate this fact to the English reader (confessedly for those not well acquainted with Greek). If he had spent some time reinforcing this grammatical nuance, Kenneth Wuest would have been apt to inform the reader of the usage of the Instantaneous Imperfect. Wallace defines the Instantaneous Imperfect (also referred to as the Aoristic or Punctiliar Imperfect) as:

The imperfect tense is rarely used just like an aorist indicative, to indicate simple past. This usage is virtually restricted to ελεγεν in narrative literature. (Wallace 542)

A few examples of this usage of the Imperfect are as follows:

και ελεγεν αυτοις, Ο εχων ωτα ακουειν ακουετω

"And he said to them, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." (Mark 4:9)

ελεγε, Τις μου ηψατο των ιματιων

".and said, who touched my clothes?" (Mark 5:30)

και αναβλεψας ελεγε, βλεπω τους ανθρωπους ως δεσδρα περιπατουντας

"And he looked up, and said, I see men as trees, walking." (Mark 8:24)

Proof positive of this principle can be gleaned by a comparison of the Greek text of Nestle to that of the Received text in John 5:19. In this particular passage in the critical text we see the Imperfect ελεγεν juxtaposed with the Aorist απεκρινατο. The Aorist is translated "answered," with the Imperfect being rendered as "said." However, upon inspection of the traditional text reading, it is seen that although the same 3 rd singular Aorist verb is used (απεκρινατο- answered), instead of an Imperfect Active Indicative verb, there is the verb ειπεν (2 nd Aorist Active Indicative, 3 rd Singular). In the English translation, both verbs, whether Imperfect or Aorist, would be translated the same way ("said"). Hence, with the substitution in the modern critical text, it goes to show the aptness of the A.V. treatment of the Instantaneous Imperfect as a simple Aorist (of course, much to the chagrin of Mr. Wuest). In reality, as one author succinctly stated, "*habit rather than logical principle appears to govern the choice of impf. or aor. with verbs of speaking.*" (Moulton and Turner 3: 67)

Consequently, Nigel Turner proclaims the following concerning the relationship of the Imperfect to the Aorist tense:

Although imperfects are retreating before aorists in the Koine, they are still in wide use and the class. distinctions are still being observed. There is a certain interplay between the tenses; indeed we can find no difference between ελεγεν and ειπεν in the NT. Although it is usual to distinguish various kinds of imperfect, and for convenience we preserve these divisions, the classification is not inelastic and the chief determining factor for translators will be the context itself. (Moulton and Turner 3: 64)

While Turner maintains above that he found no difference between the Imperfect and the Aorist when it came to the verb λεγω, it is evident that Mr. Wuest availed himself of no such study, even as a respected professor at the Moody Bible Institute. He stated emphatically,

The verb is ελεγον, imperfect in tense which is always durative in action. Had Mark wanted to speak merely of the fact of their speaking to Jesus, he would have used the aorist. (Wuest 59)

However, it seems all to clear that Mr. Wuest is alone on this point, both in reference to the opinions of other grammarians, and clear examples cited from the Scriptures.

Continuing with the relationship between the Aorist and Imperfect tenses, Dr. Robertson informs us of the following details:

The aorist is not used 'instead of' the imperfect. But the aorist is often used in the midst of imperfects. The Old Bulgarian does not distinguish between the aorist and the imperfect. In modern Greek, aorists and imperfects have the same endings (Thumb, Handb., p. 119), but the two tenses are distinct in meaning. Radermacher (N.T. Gr., p. 122) thinks that in the κοινή he finds the imperfect used as aorist, as in εκ των ιδιων επυει (εποιει) τον βωμον (Inser. De la Syrie 2413a), and διεσαφεις φορ διεσαφησας (P. Lond., XLII, Kenyon 30). But I venture to be skeptical. The same sort of event will be recorded now with the aorist, as πολυ πληθος ηκολουθησεν (Mk. 3:7), now with the imperfect, as ηκολουθει οχλος πολυς (5:24). Cf. Lu. 2:18 and 4:22. But the changing mood of the writer does not mean that the tenses are equivalent to each other. (Robertson 837-838)

Although Dr. Robertson might be correct in his assertion that the Aorist and Imperfect tenses are not equivalents, I think with the examples provided it goes without saying that they are oftentimes used synonymously, thereby warranting the idiomatic usages in English proclaimed by our Authorized Version. In short, it should be observed by the keen investigator that what is different about the imperfect and the aorist tenses, can be gleaned from the context of the English passages themselves.

Concerning the usage of the Imperfect (ελεγεν γαρ αυτω, "for he said unto him") in Mark 5:8, Mr. Wuest incorrectly insists that the Imperfect is a "Progressive Imperfect." He states:

The original has the progressive imperfect, 'for He had been saying.' Our Lord had repeatedly ordered the demon to come out of the man, as a result of which the demon had made this outcry. (Wuest 103)

Now, if Mr. Wuest's exegesis based on one type of usage of the imperfect is correct, then why do we, upon examination of others proclaiming Greek scholarship, discover that this particular instance of the Imperfect is not considered "Progressive," but a definitive example of the "Pluperfect Imperfect"? Defining this "Pluperfective" Imperfect, Dr. Wallace maintains that:

The imperfect is infrequently used to indicate a time prior to the action occurring in the narrative. It thus indicates time antecedent to that of the main verb (which also indicates past time). The difference between this and the pluperfect is that the imperfect's internal portrayal is still intact. (Wallace 549)

Hence, Mark 5:8 is not an example of a Progressive Imperfect, which Dana and Mantey refer to as, "*the most characteristic use of the tense*" (Dana and Mantey, 187), but a Pluperfect Imperfect (as attested by Wallace on page 549 of his Grammar) because it expresses antecedent action to that of the main verb (in this case the main verb would be ἐξελθε [2 Aorist Active Imperative, 2 nd Singular], "Come," or "Come out"). Therefore, it is not something that had been stated repeatedly as Wuest asserts, but a statement that had been uttered previously.

Notwithstanding, there are a couple of unsound doctrinal implications in Mr. Wuest's interpretation of the Progressive Imperfect. First, why would the Lord Jesus Christ have to repeatedly order an unclean spirit to come out of a man when that selfsame spirit had just worshipped him (Mark 5:6), and confessed his deity (Mark 5:7)? Secondly, Mr. Wuest's bold assertion explicitly defies the recognition given to the Lord Jesus Christ in Mark 1:27 that, ".even the unclean spirits.do obey him." In the context in Mark 1:25-27, the Lord Jesus rebuked the spirit (ἐπετιμήσεν [Aorist Active Indicative 3 rd Singular], which is not Imperfect to be obfuscated by Wuest), and ordered the spirit to come out of the man (using the same Aorist Imperative, ἐξελθε, as was used in Mark 5:8). It should also be noted here that the word used for speaking is not an Imperfect indicative, but a Complementary Participle, λεγών.

Another variety of subdivision within the sphere of the Imperfect Indicative is that which is deemed the, "Conative Imperfect." Under the heading of "tendential imperfect," David Allen Black defines the Conative Imperfect as:

The tendential imperfect presents the action as having been attempted but not accomplished: ο... Ιωαννης διεκωλυεν αυτον, John was trying to prevent him (Matt. 3:14). (Black, 106)

Coincidentally, Wallace (pg. 550), Turner (pg. 65), and Dana and Mantey (pg.189) list Black's example of the Conative Imperfect in Matthew 3:14. Wallace translates

as Black, while Turner relegates the passage as, ".wished to hinder." With these in mind, another passage which is more relevant to the discussion at hand, is Mark 15:23. Again, Wallace (pg. 551), Turner (pg. 65), and now Robertson (pg. 885) cite this passage as a palpable illustration of the same. In this, we turn to Kenneth Wuest who gives us the following regarding Mark 15:23:

We have the conative imperfect, 'they tried to give, offered.' This was a stupefying drink which was usually offered to condemned malefactors through the charity (it is said) of the women of Jerusalem, the intention being to deaden the sense of pain. This drink Jesus refused. (Wuest 282)

In this perspective, the grammarians are once again at variance with one another on the translation of the Conative Imperfect being represented by the verb ἐδίδου (Imperfect Active Indicative, 3rd plural form of δίδωμι). While Wallace renders the verb, "*they were attempting to give,*" (pg. 551), Turner postulates, "*tried to give*" (pg. 65- which is none other than an aorist form of translation), and of course much to the inconsistency of his claims, Mr. Wuest gives, "*And they offered him.*" (Pg. 282) in his own expanded translation (which of course is an AORIST type of rendition). However, if all of that were not sufficient to prove the innocence and perfection of our beloved A.V. text in regard to the Imperfect Indicative in the Gospel of Mark, shooting for overkill, here are some examples of the renderings of the Imperfect Indicative form of δίδωμι in the NASB and the NKJV:

- "Then they gave him." (Mark 15:23- NKJV)
- "And they tried to give." (Mark 15:23- NASB)
- ".and yielded." (Mark 4:8- NKJV [ἐδίδου - Imperfect Active Indicative, 3rd Singular])
- "they yielded." (Mark 4:8- NASB)
- "gave them power." (Mark 6:7- NKJV [ἐδίδου - Imperfect Active Indicative, 3rd Singular])
- "was giving them authority." (Mark 6:7- NASB [here the NASB keeps the supposedly literal rendition of the imperfect, but notice number 7 below])
- "and gave them authority." (Mark 6:7- NASB Update)
- "and gave them." (Mark 6:41- NKJV [ἐδίδου again])
- "He kept giving them." (Mark 6:41 - NASB and Updated edition: both editions of the NASB keep what they call the literal imperfect, but as you can see, it is poor English as was pointed out by the quotation from Dean Burgon earlier in this treatise)

Leaving, therefore, the principles surrounding the usage of the Imperfect Indicative in the Gospel of Mark, let us move onto another egregious error of Mr. Wuest, this time in reference to the Subjunctive mood of the Aorist tense. Mr. Wuest informs us in regards to Mark 9:9:

Were risen. The idea in Greek is not that of the perfect tense. The aorist subjunctive is used. The idea is more exactly, 'should rise.' (Wuest 178)

Defining the Subjunctive mood, Dr. Wallace informs us:

The subjunctive is the most common of the oblique moods in the NT. In general, the subjunctive can be said to represent the verbal action (or state) as uncertain but probable. It is not correct to call this the mood of uncertainty because the optative also presents the verb as uncertain. Rather, it is better to call it the mood of probability so as to distinguish it from the optative. (Wallace 461)

David Allan Black categorizes the various types of Subjunctives as hortatory, prohibition, deliberative, emphatic negation, and content (Black 99). Besides these, which are essentially independent uses of the Subjunctive, there are a variety of subordinate clauses involving the conjunction $\iota\alpha$ (the most common usage), those involving indirect questions with an accompanying interrogative particle, future conditions involving $\epsilon\alpha\nu$, those in indefinite relative clauses, and those in indefinite temporal clauses (see Wallace 461-480). These are introduced to correct a senseless omission permeated by Mr. Wuest, namely, while professing to be granting material for the benefit of the English reader not so accustomed to Greek, he incessantly employs usage of Greek grammatical nomenclature of which the English reader has absolutely no knowledge. Therefore, it is expedient to give a brief description of these things.

It is most unfortunate that Mr. Wuest simply corrects the Authorized Version by a passing statement that the Greek word underlying the English text is an "Aorist Subjunctive," as if this ends the matter without any more information being warranted. However, a perusal of this Subjunctive mood, along with its underlying principles, coupled with a comparison of relevant verses, will yield the obvious information that is unbeknownst to the English reader solely acquainted with Kenneth Wuest's study of the Gospel of Mark.

To begin, Mark 9:9 in Nestle's Greek New Testament is as follows:

Και καταβαινοντων αυτων εκ του ορους διεστειλατο αυτοις ινα
μηδενι α ειδον διηγησωνται, ει μη οταν ο υιος του ανθρωπου εκ
νεκρων αναστη

Although there are some variations between Nestle's text and the Receptus underlying the A.V. 1611 in this verse, the Subjunctive clause under consideration is the same in both texts. Therefore, a listing of the variants here would be redundant.

Αναστή (which is the 2nd Aorist Active Subjunctive, 3rd Singular of ἀνίστημι - cause to stand up or rise; raise up [as the dead], etc.) in Mark 9:9 is the Subjunctive used in an indefinite temporal clause. This particular usage indicates "a future contingency" (Wallace, pg. 479), referencing the time of the action to the main verb in the sentence. This type of usage is frequently employed after a temporal adverb (also known as an improper preposition), such as εως, αχρι, μεχρι, or after a temporal conjunction, such as οταν, meaning, whenever (which is a coalesced form of the conjunction οτε with the particle αν). The passage in Greek above is translated in the A.V. 1611, "And as they came down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the Son of man were risen from the dead." The underlined portion is the translation of the Aorist Subjunctive under consideration. Wuest automatically assumes that this rendition of the A.V. 1611 is a rendition equated with the perfect tense, hence a mistranslation of the subjunctive. He further, as seen above, asserts that this should be "*should rise.*" However, an examination of other Aorist Subjunctives following οταν, along with Mr. Wuest's rendition of them, will once again exonerate the A.V. text, proving its complete authenticity and veracity.

- It should be observed that just because the words "were risen" are used doesn't necessarily imply that the A.V. translators are substituting the Perfect tense for the Subjunctive. On the contrary, they render the Aorist Subjunctive following οταν as Mr. Wuest would have them render it in Mark 9:9 in the following passages: Matt. 5:11 ("when men shall revile you"); Matt. 9:15 ("when the bridegroom shall be taken"); Mark 2:20 ("when the bridegroom shall be taken"); Mark 13:7 ("And when ye shall hear "), etc. Hence, the A.V. translators had a point in their rendering in Mark 9:9. This shall be demonstrated momentarily.

- After all of the rigmarole concerning the more "exact" meaning of the Aorist Subjunctive in Mark 9:9, Mr. Wuest goes on himself to translate two sets of Aorist Subjunctives without any future indication ("should," "shall," etc.) as he promulgated previously. In Mark 12:23, he translates the Aorist Subjunctive (following οταν to boot) as, "*In the resurrection, when they are raised.*" Again, with a similar construction in Mark 12:25, Mr. Wuest offers, "*For when they arise.*" In both passages, the A.V. 1611 rendered the Aorist Subjunctive as, "when they shall rise" (both also following οταν).

- It should also be noted, that in the fair usage of good and idiomatic English, that the A.V. translators were perfectly within the logical confines of accurate translation to render Mark 9:9 as, "were risen." The reason for this is explained in examining every day English. When one desires to present a hypothetical scenario to another with which he is in dialogue, he often speaks in the following fashion: "What if I were to tell you.?" "What would you do, if he were to not pay you on

time.?" Seeing then that the Subjunctive mood is one that speaks of probability (as attested by Wallace above), referencing what could take place, what better way to render such a point than to say that the disciples shouldn't say anything until the Son of Man "were risen" from the dead?

- If those were not conclusive enough to establish the case, then what can be said of other forms of the Subjunctive with an indefinite temporal clause that translates a verse in what seems to be past time? Were not we told that the Subjunctive follows the time relative to that of the main verb? Aren't the main verbs in Mark 9:9 denoted by διεστείλατο (Aorist Middle Indicative, 3rd Singular of διαστελλω- admonish, direct, charge, command, etc.) and ειδον (2nd Aorist Active Indicative, 3rd Plural of οραω- I see)? Wallace translates the indefinite temporal clause in John 13:38 as, "*you have denied*" (αρνηση following εως ου- Wallace, pg. 479), and Matthew 5:26 as, "*you have paid back*" (αποδωσ following εως αν, ibid.). Following Wuest's logic, shouldn't these be rendered as "you should deny," and "you should pay back," respectively?

- Notwithstanding, what does one say to the NKJV which translates the Aorist Subjunctive in Mark 9:9 as, "*till the Son of Man had risen from the dead;*" Or the ASV, "*should have risen.*"; "*had risen*" in the New International Version; "*had risen*" in the New Living Translation; "*should have risen*" in the RSV; "*had risen*" in the NWT of the Russellites?

- Finally, who could have neglected to see that the indefinite temporal clause involving οταν in Matthew 23:15, in regard to the modern versions, is consistently translated in fashion with the A.V. 1611. The phrase under consideration in Greek is, και οταν γενηται (γενηται is the 2nd Aorist Middle Deponent Subjunctive, 3rd Singular form of γινομαι- I become), which is translated as follows in the A.V. 1611 and subsequently in other English versions. Notice how absolutely none of them follow the pattern as given by Wuest, but all follow in suit with the King's English:

"and when he is made." A.V. 1611

"and when he becomes a proselyte." RSV

"and when he becomes one." NIV

"and when he is become so." ASV

"and when he becomes one." NASB

"and when he becomes." Anointed Standard Translation

"and when he is won." NKJV

"and when he is made." Douay-Rheims

"and when he becomes one." NWT

In nearly all of the major, modern Bible versions, the verb ἐραυνάτε / ἐρευνάτε (Present Active Indicative/Imperative, 2nd Plural of ἐρευνάω- search, trace, investigate, explore, etc.) is interpreted as an Indicative in John 5:39, while the King James renders it as an Imperative. William Mounce concisely expounds the reason for this diversity of interpretation as follows:

Do not be fooled by the imperative second person plural (active and middle) endings (ετε, εσθε; σατε, σασθε). They are the same as the indicative. In the present, context will usually decide whether a particular form is a statement or a command. In the aorist, there will not be an augment (Mounce 313)

However, why investigate a passage in John's Gospel when the focus is on Kenneth Wuest's grammar in Mark's Gospel? The explanation is plainly given by Mr. Wuest himself as he comments on Mark 2:25 in the following:

The word is ουδεποτε, literally, 'did ye not ever,' expecting an affirmative answer. These Pharisees knew the Old Testament scriptures frontwards and backwards. Our Lord was appealing to their knowledge of the Old Testament. Incidentally, our Lord did not say to these same religious teachers, 'Search the scriptures' (John 5:39), but 'Ye are constantly searching the scriptures.' The verb could be either imperative or indicative in form. The context here decides for the latter. (Wuest 59-60)

Therefore, the argument here is one based on the interpretation of the context of the passage, and not one that is pertinent on syntactical or grammatical grounds. All parties commenting (so Mounce, so Wuest) seem to be in agreement that the word is both Indicative and Imperative in form, with the context being the deciding factor in the English translation of the word. "*The ambiguity of the imperative persists in the second person plural present where only the context can decide the mode. Thus ἐραυνάτε (Jo. 5:39;.*" (Robertson 941). Historically, Cyril, Erasmus, Beza, Lampe, Bengel, Campbell, Olshausen, Meyer, DeWette, Lucke, Tholuck, Webster and Wilkinson subscribed to the Indicative interpretation, while Chrysostom, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Maldonat, Wetstein, Stier, and Alford advocated the Imperative position. Hence, it comes down to the question of whether or not our Lord Jesus Christ was making a statement of indication, or whether he was making a solemn command to be embraced? Howbeit, as with every other point in this treatise, Greek scholarship is unable to give a definitive answer, since they are equally divided. Nonetheless, the Bible-Believing Christian with his Final Authority as found in the A.V. 1611, is fully prepared to deliver the verdict as to what our Lord Jesus Christ stated in John 5:39. As such, I contend that there are several reasons for promoting the Imperative interpretation as found in the King's English:

- Mr. Wuest asserts that the Pharisees knew the Old Testament Scriptures "*frontwards and backwards,*" although the proper word is "*forwards.*" The verb ἐρευνάω appears in the New Testament five times (twice as an Imperative; once as

an Indicative; and twice as a Participle). The two uses of the Imperative, both appear in John's Gospel. Howbeit, when it is used in John 7:52 (εραυνησον- Aorist Active Imperative, 2 nd Singular), it is in reference to the Pharisees rebuking Nicodemus for standing up for Jesus Christ. They told him to " SEARCH " for out of Galilee arises no prophet. This detail is very important because it stands to reason that the only other time that John employs usage of this verb it is in the imperative and subsequently (though indirectly) sheds light on the Pharisees lack of knowledge in the Old Testament Scriptures. Had the Pharisees searched the Scriptures, they would have discovered that a prophet did indeed arise out of Galilee, namely, the prophet Jonah (see II Kings 14:25- Gath-hepher is in Galilee [Joshua 19:10 -14]). Interestingly enough, this is the prophet whom the Lord chose to typify his death, burial and resurrection (see Matthew 12:40 -41 with Jonah 2:1-10).

- Although the Pharisees may have been familiar with a vast amount of the historical and prophetic material found in the Old Testament (see John 7:40-42; 1:19-21,24), they along with Kenneth Wuest and other expositors (ones that appeal to the Pharisees knowledge of the Old Testament as a vindication for the Indicative rendering of John 5:39), miss the point that no matter what they knew, they failed to correlate the Old Testament Scriptures with the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is the point that Jesus Christ was making in the context of John 5. He stated, ". and they are they which testify of me" (John 5:39). Again he said in the context, "for had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me" (John 5:46). This is the English Koine way of saying "you better look again." They may have looked at the Scriptures ad infinitum, but he was ordering them to search the Scriptures under the auspices that they testified of him in them.

- Jesus Christ constantly corrected the Pharisees with the very same Old Testament Scriptures with which they were supposed to be familiar. He corrected them on his deity in John 10:35; regarding his deity again in Matthew 22:41-46; and emphatically corrected them with a verse that depicted both his first and second advents in Matthew 21:41 -46. He informed them that they made the word of God of none effect through their tradition in Mark 7:13, and preached conclusively that they were of the devil (John 8:44) and did not hear the words of God because they were not of God (John 8:48).

- Finally, as a Scriptural correlation to further bolster the Imperative interpretation in John 5:39, there is the Imperative cross reference in II Timothy 2:15. In this passage the apostle Paul instructs Timothy:

σπουδασον σεαυτον δοκιμον παραστησαι τω θεω

Study to shew thyself approved unto God.

The verb σπουδασον (Aorist Active Imperative, 2nd Singular form of σπουδαζω- study, endeavor earnestly, etc.), which is rendered as "study," much to the chagrin of the modern versions, is clearly an imperative (command) given by Paul to

Timothy, which, since in the Aorist tense, cannot be discombobulated with the Present Indicative. This serendipity goes to demonstrate two facts. One, that there are two verses in the English Bible which Bible revisers have sought to alter, both being Imperatives, and both dealing with commands to search and study the Scriptures. Two, refuting the claims of those condoning the Indicative interpretation of John 5:39, Paul commands Timothy to study even though Timothy, by Paul's own admission, had known the Holy Scriptures from his childhood (see II Timothy 3:15). Therefore, it is erroneous and nugatory to assert that because the Pharisees knew the Scriptures, that Jesus Christ could not be commanding them to "Search the scriptures."

Lexicography & General Syntax

The proliferation of lexicographical blunders, and random errors of syntax are both ardently frequent and rampant throughout Mr. Wuest's commentary on the Greek text that he subscribes to as the basis for Mark's Gospel.

Concerning Mark 13:9, Wuest writes:

But the language goes beyond this, to the Jewish remnant in the Great Tribulation. The setting is Jewish. The expression should read, 'for a testimony to them' (simple dative), not 'a testimony against them.' (Wuest 247)

The passage under scrutiny reads in the King James Bible, "But take heed to yourselves: for they shall deliver you up to councils; and in the synagogues ye shall be beaten: and ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them." In Greek, the portion in bold reads, **εις μαρτυριον αυτοις**

As you can see, Mr. Wuest asserts that the A.V. 1611 is in error for not rendering the passage as a "simple dative" (which the reader not "conversant" in Greek would have absolutely no clue as to what that means), which would be "to" or "for" them. However, for the benefit of the reader, the basic fundamentals behind the dative case are as follows:

The dative substantive is that to or for which the action of the verb is performed. The indirect object will only occur with a transitive verb. When the transitive verb is in the active voice, the indirect object receives the direct object ('the boy hit the ball to me'); when the verb is in the passive voice, the indirect object receives the subject of the verb ('the ball was hit to me'). The indirect object is the receiver of the direct object of an active verb, or of the subject of a passive verb. (Wallace 140-141)

The use of the simple dative (as Wuest calls it), or the use of the pure dative (as Wallace names it), is indisputably the most common use of the dative in the New Testament. In short, it is the primary function of the dative; serving as the indirect object of a transitive verb. However, as with other syntactical points observed

earlier in this treatise by way of example through the verb and the Greek article, there are many subcategories and a variety of usages within the dative case.

When the dative case noun becomes indicative of the person interested in the action of the verb, the function of the dative can be classified generally as a Dative of Interest. Hence, *"growing out of the use of the dative of indirect object we have the dative used in a more specific expression of personal interest"* (Dana and Mantey 84). If the dative case carries this function in a given context, it usually, in a more vivid fashion, depicts the positive or negative aspect of this same idea. This being the case, the function of the dative is known as Dative of Advantage or Dative of Disadvantage. One of the major factors involved which distinguishes between a dative substantive being used as an indirect object or denoting interest is identified by the connotation of the verb.

Consequently, in the case before us, both the context of the passage, and the connotation of the verbs in the passage ("deliver you up," "ye shall be beaten," "and ye shall be brought") give the distinct idea of negativity and disadvantage. The context of the passage, even acquiesced by Wuest, has to do with the persecution of saints in the Tribulation period.

If a dative substantive is used in the idea of interest, and more specifically, a disadvantage, the translation can be provided in a variety of ways. Technically speaking, a dative of disadvantage can be rendered with the preposition "to," such as in Philippians 1:28 with *ητις εστιν αυτοις ενδειξις απωλειας* ("which is to them an evident token of perdition"), but in the case before us in Mark 13:9, Mr. Wuest simply pawned the dative usage off as a simple dative, and gave no accountability for its specific usage. In Matthew 23:31, there is a similar Dative of Disadvantage used that reads, *μαπτυρειτε εαυτοις* ("ye be witnesses UNTO yourselves"). Wallace renders this passage as *"you testify against yourselves,"* but all of this is truly immaterial, because Mr. Wuest corrects himself in Mark 6 before he even gets to Mark 13. In Mark 6:11, there is another Dative of Disadvantage, with the exact same construction as the passage under consideration in Mark 13:9. In Greek it reads, *εις μαρτυριον αυτοις*. Mr. Wuest, in his expanded translation, renders the passage, *"shake off the dust that is underneath your feet as a testimony AGAINST them"* (Wuest 124). Nevertheless, if this information were not available, our Lord Jesus Christ in the plain words of the English Bible provides the sum of the matter. In Mark 6:11 there is a variant reading, which is in the text of the Authorized Version, but is restricted to the apparatus in Nestle's text, which describes the precise reasoning as to why the word "against" is the right word to use in the A.V. 1611. The latter end of Mark 6:11, which is absent from the texts of the modern versions, reads as follows: "Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city." Paul says, "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you;" (II Thessalonians 1:6), with the context being the 2nd advent (see verses 8-9), it is no small thing that the idea behind testimony AGAINST these

individuals is that their actions will come back to be a witness at the judgment bar of God.

Next there is the anomaly of the rendering of Greek plurals as English singulars. One of the more famous cases is found in Matthew 14:9 and Mark 6:26, where the plural accusative τοὺς ὀρκούς is given in the King's English as a singular possessive ('the oath's). Commentators far and wide have insisted for centuries that this is an error in the King James Bible introduced by revisers of the A.V. 1611 that interpreted the plural in the 1611 edition (which is without apostrophes throughout the entire text of the Bible) as an English singular possessive. However, it is interesting to note that not only does Turner (pg. 26) ascribe the singular translation to the passage, but the singular interpretation is cross-referenced by Wallace (pg. 404-405), and is rendered as a singular possessive "*his oath*" by none other than Kenneth Wuest in his expanded translation (pg. 131). This then brings us to a peculiar note by Wuest in respect to Mark 1:6. He expounds:

'Hair' is plural in the Greek text. John's garment was not made of the skin of the camel, but was a rough cloth woven of camel's hairs (Wuest 20).

However, in his expanded translation Wuest writes, "*And there was this John, clothed habitually in a camel's hair garment.*" (Wuest 21). Again, Wuest takes a Greek plural accusative (τριχας), and translates it as an English singular. Unfortunately, he doesn't emphasize for his reader, confessedly not conversant in Greek, why this phenomenon takes place. This syntactical point is referred to a Categorical Plural, and is often used when a singular grammatical object is in scope. The modern versions employ usage of the Categorical Plural at their discretion, as does the A.V. 1611. In the NIV, the substantive τὰ στρατεύματα αὐτοῦ (plural accusative - "*his army*") is translated as an English singular in Matthew 22:7 and Revelation 19:19 (second reference), excepting the fact that the reference in Revelation is a genitive plural instead of an accusative. Nevertheless, on the reciprocal, the NIV translates the same plural substantive as a plural in English in Luke 21:20, Revelation 19:14, and Revelation 19:19 (first reference). Therefore, when a Greek plural of category is referred to in English, it isn't giving a revelation found in Greek that isn't in English (as Wuest's alludes to by stating what he does concerning the woven hairs in contradistinction from the skin of the camel), but is making a generic reference out of the plural. Every human being has thousands of hairs upon their heads (unless they suffer from hair loss or shave their head), but that doesn't prevent us from saying, "he has a full head of HAIR."

Discussing essential lexicography, Mr. Wuest condemns the A.V. 1611 for translating the verb συντηρεῖ (Imperfect Active Indicative, 3rd Singular of συντηρεῖν) as "observed," when he comments on Mark 6:20:

Observed him. The verb is συντηρεῖν 'to preserve a thing from perishing or being lost, to guard one, to keep him safe.' The A.V., rendering 'observe' is not correct (Vincent,

Robertson, Expositors). That is, Herod kept John safe from the evil plots of Herodias, who was seeking to kill him (Wuest 128).

On the contrary to Mr. Wuest's claims above, the rendering of the verb as "observe" is not only accurate, but a preservation of contemporary English even more so than the modern versions. First, there is the usage of the word "observe" in the 21st century which utilizes the precise meaning of "protect, preserve, keep safe, etc." The website of the Coastal Virginia Wildlife Observatory (www.cvwo.org), lists as its primary mission statement: "Protecting wildlife and habitats in coastal Virginia through field research, education, and land conservation." When one observes (used as such by the word παρατηρῶ in Galatians 4:10) a holiday, they keep that time in special consideration. Moreover, when a physician wants to retain a patient in the hospital, in order to assure that their condition doesn't immediately worsen, they keep them under observation.

Secondly, the A.V. rendering is more suitable for the context of Mark 6. Not only does Herod seek to protect John because Herodias "would have killed him; but she could not: For Herod feared John." (Mark 6:19-20), but "Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for Herodias' sake." So, the context fits both scenarios. Herod had John arrested because he preached against the sins of Herodias and Herod (see verses 17-18), but he also didn't want him dead, so he protected him. This type of observation is called "protective custody" in contemporary nomenclature.

Thirdly, not only does the meaning of the word observe as used in modern English vindicate the A.V. 1611, but the meaning of συντηρῶ as given in the lexicon justifies it as well. The New Analytical Greek Lexicon states that the word means to, "keep safe and sound; to observe strictly, or, to secure from harm, protect; to preserve in memory, keep carefully in mind" (Perschbacher 395-396). Nevertheless, that the A.V. translators were well aware that the root of the verb carries the connotation of "preserve, keep, etc." is easily demonstrable by the fact that they translated the same word as "preserved" in Matthew 9:17, "kept" in Luke 2:19, and "preserved" again in Luke 5:38.

Mr. Wuest says irresponsibly in light of Mark 2:5:

Son, thy sins be forgiven thee. 'Son' is τέκνον, 'child, the word 'son' being the proper translation of υἱός, 'an adult son' (Wuest 47).

It is conceded that the primary definition of τέκνον is "child." To this I offer no dispute. However, to make the passing usurpation that "son" is "the proper" translation of υἱός simply cannot be condoned to the eradication of the words as found in the A.V. 1611 text. Concerning these two words, Vine states, "The A.V. does not discriminate between τέκνον and υἱός." (Vine 187). Hence, Dean Burgon relayed this relationship aptly in 1883:

Τεκνον, nine times out of ten signifies nothing else but 'child.' On the tenth occasion, however, (e.g. where Abraham is addressing the rich man in Hades,) it would be absurd so to render it. We translate 'Son' (Burgon 153)

Similarly, the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament makes related observations:

In context the word may take on the sense 'son'. In the LXX it answers to 11 Heb. words, though predominately /B (Kittel V: 638).

Considering the reciprocal, I would stress the point that υιος, especially in the plural (though not always), is rendered properly in the A.V. 1611 as "children" instead of "sons" (so Galatians 3:26; Mark 2:19; certainly references to "the children of Israel" in Acts 9:15, 10:36; Romans 9:27, etc.). Furthermore, in a context such as Revelation 12:5, it would be completely unforgivable to render υιον αρρενα as "a man son." The A.V. translators rightly rendered υιος there as "child." Some of the modern versions (such as the NIV and the NASB), due to a textual variant that places αρσην in the neuter gender, thus segregating it from the masculine accusative υιον render the passage, "a son, a male child" making the "child" an italicized type of addition. However, in the text that underlies the A.V. 1611 the two substantives match in gender, number and case, so the proper rendition of υιος is "child" to avoid redundancy.

The Greek Article

Mr. Wuest's errors regarding the use of the Greek definite article are due both to negligence of applying proper grammatical principles, and a complete failure (as with the verb systems previously) in discerning between idiomatic and unidiomatic renderings of the article and the absences thereof.

Nevertheless, before engaging into Mr. Wuest's all too obvious plethora of articular discrepancies, it is noteworthy to list for the reader a general, but timeless and definitive statement on the usage of the Greek definite article by Drs. Dana and Mantey:

It is important to bear in mind that we cannot determine the English translation by the presence or absence of the article in Greek. Sometimes we should use the article in the English translation when it is not used in Greek, and sometimes the idiomatic force of the Greek article may best be rendered by an anarthrous noun in English. (Dana and Mantey 150-151)

Regarding the substantive αρχη, Mr. Wuest informs us in his comments on Mark 1:1:

Beginning, αρχη, 'beginning, origin, the person or thing that commences, the first person or thing in a series'; used without the definite article, showing that the expression is a kind of title. (Wuest 11)

Wuest's error here is only partial. Conceding the point that αρχη is functioning as a title in the passage, it should still be emphasized that it is misleading to inform the reader that αρχη is a title because it is anarthrous (without the definite article). The truth of the matter is that αρχη has other anarthrous functions (such as when it is used as the object of a preposition; see εν αρχη- John 1:1, etc.). Secondly, αρχη should not necessarily be deemed as a title because it lacks the definite article, but because it stands absolutely as a substantive in the Nominative case, independent from the whole of the sentence structure. On this matter, Wallace states:

The nominative absolute is the use of the nominative case in introductory material (such as titles, headings, salutations, and addresses), which are not to be construed as sentences. (Wallace 49)

Other anarthrous examples of substantives functioning absolutely in the Nominative case can be observed in introductory material such as Matthew 1:1, and Revelation 1:1. Had Mr. Wuest worded his sentence as Bishop Middleton ("*Titles, however, in apposition frequently want the Article.* " [Middleton 254]) regarding the function of αρχη, he might have been met with far less criticism.

In this next example, Mr. Wuest postulates a sort of converse to his usual criticism to the A.V. 1611 in perspective to the Greek article. As will be illustrated shortly, his usual manner of criticism revolves around the lack of the definite article in Greek being represented by an English definite rendering. However, for the present time, our observation will take us to a peculiar (yet not original) instance in which there is a definite article in Greek not subsequently designated by an English, " the."

Relating to Mark 6:32, Mr. Wuest asserts:

The definite article precedes the word 'ship.' The words 'by ship' are not an adequate translation. It was not merely by sea that they went, but in the boat, the πλοιον which was always kept in readiness to take our Lord out of danger from the crowds that would crush Him.

Unfortunate it is, that when it comes to the adverse implications of not corresponding the Greek article in the English translation by "the," that grammarians universally are quite irritable when discussing this syntactical phenomenon. The general consensus is that when the article is used in Greek, it is always significant and never without meaning. Concerning εις το πλοιον in Matthew 13:2, Bishop Middleton pontificates, "*In the present instance, English Version, Newcome and Campbell understand το πλοιον indefinitely; but that any ship, without reference, can be meant by this phrase is grammatically impossible*" (Middleton 211). Before proceeding, if Mr. Middleton is correct on this bold

assertion, then not only is the A.V. grammatically incorrect, but so are the NKJV, NIV, NASB, ASV, RSV, and NLT. It seems that the problem in this regard with Greek scholarship is that they are willing to disregard good English for the preservation of the interpretation of an established principle. Again, Bishop Middleton reiterates:

There is not, however, as has been shown in this work, any such thing as an indefinite sense of the Article; that, which has sometimes been so denominated, being no other than its hypothetic use, explained Part I. Chap. III Sect. ii. which is wholly inapplicable to the present case. (Middleton 211-212)

Conceding to the impression that the Greek article is not without due signification, it cannot be acquiesced that this infers that the Greek article must always be imitated by an English definite. Despite his many brilliant concepts on the Greek article, what the good Bishop is neglecting to communicate at this moment is that the Generic use of the Greek article is sometimes best reiterated by an English indefinite article. A Generic article as such is used to denote and distinguish one class from another (i.e. mankind, the animal kingdom, the realm of angels). Ο εργατης ("the labourer") in Luke 10:7 is an excellent example of this class usage. However, although you have the presence of the Greek article, sometimes it is best to render the translation with an English indefinite article. Such a case can be seen in Matthew 18:17 with the usage of the nouns ο εθνικος (Second declension Masculine Singular - "Heathen" [also Gentile]) and ο τελωνης (First declension Masculine Singular- "Publican" [also tax-collector]), which are presented by the King's English as "an heathen man and a publican." Dr. Wallace makes two excellent comments on this usage:

In translation we would probably say, ' a Gentile and a tax-collector.' However, this is due to the fact that the force of the generic article is qualitative, since it indicates the class to which one belongs (thus, kind), rather than identifying him as a particular individual. Sometimes the English indefinite article brings out this force better (Wallace 228).

Again, Daniel Wallace delineates:

At times, the most natural translation is to replace the article with an indefinite article. This is because both indefinite nouns and generic nouns share certain properties: while one categorizes or stresses the characteristics of a given class (generic), the other points to an individual within a class, without addressing any traits that would distinguish it from other members (indefinite). (Wallace 228)

Other examples can be observed in Matthew 23:24 with τον κωνωπα, την δε καμηλον, " a gnat and a camel, and I Timothy 3:2 with τον επισκοπον, " a bishop."

Hence, returning to the problem presented by Mr. Wuest in Mark 6:32, even though "ship" is arthrous in Greek, the A.V. 1611 leaves off the definite article in order to emphasize the point of quality, not particularity. This is not only observed by the omission of the English definite article, but by the usage of the prepositional phrase. In Mark 6:32, the phrase reads as thus in Greek εν τω πλοιω- "by ship." The usage of the preposition εν in this context is what we call a dative of means. The basal definition for this preposition is "in," but the context can also call for usages such as within, during, while, when, because of, by, with, etc. "By one Spirit" in I Corinthians 12:13 is a palpable example. Here εν is used to indicate the means of a particular agent shown to be the instrument by which a specific action takes place. This can also be seen in Mark 1:8 (εν πνευματι αγιω - "with the Holy Ghost"). Regarding the case in Mark 6:32, "ship" is the means through which our Lord and his disciples departed into a desert place. Had the article been translated in this instance, the emphasis would be placed upon the actual ship used instead of the fact that it was a ship being the means through which they departed privately.

Furthermore, in Wuest's notes on Mark 6:32, he attempts to justify his criticism of the A.V. text by stating that the use of the definite article proliferates the idea that a ship or a small "rowboat" at other times was always ready at hand for our Lord. Wuest of course, as per usual, makes this bold assertion without any foundation support. However, Bishop Middleton, in his earlier comments on Matthew 13:2, cites Mr. Wakefield as an authority to justify this theory (see Middleton, pg. 212). They postulate the concept that because our Lord had a ship in waiting (see Luke 5:3), and that a ship was later said to belong to Simon Peter (see Luke 8:22), that the reader should understand it of a ship previously mentioned. However, this really begs the question of which ship was previously narrated in the context? On the contrary, we see this phenomenon handled extremely precise by the King's translators. Introducing "ship" into a passage, the A.V. 1611 gives us "in a ship" (εν τω πλοιω) in Matthew 4:21, but THEN "the ship" (το πλοιον) subsequently in Matthew 4:22. Cleverly, the A.V. 1611 introduces "ship" into the narrative of Mark 8:10 with "into a ship" (εις το πλοιον), THEN informs us that it is a definite ship in Mark 8:13 by stating, "into the ship again" (εμβας παλιν εις το πλοιον). Oftentimes, because "ship" is unknown in the contextual narrative, it is introduced as a particular member of a class indefinitely, though it has the Greek article attached to it. Hence, even in Acts 27:2, we observe the omission of the Greek article introducing "ship" into a narrative (επιβαντες δε πλοιω - "entering into a ship"), with the particular emphasis on the ship introduced returning with both the Greek and English definite articles in Acts 27:10,15, etc. (note: "ship" in Acts 27:10 is definite in English by means of the compound usage of the article following " the lading" in the verse).

Commenting on Mark 1:7, Mr. Wuest places an overemphasis on the Greek article when he states:

The definite article is used. There cometh 'the One,' not merely 'one.' It was a distinctive, unique, outstanding Person, even the Jehovah of the Old Testament who was to come (Wuest 21)

The words in Greek under consideration are *ερχεται ο ισχυροτερος μου οπισω μου* ("there cometh one mightier than I after me"). Wuest insists that the insertion of the article before the adjective *ισχυρος* is indicative of the fact that the sentence structure is referring to the deity of Jesus Christ. However, although we are always forward to emphasize the deity of our Lord (see I Cor. 12:3), it should not be done at the expense of the fundamentals of Greek syntax. The rudimentary cause here for the insertion of the article is that the adjective in the passage (*ισχυροτερος*- Nominative Masculine Singular, Comparative Adjective) is functioning substantively as a comparative adjective. When an adjective functions substantively, it takes the place of a noun and not infrequently serves as the subject of a sentence. If Wuest's point had any viable substance to it, then why does our Lord refer to himself as *οτι του ιερου μειζον εστιν ωδε* ("that in this place is one greater than the temple") in Matthew 12:6? Doesn't the same point reside in Matthew 12:41-42? Granted the article is wanting in Greek, but would that not establish the point even further? If our Lord were seeking to emphasize himself particularly, would not the article be employed if Wuest's point were valid?

Notwithstanding, there is an amicable attestation to our objection in Luke 7:28, which reads, *ο δε μικροτερος εν τη βασιλεια του θεου μειζων αουτου εστι* ". but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he." In this example there is an adjective (*μικρος*), functioning substantively as a Comparative adjective (the difference in the adjectives being that although *μικροτερος* is grammatically comparative, it is contextually superlative). In this example, there is nothing out of the ordinary about the article, just as in Wuest's example in Mark 1:7, saving the fact that it is allowing the adjective to serve as a noun in the verse. Other than the fact that the article segregates the point that there is a specific individual to whom the details of the verse are reserved for, there is nothing that can be gleaned from it syntactically. As far as Mark 1:7 referring to our Lord Jesus Christ, that piece of information is ascertained from a study of the context, NOT the location of the Greek definite article.

Compounding the evidence that his knowledge of the Greek article is elementary in nature, Mr. Wuest proves this further by commenting on Mark 15:39:

The centurion, impressed with all that had taken place, exclaimed (A.V.), 'Truly this man was the Son of God.' There is no definite article before the word 'Son.' What this soldier said was, 'Truly, this man was a son of God.' (Wuest 284-285)

After going to great lengths to state that the definite article before the Comparative adjective in Mark 1:7 was evidentiary of Jesus Christ being the manifestation of the Jehovah of the Old Testament, Mr. Wuest is very quick to dispose of a reference to

our Lord's deity in the passage at hand. In Greek, nonetheless, the passage in question reads as follows: Ἀληθῶς ὁ ἀνθρώπος οὗτος υἱὸς ἦν θεοῦ, "Truly this man was the Son of God."

Before engaging in another dismantlement of Mr. Wuest's unacceptable syntactical assertions, it is necessary to establish pertinent ground rules by which to interpret the words in dispute. First, it seems inconsistent at best for Mr. Wuest to place such an emphasis on the lack of the article before υἱός but then nonchalantly pass by θεός as if it had the article in contradistinction. Therefore, if consistency were to play a part in this grammatical fiasco, why not render the passage, "a son of a god"? After all Mr. Wuest in his book goes on to emphasize that the centurion had no way of knowing the Messianic implications of the Lord Jesus Christ (see Wuest, pg. 285) referencing the phraseology of the Jewish scribes. Unfortunately, this is not the first occasion in which we have witnessed Mr. Wuest employ theological bias in order to bolster his grammatical proclivities.

Secondly, there are other grammatical considerations, which Mr. Wuest either did not consider, or did not give his readers (admittedly not conversant in Greek) the benefit of investigating. The first to be considered is what we call a "Monadic Noun." The structure of the Monadic Noun is one in which the noun is one-of-a-kind. Therefore, since it is one-of-a-kind, the definite article in Greek is unnecessary and maybe even deemed redundant. An excellent example of this syntax and consequently a parallel to the phrase in Mark 15:39 is κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ ("shall be called the Son of God") in Luke 1:35. In this passage you have the anarthrous noun υἱός which is definite because it is a reference to Jesus Christ, who is the "only begotten Son." Hence, it is obvious that υἱὸς θεοῦ can be demonstrably definite without the insertion of the Greek article. In reference to this passage, Bishop Middleton emphasizes:

Here also, of course, Mr. Wakefield translates 'a son of God.' See on ver. 32. Besides, if υἱὸς θεοῦ be here to be taken in the inferior sense, what becomes of the inference implied in δῖο? To announce to the Virgin that she shall have offspring by the extraordinary agency of God, and to add 'therefore that offspring shall be called (or 'shall be) a holy man,' really appears to me to be a downright anti-climax. (Middleton 285-286)

In respect to his comments above, Mr. Middleton says to refer to his comments on Luke 1:32 where υἱὸς υψίστου ("the Son of the Highest") are also anarthrous in similarity to the passage under consideration in Mark 15:39. He cleverly points out that Mr. Wakefield is equally inconsistent (as I have previously stated of Mr. Wuest) in rendering υἱός "a son" for not also rendering υψίστου "a most High God." Bishop Middleton fastens the certainty that our Lord Jesus Christ must either be "the Son of God" or merely one of many sons of God, which are so styled υἱοὶ θεοῦ in Romans 8:14. Therefore, he reiterates, υἱός must be anarthrous "in the original" (so phrases Middleton, pg. 285), as ὁ υἱός after κληθήσεται would not be Greek. Furthermore, he notes that υψίστου in the LXX is frequently without the

article. Along these lines the careful reader should readily incorporate "the Son of God" from Daniel 3:25 into the context of this discussion. There, modern scholarship incessantly and verbosely demands that the passage be rendered "a son of the gods" because the noun *rb*(son) lacks the definite article *h*. However, it should be noted in similar fashion that the reading *aaaa aaAMhlaaa rbl* can be deemed as definite as it is found in the A.V. 1611 because a noun in the construct position doesn't take the article. In this regard, Vance states most assuredly:

A noun in the construct state never takes the article. If the absolute noun is definite (proper names and the words for God are definite without the article) then the construct noun is translated as definite (Vance 26)

Thirdly, there is a specific Greek construction known as Apollonius' Canon. This canon, so named after the second century Greek grammarian, Apollonius Dyscolus, essentially teaches that with regard to genitive phrases, the head noun and the genitive following it, generally recapitulate one another in respect to the articularity. This principle can easily be observed by inspecting to *πνευμα του θεου* ("the Spirit of God" - Matt. 3:16); *την λαμπροτητα του ηλιου* ("the brightness of the sun" - Acts 26:13); *η βασιλεια του θεου* ("the kingdom of God" - Mark 1:15), etc.

Confirming this postulation are the words of Bishop Middleton, who again dictates:

Another omission respects Nouns in regimen. It was remarked, that according to Apollonius the Article is prefixed to both the governing and the governed Nouns, or else it is omitted before both. An omission will, therefore, frequently be observable, where the governing Noun might seem to require the definite form (Middleton 67)

Along these lines of thought, it is noteworthy that in 1983, David Hedges, as a Master's thesis for the M.Div. degree at Grace Theological Seminary, constructed a corollary to Apollonius' Canon. This corollary basically promulgates the idea that when both nouns are anarthrous in a genitive construction, then both nouns will usually have the same semantic force. Hence, if one of the nouns can be proved to be definite in the context, then it is statistically likely that both nouns are definite. In subsequent studies done by Dr. Wallace and others, although Hedges hypothesis is not an established rule, it has been shown to possess general validity in the majority of the instances examined. An example of the anarthrous definite-definite construction can be attested by Romans 1:18 where *οργη θεου* is most certainly "the wrath of God." In short, relating to Wuest's hypothesis in Mark 15:39, if *θεου* is definite in the context (which it must since our Lord had no other Father than Almighty God), then *υιος* is certainly definite as well. Therefore, it is evident that the verse found in Mark 15:39 can be interpreted as a Monadic Noun, an example of Apollonius' Canon, or more specifically, another example of the more experimental and less established corollary hypothesized by David Hedges.

The last portion of this section on the Greek Article that shall be examined is Kenneth Wuest's greatest accusation against the A.V. text in respect to the usage of

the article, and that is, namely, that the exclusion of the definite article in Greek is justification for the indefinite translation into English. Hence, if it is anarthrous in Greek, it should be rendered indefinitely in English. On this matter, in respect to Mark 1:3, he expounds:

The voice; no definite article in the Greek text. The Baptist was not the only mouthpiece of God sent to Israel. John only claimed to be 'a voice,' not 'the voice' (John 1:23). (Wuest 13)

Details in perspective to Apollonius' Canon were relegated above, being witnessed by the material from Bishop Middleton, and also by the corollary to that Canon by David Hedges. Since the semantic force of the head noun is particularly the same for the genitive connected with it, it is certainly feasible that two anarthrous nouns fitting this construction can be deemed as definite. Therefore, again, as with the example with Mark 15:39 above, just because the nouns lack the article, it is not sufficient to render the words as English indefinites. In regards to Mark 1:3, we have an anarthrous substantive in the Nominative case (φωνη) followed by an anarthrous participle in the Genitive case (βοωντος). This matches the Apollonius construction again, and as Bishop Middleton refers us to this principle (Middleton, pg. 170), he notes that Mr. Wakefield, evidently unaware of this grammatical function, translates the passage as Wuest, "*a voice of one crying.*" Observing that the passage is found in the same construction in Matthew 3:3, Luke 3:4, and John 1:23 (hence, three other times), each time being attested by the fact that John's ministry is a direct fulfillment of the prophecy depicted in Isaiah 40, it is abundantly clear that the reason that "voice" or φωνη should be rendered as definite is because it is a reference to a specific voice; a certain voice. Just because the passage is rendered as a definite doesn't call for the accusation that this defines the meaning as THE ONLY voice as thrust upon us for the interpretation of such usage by Kenneth Wuest. In line with the A.V. 1611 are the NKJV, NASB, and the RSV. The dissenting versions are the NIV, and the NLT. Similarly, the LXX has a similar anarthrous construction in Greek, yet Sir Lancelot Brenton translates the passage as the A.V. 1611, "the voice."

Textual Considerations

Besides the plethora of grammatical blunders, lexicographical assertions, syntactical oversights, negligence in explanations, failure to define terms, and a general refusal to properly reference source material cited, Kenneth Wuest, while using the A.V. 1611 as his English base, employed usage of a subsequent critical Greek text that doesn't correspond to the King James Bible. Therefore, throughout his commentary, the pages are indefatigably and relentlessly adorned with phrases such as, "not in Nestle's text," "not in the best texts," "missing in Aleph and B," "oldest and best texts omit," "rejected by Nestle," "Nestle omits," ad infinitum throughout his work.

Mr. Wuest's first error in regards to textual orientation is in the assumption that there is "the Greek text." In the introduction to his work, he pontificates:

The student can study it through verse by verse, and with the help of this book, obtain a clearer, more vivid portrait of the Lord Jesus than he could from the translation he is using, and for the reason that he has been given access to the Greek text (Wuest Intro.)

In the very next sentence, hence the final paragraph of the introduction, Wuest admits: "*The English translation commented upon is the Authorized Version, and the Greek text used is that of Nestle*" (Wuest Intro.). It is abundantly clear, that in actuality, the "student" has absolutely no chance of completing Mr. Wuest's study of the Gospel of Mark with any faith left in his King James Bible, which, (since he is not conversant with the Greek language to start with [see Wuest's introduction]) he depended upon to lead him in his initial course of study. At no time throughout his book on the Gospel of Mark, does Kenneth Wuest make one inclination as to what "the Greek text" is, nor does he even consider advising his reading audience what "the best text" is, or what "the best texts" are. You are left to assertions and guesswork, which are the unfortunate fruit of Mr. Wuest's labors, definitively manifested in this treatise. Therefore, before concluding my remarks upon Kenneth's Wuest's study on the Gospel of Mark, it behooves us to examine at least one instance in which he insists that "the best texts" are superior to the text that underlies the King's English in Greek.

Considering the textual variant in Mark 1:2, Mr. Wuest describes it as thus:

In the prophets. The best Greek texts have 'in Isaiah the prophet.' The quotation is from Malachi and Isaiah 40:3. As to the apparent discrepancy here, Robertson says that it was common to combine quotations from the prophets. Bruce, in Expositor's Greek Testament, says, 'An inaccuracy doubtless, but not through error of memory, but through indifference to greater exactness, the quotation from Isaiah being what chiefly occupied the mind. It is somewhat analogous to attraction in grammar.' (Wuest 12)

The "texts" which contain the reading "in Isaiah the prophet" or εν τῷ Ησαϊα τῷ προφητῇ are uncial mss. Aleph B D L Δ; less than fifteen cursive mss. according to Dean Burgon (Burgon, Causes of Corruption in the Traditional Text, pg. 113); Nestle specifically cites minuscule mss. 33 565 892 1241 2427; Syriac Peshitta, the margin of the Harklean Syriac, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac as well as some copies of that version, the Latin, the Memphitic (Coptic according to Nestle), some codices of the Armenian, Erpenius' Arabic, the Persic and the Gothic for the Early Versions; Titus of Bostra (Adv. Manich. iii.4 per Burgon, The Traditional Text, pg. 108), Origen (Cels. ii.4; Comment. In John i.14, *ibid*) listed as in part by Nestle (pg. 90), Irenaeus (III.xi.8), Epiphanius, Basil (Adv. Eunom. ii.15), Serapion, Victorinus of Pettau (In Apoc. S. Joann.), Severianus, Porphyry

(according to Whitney, pg. 171), and others representing the testimonies of the church fathers.

For the external evidence in support of "in the prophets" or εν τοις προφηταις we have uncial mss. A E F G H K M P S U V Γ Π; the vast majority of the extant cursive mss., ferrar group 13; the Early versions consist of some Vulgate mss, the Harklean Syriac, one manuscript of the Memphitic (which has both readings conflated into the text), the text of the Philoxenian Syriac, Zohrab's Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Roman Arabic as well as that of the Polyglot, and the Slavonic; the church fathers are represented by Porphyry (Burgon, The Traditional Text, pg. 108), Titus of Bostra, Origen, Irenaeus (III.xvi.3), Eusebius, Victor of Antioch, Ambrose, Photius, and Theophylact.

Beginning with the witnesses of the early versions, when the contents of other relevant material is factored in, it becomes evident that they don't play an integral part as weighty witnesses in the attestation of the false reading ('Isaiah the prophet'). Isaiah's name can be found in copies of the Old Latin in Matthew 1:22, Zechariah's name placed into Matthew 21:4, as well as the removal of Jeremy's name from Matthew 27:9. The first blunder can also be discovered in the Curetonian Syriac, Lewis' edition, the Harklean Syriac, as well as the Palestinian Syriac, and Codex D (D, however, can probably be explained on the account of its Latin affinity). The second error made its way into the writings of Chrysostom and Hilary, with the third manifestation of corruption being witnessed in the Peshitta. Notwithstanding, the Latin and Syriac, in Matthew 2:23, replace του προφητου with των προφητων by "*misapprehension of the Evangelist's meaning*" (Burgon, Causes, pg. 112).

Secondly, it should be noted that this blunder in Mark 1:2 is not only attested by Codex Aleph, but other such fabrications are thrust into that manuscript. In Matthew 13:35, the name of Isaiah is found, although the citation is clearly from Psalm 78:2 (see Nestle, pg. 35). Of course, this inexcusable alteration could not stand, being later corrected in the mss. by another scribe.

Statistically considering Aleph and B, although Wuest never specifically calls them, "the best texts," such a detail can be affirmed and ascertained by his substitution of his usual phrase "the best texts," with "*Robertson says that the words 'and of fasting' do not appear in the two best manuscripts (Aleph and B).*" (Wuest 187) However, if these two manuscripts are truly, "the best texts," then they are inaugurated as such *contra mundum*. Vaticanus possess 620 readings than cannot be found in any mss., as Sinaiticus 820 to boot. Together, throughout the New Testament, they omit 3,704 words, add 2,213, substitute 2,121, transpose 3,471, modify 1,772, levying a grand summation of 13,281 alterations to the Received Text of the New Testament.

The church fathers that witness to the fabricated reading in Mark 1:2 are somewhat interesting because of the nature of their testimony. For example, Titus and Basil are said to have but reproduced the text of Origen, along with his argument. Origen,

not only procured the reading, "Isaiah the prophet" in his text, but he did so by completely omitting the portion that is quoted from Malachi, thereby passing from "Isaiah the prophet" to the portion quoted from that prophet. According to Dean Burgon, Epiphanius does the same thing (see Burgon, *Causes*, pg. 113). Victorinus and Augustine simply quote the Latin version ("sicut scriptum est in Isaia propheta"), lacking variation. Porphyry the heretic, is hardly a reputable witness, on record as having written a book to prove that the Gospel writers were full of misstatements. Eusebius and Jerome both confess as their opinion that the name of Isaiah was admitted into the text "*through the inadvertency of the copyists*" (Burgon, *Causes*, pg. 114).

Seeing not only that the external evidence of the false reading is questionable, and that the concrete remaining witnesses are few and disputable in character, what does it stand to reason as to how this reading originated, being preserved in antiquity and forced upon Bible readers in the 21st century?

First, Dean Burgon insists that the origin of the reading, "Isaiah the prophet" came to pass as an assimilation to the text, when "*some critic with harmonistic proclivities should have insisted on supplying the second also, i.e. the parallel place in St. Mark's Gospel, with the name of the evangelical prophet, elsewhere so familiarly connected with the passage quoted?*" (Burgon, *Causes*, pg. 115). This question is posed after showing that the Eusebian tables each contained in a row all four references to the passage quoted from Isaiah 40 in reference to John the Baptist (Matt. 3:3; Mark 1:3; Luke 3:3-6; and John 1:23). With Matthew, Luke, and John all reading "Isaiah" (howbeit only quoting from Isaiah), it is easy to see how an unsuspecting scribe might naturally assimilate Isaiah into Mark's quote of two prophets.

Finally, to this reasoning Whitney ascribes, adding the point that the false reading (as given previously in the listing of evidence) appears in the margin of one Syriac version, then in the text of another. With these being the versions of the country of Tatian's Diatessaron, "*we need not be at a loss to see whence or how or when it got into the text. It evidently came from Matthew iii.3, through Tatian in the latter part of the second century. It is what Dr. Hort would call a Syrian, a distinctively Syrian reading, though preserved in Aleph B L 33 Origen, etc. The genuine reading, as found in the Received Text, comes down to us in later uncials and other documents.*" (Whitney 173).

Reverting back to Mark 9:29, we are not at all impressed by the infelicity of Wuest's reference to Dr. Robertson:

Robertson says that the words 'and of fasting' do not appear in the two best manuscripts (Aleph and B), also that it is clearly a late addition to help explain the failure of the disciples. Their failure was due to their prayerlessness. They lacked power because of that (Wuest 187)

And, how may we ask, is this reading (Gr.- και νηστεια, "and of fasting") "*clearly a late addition*" if the sole authority for its eradication from the text are Aleph and B? According to the external manuscript evidence available for the omission of the phrase, besides these two manuscripts of spurious character and uncertain origin, there is the Old Latin manuscript *k*, as well as cursive mss. 0274 and 2427. However, that is all.

Attesting to the reading of the Received text is a copious selection of texts so well accounted for, and so well distributed, that it is exhaustibly a wonder how any individual claiming to purport scholarship, could make such an injudicious remark as this is "*clearly a late addition.*" "And of fasting" is overwhelmingly supported by Uncials A C D E F G H K L M N S U V W X Γ Δ Θ Π Ψ, the entire envoy of cursives (save the two previously mentioned in support of the former), the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshitta and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Persic, etc. The fathers, such as Clement of Rome, Cyprian, and others vindicate the A.V. reading, although some invert the order of "prayer" and "fasting."

The Receptus or Received reading is not only witnessed by the host of testimonies above, but according to Nestle, it is possibly read in Papyrus 45 of the third century (Nestle, pg. 119). This exquisite detail goes a long way in refuting the claim of Robertson, blindly and superstitiously embraced by Mr. Wuest, namely, that the King James reading is a late addition. A Number of the versions above represent an older text than Aleph and B (such as the Old Latin and the Peshitta), some are essentially coeval with these two mss. (such as Codex Washingtonianus of the 4th century), and others are not very far removed (such as Codex Alexandrinus of the 5th century). Notwithstanding, the second corrector of Sinaiticus restores the ms. to the Receptus reading.

Seeing that the external evidence is not even a question, Whitney reports the following on internal considerations:

Christ believed in fasting as well as in praying, as his teaching and example abundantly show. Believing in it as a means of strengthening one's faith and of growth in grace generally, he naturally coupled it with prayer in his teaching. And those who know by experience the effect of fasting in keeping the mind clear and in preserving a spiritually minded condition of soul, are prepared to see the propriety and appositeness of coupling the two duties (Whitney 229)

The real issue is that not only is fasting reiterated doctrinally in other passages (Matthew 6:16-17; Acts 10:30; 13:3; 14:23, etc.), but it is readily altered by other variant readings of a similar circumstance and nature in other passages. In I Corinthians 7:5, the Received reading, τη νηστεια is shunned from the critical texts, just like Mark 9:29. The Receptus reading, "Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting" (Gr- τουτο δε το γενοσ ουκ εκπορευεται ει μη εν προσευχη και νηστεια). Hence,

there is some scribal motivation to emasculate these words from their inspired domains. Based on the overwhelming external testimony, and the obvious internal considerations, the passage should be left as it stands in the text of the A.V. 1611. On an interesting note, it should be observed that there is perhaps more external support for I John 5:7, than there is for this omission from Aleph and B, yet it is accepted antipaV. The false reading was obviously a very limited and fleeting perforation. Ultimately, some early scribe, not sedulously seeking to preserve the text, taking extravagant liberties as a transcriber, omitted the words from the sacred passage of Scripture, thus erecting an interminable scandal of confusion that still thunders in textual circles today.

Bibliography

- Black, David Alan. It's Still Greek To Me. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998.
- Burgon, John William. The Revision Revised. Collingswood: Dean Burgon Society Press, 2000.
- Burgon, John William. The Causes of Corruption of the Traditional Text. Collingswood: Dean Burgon Society Press, 1998
- Burgon, John William. The Tradition Texts of the Holy Gospels. Collingswood: Dean Burgon Society Press, 1998.
- Burgon, John William. The Last Twelve Verse of Mark. Oxford James Parker and Co., 1871.
- Coxe, Arthur Cleveland. An Apology For the Common English Bible. Pensacola: Vance Publications, 2001.
- Dana, H.E., & Julius Mantey. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. Toronto: The MacMillan Co., 1957.
- Funk, Robert. A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1973
- Kittel, Gerhard. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1964.
- La Sor, William Sanford. Handbook of New Testament Greek: An Inductive Approach Based on the Greek Text of Acts. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1973.
- Middleton, Thomas Fanshaw. The Doctrine of the Greek Article Applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament. Cambridge: Jay Smith Printer, 1828.

Moulton, James Hope & Nigel Turner. A Grammar of New Testament Greek Volume 3. Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd., 1988.

Mounce, William D. Basics of Biblical Greek. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Co., 2003.

Nestle, Eberhard, Erwin Nestle & Kurt Aland. Novum Testamentum Graece - 27th Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

Perschbacher, Wesley. The New Analytical Greek Lexicon. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers Inc., 1990.

Robertson, Archibald T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in Light of Historical Research. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914.

Tibbetts, Jeffrey A. A Critique of Kenneth Wuest's Mark in the Green New Testament for the English Reader. Tibbetts Publications, 2004.

Vance, Laurence M. A Practical Grammar of Basic Biblical Hebrew. Pensacola: Vance Publications, 1997.

Vine, W.E. Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words. Old Tappan: Flemming H. Revell Co., 1966.

Wallace, Daniel. Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1996.

Wigram, George V. The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers Inc., 1996.

Whitney, S.W. The Revisers Greek Text. Boston: Silver, Burdett & Co. 1892.

Wuest, Kenneth. Mark in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1950.

A More Sure Word of Prophecy Than Greek Scholarship

By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson

Modern Bible revisers, translators, accompanied by Romantic and Semitic language scholars, operate with one essential, basic, fundamental principle (either consciously or unwittingly) guiding them in their pursuits: Diminish and annihilate the authority of a single Book- the Authorized Version of the Holy Bible. While it is acceptable to publicly profess allegiance to this particular Book (use in church/chapel services, classroom lectures, etc.), it is equally and oppositely intolerable to receive and cleave to it as the Christian's sole and absolute authority for determining, "*Thus saith the Lord.*" Hence, in order to welcome the public reading of the King James Bible from pulpits far and wide, while still recommending any number of contemporary and contradictory English Bible versions, the preciseness of the words of God has been reduced to a preferential relativism.

In 1997 the faculty and staff of Central Baptist Theological Seminary conspired to write a book entitled *The Bible Version Debate*, 1 which is a buttressed title covertly designed to sequester the real, guileful objective: *How to Get Rid of Your Final Authority in Exchange for the Opinions and Preferences of the Faculty of Central Seminary*. The coconspirators include Douglas McLachlan, Larry Pettigrew, Roy Beacham, and W. Edward Glenny. Pastor Lloyd Streeter has thoroughly and aptly critiqued this hideous and deplorable work in his book *Seventy-five Problems with Central Baptist Seminary's Book The Bible Version Debate*. 2 Nevertheless, within the contents of this acme of Satanic ingenuity, Professor Glenny illustrates exactly how translation relativity operates: "*No translation of Scripture is perfectly exact or exhaustive, and Christians must realize the difference between the authority inherent in any translation of Scripture and the authority inherent in the meaning of the original language manuscripts.*" 3 Of course, we are indubitably curious as to which of the 5,656 NT Greek manuscripts 4 comprise "*the original language manuscripts.*" Besides the substitution of εως ου ετεκεν υιον (*until she gave birth to a son*) for εως ου ετεκεν τον υιον αυτης πρωτοτοκον (*till she had brought forth her first born son* - Matt. 1:25); the substitution of βληθεν (aorist passive participle of βαλλω - *I cast*) for βληθηναι (aorist passive infinitive - *to be cast*) along with the omission of και (*and*) before καταπατεισθαι (present passive infinitive - *to be trodden under foot* - Matt. 5:13); the acidulous omission of εικη (*without a cause* - Matt. 5:22); the alteration of εδικαιωθη η σοφια απο των τεκνων αυτης (*wisdom is justified of her children*) to εδικαιωθη η σοφια απο των εργαων αυτης (*wisdom is justified by her deeds* - Matt. 11:19); the fallacious and incredible notion that Jesus asked μη εως του ουρανου υψωθηση (*will you be exalted to heaven?*) instead of flatly stating, η εως του ουρανου υψωθαισα (*which art exalted unto heaven* - Matt. 11:23); we really desire to know which "*original language manuscripts*" are disposed to teach us whether Peter really saw τον ανεμον ισχυρον (*the wind boisterous*) or did he just see τον ανεμον (*the wind*) in Matt. 14:30? Are we to blindly suppose that the eradication of πολλοι γαρ εισι κλητοι, ολιγοι δε εκλεκτοι (*for many be called, but few chosen* - Matt. 20:16) from the sacred text is a fair representation of these

"original language manuscripts"? We desperately inquire, did the disciples do καθως προσεταξεν αυτοις ο Ιησους (*as Jesus commanded them*), or as he appointed, directed, or instructed them (συνεταξεν) in Matt. 21:6? Considering the removal of μωροι και (*Ye fools and*) from Matt. 23:19, we are urged to accept the proposition that whether or not the Lord Jesus called them "*fools and blind*" instead of just "*blind*," will forever be relegated to the candor of individual caprice.

The sampling of verses in the previous paragraph, in all truthfulness, are just a whimsical assortment of variances in the textual tradition of the modern versions compared to the A.V. 1611 in Matthew's Gospel. No forthright appraisal of "*the original language manuscripts*" will yield anything definitive or certain, unless the God-honored readings are sought out objectively by manifest fruition, providence, universality, and in contradistinction from subjective textual motives designed to rid the world of the greatest piece of literary prose in the history of the world. Without *a more sure word of prophecy* the exactness of what God said and inspired to be documented in Holy Writ will forever be a mystery, hopelessly lingering in the exhausted days of yore. Neal Windham observed the matter profoundly when he succinctly stated, "*textual criticism is rather like an enormous jigsaw puzzle. Its pieces are the words contained in the numerous and often dissimilar manuscripts of the Greek New Testament.*" [5](#) The trouble, however, lies in the fact that the proponents of "textual criticism," in the current usage of the word, are not only inclined to dictate which pieces to use, but where to put them and how to apply them. And, what is the end result? The riddance and attempted disposal of the mellifluous words of the A.V. 1611.

Let's assume, then, that we are involved in a classic scenario in which textual variants are not an issue. For the present indulgence, we are going to entertain an enigmatic extravagancy in which there exists a passage of Scripture that textual critics are not persistent in changing because of a differentiation in the underlying Greek words of a particular verse. What we are going to uncover is not a medley of word diversity as in our erstwhile example, but a multiplicity of interpretations based on the varying nuances of Greek syntax.

Accordingly, we are bamboozled to no certain degree for the reasoning and logic urging the alteration of the A.V. 1611's rendition of και εχομεν βεβαιωτερον τον προφητικον λογον as, "*we have also a more sure word of prophecy.*" (2 Pet. 1:19) to something completely different in both sense and meaning. For instance, the NASB renders the passage, "*So we have the prophetic word made more sure.*" The ESV translates (although the sense is the same as the A.V.) the Greek of the text as, "*And we have something more sure, the prophetic word.*" Providing a third take on grammatical possibilities, the NET Bible says, "*Moreover, we possess the prophetic word as an altogether reliable thing.*" These four perspectives constitute what Professor Glenney asserts, namely, "*the translations will help the student see different dimensions and emphases of the meaning of the Bible in any given passage.*" [6](#) Well, if this relative asseveration is substantial, then the "*different dimensions and emphases of the meaning of the Bible*" in 2 Peter 1:19

allow for four entirely opposing translations of the comparative adjective βεβαιωτερον to be practically applicable based on someone's personal delight. Glennly later tells us that, "*Loyalty to Christ and His Word is not measured by the version of Scripture one uses in public worship or private study.*" 7 Therefore, doesn't it stand to reason that Professor Glennly or any other avaricious, English Bible-translating apostate should forbear any further pontificating rhetoric in reference to which underlying Greek text is right, or which peculiar rendering is correct? Such acquiescence though, is not going to happen. If these egomaniacal, self-commending, scholarship-adoring simpletons would apply the same standards to the A.V. 1611 that they expect the rest of Bible-believing Christendom to express towards the modern English Bible versions, then they would all be frequenting the mailbox for unemployment compensation. Imagine the sheer lunacy involved in saying something so obtuse as, "*loyalty to Christ and His Word,*" when you just spent over 100 pages of print promoting textual relativity and usurping the authority of one Book? However, the deleterious implications of several Greek translation options evidently don't end with Professor Glennly.

Daniel Wallace, author of the exegetically opulent *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 8 and Professor of New Testament at the Dallas Theological Seminary has composed a short treatise on the translation of 2 Peter 1:19. Dr. Wallace maintains that the four translation specimens above can be categorized into three broad groups. First, the A.V. 1611 represents, "*those that take the adjective as an attributive adjective modifying τον προφητικον λογον.*" Secondly, a translation such as the ESV depicts, "*those that take it appositional to τον προφητικον λογον.*" Next, he insists that the third group such as the NASB and the NET describe, "*those that regard it as a predicate adjective.*" This third category, notwithstanding, can be further broken down into more detailed subgroups.

Naturally, the authority of the A.V. 1611 cannot be allowed to stand. Disqualifying the King's English immediately, Professor Wallace declares, "*taking the adjective as an attributive is virtually impossible since it stands outside the article-noun group. The construction is εχομεν βεβαιωτερον τον προφητικον λογον. In such a construction, the adjective needs to be taken as predicate or perhaps as substantival (and thus appositional). To be sure, there are a few places in the NT in which an adjective stands in predicate position but has an attributive relation to the noun, but these are few and far between. There are no more than half a dozen of them. And when the text makes good sense taking the adjective as a predicate, there is no need to resort to seeing as an attributive. That is the case in 2 Peter 1.19. The KJV translation is thus in error here, as is often the case when the underlying Greek text involves the article.*" Professor Wallace's bigoted attitude towards the A.V. 1611 can easily be demonstrated in his more delicate treatment of the other translations of the passage with which he disagrees. Notwithstanding, his dismissal of the A.V. 1611 because the verbal-adjective-article-adjective construction is uncommon in the NT really just betrays good sense. Dean Burgon timelessly preserved this moment perpetually with the following captivating remarks: "*But what makes this so serious a matter is that, because Holy Scripture is the Book experimented upon, the loftiest interests that can be*

named become imperiled; and it will constantly happen that what is not perhaps in itself a very serious mistake may yet inflict irreparable injury." **2**

The quintessential principle that Dr. Wallace neglects to mention in his treatise (this is after stating that, "*when the text makes good sense taking the adjective as a predicate, there is no need to resort to seeing as an attributive*") that segregates 2 Peter 1:19 from other, similar adjective-article-noun constructions is the fact that in this particular instance the meaning of the rendition is utterly altered by the difference in the attributive and predicative outlooks. But, in other related, scriptural cognates the attributive and predicative interpretations don't alter the force of the point being conveyed in the verse. For example, in Hebrews 11:23, *διότι εἶδον ἄσκειον τὸ παιδίον* is rendered attributively ("*because they saw he was a beautiful child*") in the NASB, but as a predicate in the NET ("*because they saw the child was beautiful*"). Similarly, *θεωρουντος κατειδωλον ουσαν την πολιν* may be treated as an attributive adjective ("*as he was beholding the city full of idols*" [i.e. the full-of-idols-city]) as it is given in the NASB, or as a predicate adjective ("*as he saw that the city was full of idols*") like it is translated in the ESV. The point being, that with either example, neither the attributive nor predicative aspects deter from the obvious implications demanded in the verse. Yet, in 2 Peter 1:19 the verbal predicative perspective as illustrated by Dr. Wallace metamorphoses the intent from the fact that an attributive interpretation relegates the notion that the scriptures in the believer's possession are more reliable than Peter's mountain experience in which he personally witnessed Jesus Christ transfigured into his millennial glory. Moreover, the attributive translation bolsters the doctrinal certainty that the holy Scriptures are *a more sure word of prophecy* than the actual, audible voice of God himself when he stated, "*This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*" (2 Pet. 1:17). On the other hand, the verbal predicative position promulgates the wicked insinuation that Peter's experience confirms the authority of the written word. The NIV says, "*And we have the word of the prophets made more certain.*" When the Book says, "*So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God,*" (Rom. 10:17) it means just that. You take the words of God by faith at face value, lest you abruptly discover that your experience could get you killed (see 1 Kings 13:8-9; 18-19; 23-24).

However, Dr. Wallace's treatment of the NIV/NASB renderings of 2 Peter 1:19 is honorable, although his prejudicial leanings against the A.V. 1611 are exposed to a greater degree. Following his escape from the ESV reading (which promotes the same meaning as the A.V. 1611), Dr. Wallace proceeds to comment upon the predicative interpretation of the comparative adjective *βεβαιωτερον*. He stresses that, "*One of the fundamental points we wish to raise in this brief essay is that the rendering 'we have the prophetic word made more sure' is unlikely from a grammatical standpoint.*" I, myself, find it nonsensically remarkable that this irreverent, objurgating, Greek adulator takes it upon himself to spew the panty-waist, "*unlikely from a grammatical standpoint*" while insisting that our Common English Bible is thus, "*in error here, as if often the case when the underlying Greek text involves the article.*" What in the world, may we ask, happened to the other versions being "*in*

error" when he holds a dissenting position to those translation particularities? Despite his sissified performance in highlighting errors in some of the modern English versions, Dr. Wallace's keen remarks regarding this "unlikely grammatical standpoint" should not go unnoticed or unconsidered. He instructs us that, *"The translation is unparalleled in object-complement constructions. When the construction has this force, ποιεω is present (as in 2 Pet. 1.10 [σπουδατε βεβαιαν υμων την κλησιν και εκλογην ποιεισθαι])"*

Furthermore, it desperately behooves the reader to capture and ponder upon the convenient negligence abounding in Dr. Wallace's treatment of the predicative interpretation in 2 Peter 1:19. I find it shamefully transparent that Dr. Wallace only provided a sampling of two types of sub-points in relation to βεβαιότερον being treated as a predicate adjective (see renditions by the NASB and NET above) to rebuff in our current passage of Scripture. However, although Bishop Middleton shared Dr. Wallace's disdain for the A.V. 1611 translation of the verse, the Middleton reviser, James Scholefield, stated in a footnote that an optional, right rendering of the verse could be, *"The prophetic word which we have is more sure."* [10](#) Even Dr. Wallace, later in his essay expresses that, *"if we render the clause as 'the prophetic word is more sure' (which is certainly more plausible grammatically), then this would be saying that the OT was a more reliable guide to truth than Peter's experiences, including his experience of the Transfiguration."* This translation, though given as a predicate adjective instead of attributive, as in our attributive/predicative examples above, postulates the same meaning as the A.V. 1611. Professor Wallace's reasoning for rejecting the NASB translation of βεβαιότερον as a predicate adjective had to do with the fact that ποιεω is not used in the verse as it is in back in verse 10. What, then, will be his excuse for shunning this rendition that reinforces the good sense of our King James Bible? We will consider this question in our concluding remarks.

The ESV translates βεβαιότερον as a substantive, meaning that the adjective functions as a noun. In this case the adjective isn't modifying another noun (attributive), nor is it asserting something about the subject (predicative). We would agree with Dr. Wallace that, *"as an adjective one would expect it to function in its typical adjectival capacity unless there is contextual or lexical warrant for taking it otherwise"* in light of the observation that in all 9 NT usages in which βεβαιος occurs, it indeed functions *"in its typical adjectival capacity."* His second reason for rejecting the ESV translation of the passage is that, *"as a substantival adjective one would expect it to have the article with it."* Notwithstanding, as you might have guessed, one might not always expect to have the article with an adjective functioning as a substantive. Mounce maintains that, *"it is possible for an anarthrous adjective to function substantivally, but it is unusual."* [11](#) Palpable examples include, Τυφλοι αναβλεπουσιν (*The blind receive their sight* - Matt. 11:5); που σοφος (*Where is the wise?* - 1 Cor. 1:20); συ δυνη βαστασαι κακους (*thou canst not bear them which are evil* - Rev. 2:2), etc. The reader should keep fresh in his mind the blatant hypocrisy and inconsistency of Dr. Wallace at this juncture. His second reason for ousting the ESV reading is due to the assertion that we should

"expect" to see an article with a substantival adjective. However, he did not bother to apply this standard of expectation to the elative use of the comparative adjective in the Petrine epistles. Also, how is Dr. Wallace to know whether an exceptional case is erroneous or not if it is permissible in other sections of the NT? Were not those cases atypical in their respective locations as well? The point here is that irregularities cannot be a solidified determinate for shelving a general consideration, especially when that irregularity carries the same weight in sense as the A.V. 1611.

Ultimately, Dr. Wallace's obdurate design in denying the authority of the A.V. 1611 in 2 Peter 1:19 (indirectly and to a lesser degree rebutting the translation attempts of other "*modern, reputable translations*") is to provide a vindication for the interpretative slope manifested in the NET. In this version the comparative adjective *βεβαιότερον* (*more sure*) is not treated as a true comparative, but is determined to be a comparative adjective functioning as an elative (e.g. *ἡμερὰς πλείους* - *many days* [Acts 13:31]). An elative, instead of making a comparison, intensifies the quality inherent in the adjective. Hence, the translation offered by the NET ("*Moreover, we possess the prophetic word as an altogether reliable thing*"). Surprisingly enough, the 1525 Tyndale translation ("*a right sure word*"); the 1535 Miles Coverdale version ("*a sure word*"); and the 1568 Bishop's Bible ("*a right sure word*") all seem to convey this elative sense even though the actual word placement follows the attributive position. Nevertheless, as Robertson notes, "*one could go through all the rather numerous examples of elative comparative adjectives and adverbs in the N.T. and show that with proper attention to the context the point of comparison appears plainly enough.*" [12](#)

Despite Professor Wallace's effrontery in seeking to justify the comparative adjective functioning as an elative approach, we must insistently demur from his conjectures. In [a very intriguing article](#), which actually defends the A.V. 1611 reading in 2 Peter 1:19, John Sherwood effectively reveals the flawed chink in Professor Wallace's elative stronghold. In an unwitting preemptive blow to the elative hypothesis advocated by Dr. Wallace, Mr. Sherwood wrote, "*However, of the seven other times Peter uses a comparative adjective, he always uses it comparatively instead of elatively, sometimes with an expressed object of comparison (1 Pet. 1:7; 3:17; 2 Pet. 2:20, 21), sometimes without (1 Pet. 3:7; 5:5; 2 Pet. 2:11). If the present verse follows that norm, he must be comparing the prophetic word to something. Since the following verses make clear that he is speaking of the written Word, he has now advanced to present the written Word as superior to the audio/visual experiences of vv. 17-18.*" [13](#) Here, the reader should recall our previous point about Dr. Wallace's undeniable and mordacious hypocrisy in reference to thrusting the supposed inapplicability of exceptional grammatical nuances onto us. He stated that because we would "expect" to see an article used with a substantival adjective, this renders the ESV possibility "less satisfactory." How is it that Dr. Wallace is allowed to have exceptional cases (i.e. the elative used for the comparative in the Petrine literature), but we cannot have a substantival use of an anarthrous adjective, or an anarthrous,

comparative adjective followed by an articular noun? Even ἀμφοτέρω (both) modifies τὰ πλοῖα (*the ships*) in Luke 5:7 as an anarthrous attributive adjective.

Reverting back to our previous inquiry concerning what or any excuse that the good Professor may employ to elude the implications of the (in his own words) grammatically plausible translation of ἐχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον as the literal predicate adjective (remember that up to this time he's already ruled out the attributive rendition), "*we have the prophetic word which is more sure,*" we discover that he asserts, "*to say that the OT scriptures (the most likely meaning of 'the prophetic word') were more trustworthy an authority than an apostle's own experience of Christ is both to misconstrue how prophecy took place in the OT (did not the prophets have visions or other experiences?) and deny the final revelation of God in Christ (cf. Heb. 1:2).*" First, Dr. Wallace ignorantly misses the apostle's intention in the verse. The attributive or predicative interpretations of the passage do not definitively implicate the text as stating that the Scriptures are "*more trustworthy an authority than an apostle's own experience.*" The prospectus here is that Peter is propagating the idea that the Scriptures are more certain than his audio/visual experiences on the mount of Transfiguration because the tangibility of the Scriptures are an obvious practical aberration of which the Professor is utterly oblivious. Peter says that the word of prophecy is something that "*we have*" (ἐχομεν). Secondly, the prophecy of Scripture is not to be of any private interpretation. The words of prophecy are to be taken literally and at face value, exactly as they were given (see 2 Peter 1:20-21). If there is one thing that is abundantly and overtly apparent in the Bible it is the fact that experiences can be completely misguided and understood improperly or partially. Two mammoth examples of this dilemma are found in John 12:28-29, and Acts 9:7 in conjunction with Acts 22:9. In reference to the latter example, the Bible-correcting intelligentsias of our day have magnified this supposed "discrepancy" (which is no discrepancy at all) to epic proportions, obfuscating many. The point here is that experience can be misinterpreted, and moreover, communicated inaccurately. And, while we all are painfully aware of the travesty of misinterpreting Scripture, we are also enlightened to the privilege that we possess in that we can compare the interpretation of verses by the Scriptures themselves. Such a feat is impossible with experiences only, unless you judge the experience by the Book. Thirdly, Dr. Wallace is clueless (at least in his particular treatise regarding 2 Peter 1:19) to the superiority of Scripture to experiences, even if the experience were first in order of existence. 2 Peter 1:21 says that "*holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*" Original inspiration had to do with speaking, even though specific inspired words of God's choosing were subsequently relegated to written Scripture. By virtue of fact that the "*visions and other experiences*" are known to subsequent generations through sola scriptura reinforces the attributive/basal predicative interpretation of the passage. In Jeremiah 36:1-2 not only does the Lord speak to Jeremiah, but more importantly, he instructs him to, "*take thee a roll of a book, and write therein all the words that I have spoken unto thee against Israel, and against Judah, and against all the nations, from the day I spake unto thee, from the days of Josiah, even unto this day.*" Consequently, when our Lord spoke to Ezekiel and commanded him to

prophesy certain words to the children of Israel, he first told him to, "*eat that thou findest; eat this roll, and go speak unto the house of Israel*" (Ez. 3:1). Question: If the Bible were not more affirmative than a prophet or apostle's experience, then how else would one discern a millennial false prophet without Zechariah's written exhortation (Zech. 13:1-4)? Dr. Wallace's trouble is that the words of God are not ingrained into the fiber of his being. For Daniel Wallace, the idea of the words of God is a peddled enterprise to earn a paycheck. Fourthly, "*the final revelation of God in Christ*" of which Dr. Wallace references in Hebrews 1:2 by stating that taking 2 Peter 1:19 attributively diametrically opposes this revelation, is nothing more than a farcical isolation of the text. In Hebrews 1:2 the doctrinal reference is to God speaking to Hebrews (to whom the book is addressed, and hence "the fathers" from verse 1) "*in these last days,*" which are none other than a little time period (*the time of Jacob's trouble* - Jer. 30:7) prior to the Second Advent. We know this to be so because, Jesus Christ is referenced as the, "*appointed heir of all things*" (1:2); his receiving a sceptre and a kingdom (1:8); and most illuminatingly, the context of the book of Hebrews is forthrightly manifested in Hebrews 2:5: "*for unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak.*" However, the most prominent feature in Hebrews chapter 1, which devastates Professor Wallace's doctrinal proclivity is the use of Scripture in Hebrews 1:5; 1:6; 1:7; 1:8; 1:9; 1:10; 1:11; 1:12; and 1:13 to prove the superiority of Christ! The Holy Scriptures were used to prove Christ's superiority, not just some "*finality of revelation*" that climaxes at the Second Advent anyway; not with the Church Age apostles as Dr. Wallace supposes (cf. Daniel 9:24) Fifthly, Peter says, "*for we have not followed cunningly devised fables*" (2 Peter 1:16). Even though proof positive exists that Jesus Christ is coming again because Peter, James, and John were "*eyewitnesses of his majesty*" the one element that confirms the truthfulness of this doctrine to a greater degree is the fact that the Second Coming of Christ can be proven from the Scriptures. If there was nothing else, the Scriptures are a weightier source of affirmation than mere experience due to the probability that the synoptic Gospel accounts (Matthew 17; Mark 9; Luke 9) had been written by this time, and Peter could very well have returned to the mount of Transfiguration through the blessed words of God. On top of that, Peter's testimony could have been corroborated in this manner to boot. Furthermore, we know that not only was Peter referring to Paul's epistles as Scripture (2 Peter 3:15-16) at the time, but Paul referred to Luke 10:7 as Scripture along with Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Timothy 5:18. Taking either angle, experiences are substantiated or unsubstantiated by the words of the Lord; that, however, is all.

Finally, our six reason for refuting Dr. Daniel Wallace's assertion that a true comparative interpretation of the adjective is not warranted in 2 Peter 1:19 is for this purpose: The alteration of the A.V. 1611 text in this passage rids us of a proof text for the Scriptures being the Christian's sole and final authority. 2 Peter 1:19 says, "*We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day stars arise in your hearts.*" This verse is telling you in no uncertain terms that the words of Scripture are your final, complete, and highest authority *UNTIL THE DAY*

DAWN, meaning that you are to follow the Scriptures and judge experiences by the Scriptures from now until the Second Coming of Christ. The real issue then behind the corrupted sense of 2 Peter 1:19 in the modern, English Bible versions that oppose the A.V. 1611 is that the Scriptures are not promoted as the absolute standard in separating truth from error.

Conclusively, Daniel Wallace has been weighed and found wanting on all counts. He failed to prove that the comparative adjective couldn't be treated attributively in the passage contextually or lexically, even though there is a paucity of these examples in the NT syntactically. What he termed "*virtually impossible*" grammatically turned out to be complemented by some very strikingly handsome parallels that we examined earlier in this treatise. Professor Wallace failed to acknowledge that virtually all of Peter's seven other uses of a comparative adjective, none of these instances are rendered as an elative functioning by means of a comparative. While he aptly rebutted the verbal predicative interpretation of βεβαίωτερον as seen in the NASB, his reason for denying the authenticity of the basal predicative understanding (which carries the same meaning as the A.V. 1611) has been dealt with above on six points. Dr. Wallace's accusation toward the ESV that it has "*erred*" in two ways was only seen to have erred in one way since the substantive use of the adjective can function without the Greek article. The reason for this point is that the appositional approach, though not as idiomatic as the attributive rendition, still carries the same interpretative force as the A.V. 1611 (i.e. the word of prophecy is more sure than your experience). Though in a minority, the A.V. 1611 as well as the sectarian Anointed Standard Translation; the Duoay-Rheims; the World English Bible; Webster's translation; Rotherham's Emphasized Bible (though closer to appositional than attributive); Green's Literal Translation; Young's Literal Translation (similar to Rotherham); Mace's 1729 NT; and the 1560 Geneva Bible (though βεβαίωτερον is translated as a superlative [most sure] instead of as a comparative [more sure]) all treat the comparative adjective attributively or the like, which upholds the words of God as the supreme and sole authority by which to judge all matters pertaining to faith and practice.

1 Glenny, W. Edward, et al. The Bible Version Debate: The Perspective of Central Baptist Theological Seminary (Plymouth: Central Baptist Theological Seminary, 1997).

2 Streeter, Lloyd L. Seventy-five Problems with Central Baptist Seminary's Book The Bible Version Debate (Kearney: Morris Publishing, 2001).

3 Glenny, 121-122.

4 Glenny, 42.

5 Windham, Neal. New Testament Greek For Preachers and Teachers (Lanham: University Press of America, 1991), 15.

6 Glenny, 122.

7 Glenny, 124.

8 Wallace, Daniel. Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996).

9 Burgon, John William. The Revision Revised (Collingswood: Dean Burgon Society Press, 2000), 197.

10 Middleton, Thomas Fanshaw. The Doctrine of the Greek Article Applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament, ed. James Scholefield (Cambridge: J. Smith, Printer to the University, 1828), 599.

11 Mounce, William D. Basics of Biblical Greek (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993), 67.

12 Robertson, Archibald T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in Light of Historical Research (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1915), 665.

13 Sherwood, John. "The Only Sure Word." The Master's Seminary Journal 7/1 (Spring 1996): 61.

**John 1:1 in the NWT:
A Blasphemous Demonstration of Defunct Greek Scholarship
By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson**

The advent of the New World Translation commenced over 40 years ago, promoting some of the most asinine translations and readings in the history of Bible translation. For example, our Lord Jesus Christ, who is taught in our sacred Scriptures to be the very Lord God of the Old Testament (compare Malachi 3:1-3 with Mark 1:1-3), is reduced a mere "only begotten god" in John 1:18, following the corrupt alteration of υἱος (Son) to θεος (God or in this case, god) as found in Codices B and Aleph. In Acts 20:28, the passage with which we are familiar that Jesus Christ is said to have God's blood (hence, an affirmation of his deity), is both hijacked and hideously changed to reflect the Watchtower Society's theological proclivity that the church of God was not purchased with God's own blood, but the congregation of God was purchased with the blood of his own Son.

Accordingly, with the manifest principle set before us that this translation is decked about with doctrinal bias, it is no surprise to find another passage referencing the deity of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ buried in the deceptive tenets of Greek Scholarship. Recently, I have received more than one request from different Bible-Believers, who doing spiritual battle with the wiles of the Russellite heresies, have sought to know the different ways that the predicate nominative "God" can be translated in John 1:1, and why it should be thus rendered as it is found in the A.V. 1611. Therefore, we shall examine the contents of Greek grammar, and discover the different methods of translating John 1:1, ultimately vindicating the true reading as found in the Holy Scriptures of the A.V. 1611.

In the appendix to the New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures, there is a detailed explanation seeking to excuse the NWT for translating the predicate nominative in John 1:1 as an indefinite instead of a more distinct and consistent method, which would render the translation as "God," instead of "a god." Although it is impossible to reproduce the entire explanation made by the Watchtower Society, the more pertinent comments are as follows:

The Complete Bible - An American Translation renders this expression "divine," making the entire verse read: 'In the beginning the Word existed. The Word was with God, and the Word was divine.' (1943 Reprint) A New Translation of The Bible by Dr. Jas. Moffatt reads likewise: 'The Logos existed in the very beginning, the Logos was with God, the Logos was divine.' (1935 edition) Every honest person will have to admit that John's saying that the Word or Logos "was divine" is not saying that he was the God with whom he was. It merely tells of a certain quality about the Word or Logos, but it does not identify him as one and the same as God.

The reason for their rendering the Greek word "divine," and not "God," is that it is the Greek noun theos without the definite article, hence an anarthrous theos. The God with whom the Word or Logos was originally is designated here by the Greek

expression ο γεοV, theos preceded by the definite article ho, hence an articular theos. Careful translators recognize that the articular construction points to a quality about someone. That is what A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament by Dana and Mantey remarks on page 140, paragraph vii. Accordingly, on page 148, paragraph (3), this same publication says about the subject of a copulative sentence:

'The article sometimes distinguishes the subject from the predicate in a copulative sentence. In Xenophon's Anabasis 1:4:6, ἐμποριον δ' ἦν τὸ χωριον, and the place was a market, we have a parallel to what we have in John 1:1, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, and the word was deity. The article points out the subject in these examples. Neither was the place the only market, nor was the word all of God, as it would mean if the article were also used with θεός. '

Instead of translating John 1:1, and the word was deity, this Grammar could have translated it, and the word was a god, to run more parallel with Xenophon's statement, and the place was a market.

In the sentence, and the word was a god" the copulative verb "was" and the expression "a god" form the predicate of the sentence. In the original Greek there is no definite article ho (the) before theos (god), and it is presumptuous to say that such a definite article is to be understood so that the sentence should therefore be translated "and the word was God." That would mean that the Word was the God with whom the Word was said to be. This is unreasonable; for how can the Word be with the God and at the same time be that same God? (New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures, Copyright 1961, The Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania, pg. 1362)

In Nestle's Greek text (27 th edition), John 1:1 appears as follows:

Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος

The A.V. 1611 translates the passage:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

The NWT translates as follows:

In the beginning the Word was, and the Word was with God, and the Word was a god.

Now, concerning ways to translate this passage in Greek, there are three main headings under which this passage can be translated. All three, of course, depend upon the interpretation of θεός (God; a god) in the verse:

1) The usage of θεός in John 1:1 can be deemed as "indefinite." This is the assertion bolstered by the J.W.'s simply because the noun lacks the definite article in front of it (The Greek definite article roughly corresponds to our English "the"). Hence, the above usage of the word, "anarthrous" (without the article). This is a very weak

grammatical argument for John 1:1 because it cannot be followed through to conclusion. For example, there are approximately 282 instances in the New Testament in which *θεος* occurs and is subsequently anarthrous. In sixteen of these places the NWT translates the word as "a god," "god," "gods," or "godly." Which, statistically speaking, the NWT translators were only faithful to their indefinite, anarthrous assertion SIX percent of the time. Concerning John 1:1-18, *θεος* occurs 18 times respectively in verses 1, 2, 6, 12, 13, 18. However, in these passages, *θεος* only occurs with the article twice (verses 1-2), yet six out of the eight times *θεος* is translated as "God." Only once is it referred to as "a god" (verse 1), and only once is it rendered as "the god" (verse 18). Both of the exceptions here, as we are all very well aware, are adorned with theological bias. Therefore, thus far the following points can be gleaned:

- a) The usual translation of *θεος* in the NWT is "God," whether it has the definite article before it in Greek or not.
- b) The exceptional cases in John 1 to the usual NWT rendering of *θεος* bear the undeniable marks of theological bias.
- c) Translating *θεος* as "a god" is woefully inconsistent. If such lines of thought are followed through to conclusion, then in John chapter one alone, the following should be translated as indefinites simply because they lack the article in Greek.
 - *αρχη* should be "a beginning" (1:1-2)
 - *ζωη* should be "a life" (1:4)
 - *Ιωαννης* should be "a John" (1:6)
 - *παρα θεου* should be "from a god" (1:18- consequently, the form of *θεος* here is a reference to God the Father, which the J.W.'s assert, due to the insertion of the article before *θεος* in John 1:1 that that simply means that Jesus Christ is not God; however, notice in this passage that there is no article before *θεος*).

Demonstrating even further poor, deluded scholarship from the Jehovah's witnesses is the quoting of the Dana and Mantey Grammar to promulgate their ideas. When the author of the NWT appendix regarding John 1:1 quoted Dana and Mantey, he did so without quoting the final sentence in the paragraph. This detail is very important because it allows the reader to see first hand that no matter what Drs. Dana and Mantey have observed in respect to the Greek construction of the predicate nominative in John 1:1, that they had absolutely no illusions as to the fact that John 1:1 isn't denying the deity of Jesus Christ. The final sentence on page 149 states emphatically, " As it stands, the other persons of the Trinity may be implied in *θεος*. "

However, that isn't the biggest blunder manifest thus far by the Watchtower grammarians. In the beginning of the treatise that I quoted earlier at length, the author stated, "Every honest person will have to admit that John's saying that the Word or Logos "was divine" is not saying that he was the God with whom he was. It merely tells of a certain quality about the Word or Logos, but it does not identify him as one and the same as God."

First, the author obviously doesn't understand what it means to be "divine" in this context. When a translator such as Moffatt states that the word was divine he is stating that the Word is the same in essence and character as the God with whom he was with, but not the same person. This is perfectly consistent with Trinitarian doctrine, as we know that although the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost are one (I John 5:7), that the Father is NOT the Word, nor the Word the Holy Ghost, nor the Holy Ghost the Father, etc. Hence, all three of them constitute the Godhead, and all three are one God, the three are not the same person in identity. This is simply illustrated by considering the three-part nature of man. He has a body, a soul, and a spirit, all of which are composite to make up that man, but none of which are all the same in personal identity. So, when John calls the Logos $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, he is telling the reader that although the Word has all the essential attributes of God, and is in his very nature God, he is not the same identical PERSON as the God with whom he is with; hence, the Father.

Secondly, although the author admits above that the translation of the other versions is due to the emphasis of a certain quality, he evidently confounds the qualitative (more on this later) translation of the passage with the indefinite interpretation discussed above. Further in his treatise, the J.W. author stated, "Instead of translating John 1:1, *and the word was deity*, this Grammar could have translated it, *and the word was a god*, to run more parallel with Xenophon's statement, *and the place was a market*. " As a matter of fact "this Grammar" wouldn't think of translating the word as "a god." The rendering, "a god" is completely foreign to the idea of "deity," or "divine." One is a qualitative perspective, the other indefinite. You see Drs. Dana and Mantey didn't use the Xenophon illustration to serve as a means to justify the translation of "a god" versus "God," but to illustrate that the lack of the article signifies that the word didn't encompass the whole of the subject under consideration. As they stated, "Neither was *the place* the only market, nor was *the word* all of God, as it would mean if the article were also used with $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$. " The idea is that the Word wasn't the entire Godhead, although he is the fullness of the Godhead bodily (Colossians 2:9). As such, this has nothing to do with Dana and Mantey's point justifying the translation of "a god."

The proof positive afforded by my criticism of the Watchtower grammarian is found in the very pages that he references for proof of his own position. Earlier in the treatise from which I quoted above, he insisted that the point he was trying to make could be found on page 140, paragraph vii of Dana and Mantey's grammar. However, a brief perusal of that section will yield the same information from my

earlier points that the use of θεος in certain constructions emphasize identity, while the anarthrous usage depicts character. Howbeit, it is alacritous to note that when Dana and Mantey relegate the principle that the anarthrous use of θεος is directed towards the character of the Word's divinity, that it had no inclination of translating the passage as an indefinite. They stated on the very page that our Watchtower grammarian referenced:

The use of θεος in John 1:1 is a good example. Προς τον θεον points to Christ's fellowship with the person of the Father; θεος ην ο λογος emphasizes Christ's participation in the essence of the divine nature. The former clearly applies to personality, while the latter applies to character. This distinction is in line with the general force of the article. **IT MAY BE SEEN EVEN IN THE PAPYRI, AS ο φως εκ φωτος, θεος αληθινος, O Light of light, TRUE GOD, where the emphasis is clearly on God's character rather than His personality. (Dana and Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament, pg. 140, citing Milligan op. cit., pg. 134; emphasis and bold mine)**

What is plain to see in the above quotation is that Dana and Mantey, evidencing the fact that the character versus identity of God is being stressed due to the anarthrous usage of the noun in John 1:1, cite a papyrus statement that in reference to God, is anarthrous. Therefore, the Jehovah's witness assertion that Dana and Mantey advocate a translation that would catapult the NWT rendition of John 1:1 is falsified, nugatory, misleading, and void.

Concerning the fundamental delegation of the article in both Greek and English, Dana and Mantey stress:

It is important to bear in mind that we cannot determine the English translation by the presence or absence of the article in Greek. Sometimes we should use the article in the English translation when it is not used in the Greek, and sometimes the idiomatic force of the Greek article may best be rendered by an anarthrous noun in English. (Dana and Mantey, 150-151)

The Greek scholar, Daniel Wallace, states concerning the indefinite interpretation of John 1:1 levied by the NWT:

The indefinite notion is the most poorly attested for anarthrous pre-verbal predicate nominatives. Thus, grammatically such a meaning is improbable. Also, the context suggests that such is not likely, for the Word already existed in the beginning. Thus, contextually and grammatically, it is highly improbable that the Logos could be "a god" according to John. Finally, the evangelist's own theology militates against this view, for there is an exalted Christology in the Fourth Gospel, to the point that Jesus Christ is identified as God (cf. 5:23; 8:58; 10:30; 20:28, etc.)

2) The usage of θεος in John 1:1 can be deemed as definite. In 1931, E.C. Colwell submitted his doctoral dissertation on "The Character of the Greek of John's

Gospel." This extensive research led to the discovery of what would become known as "Colwell's Rule." In 1933 Colwell published an article entitled, "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament." Wallace quotes Colwell's Rule in part from Colwell's article as follows:

Definite predicate nouns which precede the verb usually lack the article. a predicate nominative which precedes the verb cannot be translated as an indefinite or a 'qualitative' noun solely because of the absence of the article; if the context suggest that the predicate is definite, it should be translated as a definite noun. (Wallace, Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, pg. 257, citing, Colwell, "A Definite Rule.," pg. 20)

Unfortunately, this rule has been absurdly misunderstood and subsequently abused by many fundamentalists, Greek grammarians, and conservative scholars who have sought to use Colwell's Rule as a basis for affirming the deity of Christ in John 1:1. As a general rule as seen above, Colwell stated that definite predicate nouns (like θεος in John 1:1) usually lack the article. Therefore, from this, since θεος in John 1:1 is a pre-verbal predicate nominative and lacks the article, it has been asserted that it is definite. Hence, grammarians and conservatives have sought to disintegrate the Watchtower version by appealing to their interpretation of this Rule. However, as you can see above, Colwell never stated that if the pre-verbal predicate nominative lacked the article that it was definitively definite. He stated that the definiteness of the noun had to be determined by the context.

So, the question arises, since John 1:1 matches Colwell's construction, is the predicate nominative θεος definite? The problem with interpreting the θεος as definite in the passage is that it would make the noun intimate that the Word is the Father, which is exactly what John did not want to do. John wanted to stress the fact that Jesus Christ was God without making him the same as the Father in identity. However, making the predicate nominative definite assumes that the θεος in this passage is the same as having an article before it, and would yield that very teaching that Jesus Christ is God the Father. If this be done, then the passage would cease to be a haven for the Arian heresy (the two Gods of the Watchtower Society), and become a breeding ground for the Sabellians or Modalists (this is the essential teaching of the "Oneness" groups [Oneness Pentecostals, etc.]

Before engaging into the correct interpretation of the predicate nominative in John 1:1, which is its use as a qualitative noun within the scope of Colwell's construction, let us glean some of the intricate details from our Greek grammarian predecessors who were pioneers in their field. The first is Bishop Thomas Middleton, who in 1808 published the definitive work on the Greek article entitled, "The Doctrine of the Greek Article Applied To The Criticism and Illustration Of The New Testament." A Second edition was released by the Regius Professor of Greek at the University of Cambridge in 1828, James Scholefield. Bishop Middleton had this to say about θεος and the article as well as some commentary in respect to John 1:1:

It has already been observed on Matt. i.20. that θεος and also Κυριος in the sense of God, either take or reject the Article indiscriminately; In some other respects also it follows the common rule of Appellatives, e.g. in rejecting the Article where it (θεος) is the Predicate of a Proposition which does not reciprocate, as in John i.1. for as to θεος being sometimes used in an inferior or qualified sense, an opinion which Mr. Wakefield and others have found it convenient to adopt, there is not a single example of such an use in the whole N.T. θεος is God or a God, either true or false, real or imaginary; but never superior or inferior. But more of this on Romans ix.5. For the present it is sufficient to shew that the absence of the Article affords not, as some have affirmed, any indication of this pretended subordinate sense; for in many of the passages, in which without dispute θεος is meant of the Supreme Being, the Article is not used: see Matt. xix.26.; Luke xvi.13.; John i.18.ix.33.xvi.30.; Romans viii.8.; 1 Cor. i.3.; Gal. i.1.; Eph. ii.8.; Heb. ix.14. (Middleton, The Doctrine of the Greek Article, pg. 280-281)

One of the greatest Greek grammars produced in history is the voluptuous, "A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in Light of Historical Research," produced by Dr. A.T. Robertson in the early twentieth century. He states on pages 767-768 of this work:

It is true also that ο θεος ην ο λογος (convertible terms) would have been Sabellianism.

He states again on page 795:

The word θεος, like a proper name, is freely used with and without the article. But it is 'beyond comparison the most frequently in the Epistles without the article.' This may be alone as subject, θεος (Ro. 8:33); as a predicate, θεος ην ο λογος (Jo. 1:1); as genitive, γνωσεως θεου (Ro. 11:33); with prepositions, εν θεω (Jo. 3:21); with adjectives, θεος ευλογητος (Ro. 9:5); with participles also, θεω ζωντι και αληθινω (1 Th. 1:9); in conjunction with πατηρ (Gal. 1:1).

Wallace states concerning Westcott's commentary on John:

Before 1933 NT commentators saw geoV as qualitative. For example, in Westcott's commentary on John: 'It is necessarily without the article (θεος not ο θεος) inasmuch as it describes the nature of the Word and does not identify His person. It would be pure Sabellianism to say 'the Word was ο θεος' (Wallace, 268)

3) The final consideration is that θεος in John 1:1 is qualitative. This interpretation is the obvious one because it encompasses the Word's deity ("in the beginning was the Word," John 1:1), and the Word's manifestation in the flesh ("the Word was made flesh," John 1:14). It not only allows the translation of the predicate nominative as "God," stressing the quality or character of the Word, but it thus distinguishes the Word from the identity of the Father. Examples of qualitative

predicate nominatives, which are similar to the construction of John 1:1, are as follows:

a) John 1:14 - ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο (the Word was made flesh). Here it would be a reductio ad absurdum to render the passage, "the Word was made a flesh."

b) 1 John 4:8 - ο θεος αγαπη εστιν (God is love). Love in this context would be that in God's nature is the quality of love. It is an attribute, not an identification.

Considering the above examples, when we inspect the position of the Logos in conjunction to the being verb, it becomes evident that the Word's quality as God is being promulgated, not his identity. Therefore, it would be ridiculous to say, "the Word is a god," just as it would be absurd to say, "the Word was made a flesh." Wallace concludes his findings on John 1:1 representing a qualitative interpretation as thus:

Such an option does not at all impugn the deity of Christ. Rather, it stresses that, although the person of Christ is not the person of the Father, their essence is identical. The idea of a qualitative θεος here is that the Word had all the attributes and qualities that "the God" (of 1:1b) had. In other words, he shared the essence of the Father, though they differed in person. The construction the evangelist chose to express this idea was the most concise way he could have stated that the Word was God and yet was distinct from the Father. (Wallace, 269)

In short, the German Reformer Martin Luther, aptly declared the essence of the situation when he stated:

'the Word was God' is against Arius; 'the Word was with God' against Sabellius. (Wallace, 268)

The Greek Grammatical Desperado

By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson

Seeking to alleviate himself of his performance melancholy in a debate with Dr. Peter Ruckman in July of 1990, Gary Robert Hudson has reattached himself undeservingly to a "quasi-judicial" persecutory status in the form of a repugnant website editor in order to publish further attacks against the King's English. However, this time around Mr. Hudson has employed the usage of several amateur Alexandrian Apostates (such as Doug Kutilek, James May, Robert Joyner, Bob Ross, and Rick Norris) to develop anti-A.V. antics on a much larger scale.

After perpetuating A.V. 1611 Onlyism for a number of years as a Baptist evangelist (See "The Castaway" for Hudson's sermon on the infallibility of the A.V. 1611 available from the Bible Baptist Bookstore; Pensacola, FL) Mr. Hudson began his progressive degeneration into an approval seeking, Bible corrector. At first he regressed to a "TR ONLY" position, and then finally into his "NO HOLDS BARRED" textual status. Personally, I think that Gary Hudson ignited his own egocentricity when he learned a little Greek in Bible College, and naturally I could never postulate a hypothesis about Gary's apostacy without including the possibility of Doug Kutilek's influence on him. Kutilek has been a feisty but yet vociferous opponent of the King James text for many years.

In the above mentioned debate with Peter Ruckman in 1990, Gary Hudson demonstrated to an attentive public, his absolute ignorance and stellar bigotry involved in his perception of Greek. He attempted to prove error in the A.V. 1611 in four cases by insisting that the AV translators were "in error" in their usage of Greek in those four instances. He failed miserably to demonstrate that the context of Acts 2:40 called for the Aorist passive imperative of "sozo" (I save) to be translated definitively in the passive voice (Be ye saved) instead of the middle voice (Save yourselves) as it stands in the AV text. He grossly failed to demonstrate how Romans 8:24 could not be translated as a dative of means (Robertson's instrumental case) with "by hope" compared to his correction of "in hope." Hudson never did educate his audience as to why the genitive singular form of "kerugma" (kerugmatos- "preaching") HAD to be translated with the definite article in I Cor. 1:21. Anyone who has studied Middleton's work on the Greek article or Robertson's monumental grammar knows that the article isn't always warranted in English even if it does appear in Greek. Such translations must be considered to be good, idiomatic English first. Finally, Mr. Hudson lost case number four when he failed to prove that the genitive, plural, personal pronoun (hemon- "of us" or "our") couldn't be translated in front of "soterou Iesou Christou" instead of "tou Theou." Dr. Ruckman easily showed the audience that such a construction constitutes a Jewish idiom called a "Hendiady" (A Greek compound which means "one by means of two" or "one through two") and is certainly not an error in the AV text. This material can be purchased from the Bible Baptist Bookstore in Pensacola, FL under the video title, "Are There Errors in the King James Bible?"

As a vital part of Mr. Hudson's repristination process to reascertain a status of respectability in the "scholarly community," he erected a six page treatise on his website entitled, "I John 5:7 Grammatical Argument Refuted: An Answer to Dabney, Hills, Strouse, & Cloud." In this article Gary Hudson set up a foundation which was ultimately dependent upon the interpretation of the Greek pronoun "ekeinos" in syntactical relation to the word for the Holy Spirit, "pneuma." Secondly, Hudson presents an argument where Greek grammatical irregularities are acceptable on a general scale (in his presentation) by providing two examples of such cases. Of course, this was the "reply" to the awkward grammatical construction left in Greek texts that omit I John 5:7. Nevertheless, it is this shameful performance by Mr. Hudson to which I would endeavor to demonstrate his ignorance of Greek grammar and subsequent interpretations thereof, undoubtedly based solely upon his utter disdain for the Authorized Text.

Introductory comments upon what this "grammatical difficulty" entails will require some preliminary explanations on some of the basic rules of Greek grammar to facilitate ease for the common English reader. As such, it is first noteworthy to understand that as an English speaker/reader, one is vastly inclined to comprehend "gender" upon a natural level. This means that when we see/hear words such as "man," "woman," "church," "tree," "love," and so on, we automatically consider those things NATURALLY. More specifically that means that when we see/hear "man," we know that it is of the masculine gender. Consequently, we know that "woman," is feminine, and that a word such as "church" is neuter. Therefore, in a sentence such as, "Robert, please clean the church, for it is exceedingly filthy," we would understand that "church" per se is described by the pronoun "it" in the sentence. The reason for that again, is that the gender is naturally neuter. We wouldn't dare say "...clean the church, for she is exceedingly filthy," (at least in reference to the building) because that doesn't make any sense to our comprehension of gender. Accordingly, the point being, that the GENDERS MUCH MATCH.

Greek, nonetheless, is similar in that regard in that it has natural gender, but more so in that it also has what we call grammatical gender. Carefully notice these concise notes on Gender by the grammarian, Robert Funk:

"In English gender may be said to be natural, i.e. males (men and animals) are masculine, females (women and animals) are feminine, and all inanimate things are neuter. There is also common gender of nouns which denote persons or animals of either sex, e.g. parent, cousin, friend. In relation to Greek, two things require noting:...nouns denoting males are indeed masculine, and nouns denoting females are feminine, but a large number of nouns denoting things which are understood to be neuter in English are either masculine or feminine. GENDER IS THUS BOTH NATURAL AND GRAMMATICAL. House is neuter in English as in German (das Haus), but in Greek it is feminine (he oikia). Day is feminine in Greek (he hemera), masculine in German (der Tag), but understood to be neuter in English." A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek, Robert W. Funk, pg. 59-60

Hence, when you have a noun in Greek, if it has an article, pronoun, participle, etc that is connected with it, the noun and the others will match in gender, number, and case. Of course, there are notable exceptions to that, but the exceptions are dependent upon clear reasoning from other Greek syntactical points. Gary Hudson tried to prove that any exception to gender matching would explain the situation in I John 5:7-8, but that is certainly not the case as will be seen. I pray by this time the reader has some sort of general idea about things matching in Greek. To serve as a final example before proceeding, I offer this simple illustration. "houtoi hoi hagioi apostoloi." In this example each Greek word has an ending. In Greek you can tell the gender, number, and case of a word by its ending. The apparent ending here is "oi," which is a nominative, masculine, plural ending. In translation it would read, "These holy apostles." The pronoun, article, adjective, and noun all agree in gender, number and case. They are all nominative, masculine, and plural.

The standard argument for I John 5:7 belonging in the text of the holy scriptures from a grammatical perspective is well explained by Robert Dabney cited on pg. 200-201 of Michael Maynard's, "A History of the Debate over I John 5:7-8:"

"The internal evidence against this excision, then, is in the following strong points; First, if it be made, the masculine, article, numeral, and participle, hoi treis martuountes, are made to agree directly with three neuters- an insuperable and very bald grammatical difficulty. But if the disputed words are allowed to stand, they agree directly with two masculines and one neuter noun, ho Pater, ho Logos, kai to hagian Pneuma where, according to a well known rule of syntax, the masculines among the group control the gender over a neuter connected with them. Then the occurrence of the masculines treis martuountes in the eighth verse agreeing with the neuters. Pneuma hudor and haima may be accounted for by the power of attraction, so well known in Greek syntax, and by the fact that the Pneuma, the leading noun of this second group, and next to the adjectives, has just had a species of masculines superinduced upon it by its previous position in the masculine group." "The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek," The Works of Robert L. Dabney, 3 vols. London: Banner of Truth, 1967 Reprint. 1:377-382

Very simply, Mr. Dabney said the following concerning I John 5:7-8: -hoti treis eisin hoi martuountes en to ourano-(Literally- Because three are the men who are bearing witness in heaven); - ho Pater, ho Logos, kai to Hagion Pneuma- (Lit.- The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost). At this point the reader should notice a couple of things: 1) treis (three- MASCULINE); hoi martuountes (THE MEN (ones) who are bearing witness- MASCULINE); ho Pater, ho Logos, kai to Hagion Pneuma (The Father [MASCULINE];The Word [MASCULINE]; The Holy Ghost [NEUTER]). So here we have two masculines and a neuter represented by a masculine numeral and a masculine, present active, nominative participle. They match! The neuter Holy Spirit is considered with the masculines because the masculines control the gender over the neuter in the sentence. This can be

illustrated in English by speaking of the human race and saying, "Mankind." Also, the verse that says, "Who would have all MEN to be saved..." in I Tim. 2 could illustrate that as well. Masculines take precedence over grammatical and natural gender generally, except in special cases which we will look at later in this study.

I John 5:7 finishes by saying, -kai hutoi hoi treis hen eisi- (and these three are one). Again the pronoun "hutoi" is masculine, nominative, plural; the article is masculine, nominative, plural; and the numeral is a masculine, nominative. This verse easily illustrates, grammatical attraction, gender matchings, and masculine precedence. However, the trouble comes in the next verse: - kai treis eisin hoi marturountes en te ge, to Pneuma, kai to hudor, kai to haima- (here we have treis [three-MASCULINE]; hoi marturountes [the MEN (ones) who are bearing witness]; to Pneuma [The Spirit- NEUTER]; to hudor [the water- NEUTER]; to haima [the blood-NEUTER]. We can clearly see that we have a gender matching problem in verse 8. The Masculine numeral, and participle are described by three NEUTER nouns! They clearly do not match. However, we learned in verse 7 that the Pneuma was attracted to the two masculine nouns (Pater and Logos), therefore it is abundantly clear [IF VERSE 7 IS LEFT IN THE TEXT] that the apostle John is seeking to relate the three witnesses of verse 7 with the three witnesses of verse 8, all in the person of Jesus Christ. The question is, how do you explain this bizzare grammatical phenomenon if verse 7 is removed? Gary Hudson now provides his argumentation:

"Are Dabney's words here really the "strong points" he purports them to be? He claims first of all that if v. 7 be removed, the "masculine, article, numerical and participle hoitreis marturountes are made to agree with three neuters," i.e., spirit, water, and blood in v. 8. But, "hoi treis marturountes" is not even the proper arrangement of these words anywhere as they appear in the passage. "Treis eisin hoi marturountes" ("three are the ones bearing witness") is the proper wording of the phrase Dabney refers to. The irregular agreement of the masculine here with three neuter antecedents Dabney termed "an insuperable and very bald grammatical difficulty." Irregular gender agreement, however, is never a "very bald grammatical difficulty" in Greek. It may be seen, for example, in I Cor. 13:13, where the antecedents, "faith, hope, and love" (feminine genders) are followed immediately by "these three" (neuter, "tauta"). Matt. 23:23 proves the point further, that "judgment (feminine), mercy (masculine), and faith" (feminine) are the implied antecedents of the demonstrative pronoun "these (neuter) ought ye to have done."

"Any "known rule of syntax" about "the masculines among the group" that "control the gender over a neuter connected with them" is completely irrelevant here. In v. 6, the "Spirit" has been introduced as the witness bearer, and John in his Gospel narrative uses the masculine ekeinos ("he") to refer to the neuter, "Spirit" in John 16:13. There is no reason why John would not use a masculine participle here where the third Person of the Godhead was "connected" with the two other neuters in I John 5:8. Dabney, here, thus destroys his own argument by correctly

stating that "pneuma" (Spirit) is "the leading noun of this second group" in v. 8-- that being the case, John would certainly ascribe a masculine gender to the entire "group" since he has already been known to ascribe a masculine gender to the Holy Spirit in John 16:13."

"Dabney is also quite incorrect in suggesting that "Spirit" ("pneuma") needed a "species of masculineness superinduced upon it by its previous position in the group," namely, by its position in the Trinitarian formula. John never needed to "superinduce masculineness" on the Holy Spirit when he referred to Him with a masculine pronoun in John 16:13. Dabney's argument is exegetically flawed."

"Another point is in order that is almost entirely overlooked by KJOnlys who parrot Dabney's "argument" about the "insuperable and very bald grammatical difficulty" of leaving out I John 5:7. Why did the Greek scribes who transmitted and copied multiple hundreds of Greek manuscripts of I John allow such a "grammatical difficulty" to remain in the text if it was so "insuperable" and "very bald?" In addition to that, why did not the original "corrupter" of the passage change *hoi marturountes* to the neuter plural *ta marturounta*, which would have made it "agree with three neuters" and completely covered his tracks?--If he could have "removed an entire verse" so successfully, he certainly could have made this change unnoticed and thus avoided the "very bald grammatical difficulty." Greek-speaking copyists down through the centuries likewise had this opportunity but left both the omission and the genders stand in virtually every Greek manuscript of the passage, and their reason for doing so was obvious: the "grammatical difficulty" did not exist."

The first point that Mr. Hudson attempts to make is that "irregular gender agreement, however, is never a "very bald grammatical difficulty" in Greek." He then, as you read, goes on to list I Cor. 13:13 and Matthew 23:23 as examples for this grammatical irregularity in I John 5:8 being justifiable. He correctly states that *pistis* [faith- FEMININE]; *elpis* [hope- FEMININE]; and *agape* [charity- FEMININE] are represented by a NEUTER numeral and a NEUTER demonstrative pronoun (*ta tria tauta*- These three). Again, Mr. Hudson correctly relays that *-ten krisin* [judgment- FEMININE]; *ton eleon* [mercy- MASCULINE]; and *ten pistin* [faith- FEMININE] are represented by a NEUTER demonstrative pronoun (*THESE*- *tauta*). Unfortunately, what Mr. Hudson does is leave the reader with the impression that just because these two instances have an "irregular agreement" that that automatically explains the situation in I John 5:8. If Mr. Hudson had any idea what he was talking about, he would have understood why there was an exception here. Instead he goes on to say, "Any 'known rule of syntax' about 'the masculines among the group' that 'control the gender over a neuter connected with them' is completely irrelevant here." NO, that rule was just illustrated in I John 5:7 with the three witnesses, Mr. Hudson just pretended that the verse didn't belong. As the canine who adamantly fetched a compass about his tail, so Gary Hudson assumed the thing he had yet to prove.

Mr. Hudson's engraved error in attempting to illustrate the critical text reading in I John 5:8 by the demonstrative pronouns in I Cor. 13:13 and Matthew 23:23 come back to the point I was making with Robert Funk's comments at the beginning of the treatise. Namely, that Greek can take GRAMMATICAL OR NATURAL GENDER, unlike English that only takes natural. Thus, we have an exceptional grammatical construction, well illustrated by Dr. Daniel Wallace in his book on Greek syntax, called "Constructio Ad Sensum." Hence, Wallace explains:

"A small group of demonstrative pronouns involve a NATURAL AGREEMENT with their antecedents THAT OVERRIDES STRICT GRAMMATICAL CONCORD. As such, they are illustrations of constructions according to sense (constructio ad sensum). This natural agreement may involve gender, or much more rarely, number. Frequently, the agreement is conceptual only, since the pronoun refers to a phrase or clause rather than a noun or other substantive." -Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, Dr. Daniel Wallace, pg.330-331

Dr. Wallace gives 3 clear illustrations of this constructio ad sensum. One will be found in Acts 8:10 where the masculine pronoun *houtos* (This [man]) naturally agrees with *he dunamis* (the power [FEMININE]), but they certainly don't agree grammatically. The next one, located in Romans 2:14, is the NEUTER word for Gentiles (*ethne*) that serves as the antecedent to the MASCULINE pronoun *houtoi* NATURALLY because it refers to human beings generally. Thus they don't match grammatically. Thirdly, is I Cor. 6:10-11 where a list of non neuters are described by a NEUTER demonstrative pronoun to match in natural gender, but not grammatically. Therefore, based on this "well known rule of syntax in Greek," the most we can glean from Hudson's tirade is that he provided two cases of constructio ad sensum! Both lists are clear references to inanimate THINGS. However, what is absurd is to assume that these "irregularities" apply to I John 5:8 since ALL THREE WORDS ARE NATURALLY AND GRAMMATICALLY NEUTER IN THAT VERSE! There is nothing that would warrant an ad sensum translation with the passage in I John.

Compounding the frivolous nature of Mr. Hudson's presentation, he decides to ask a redundant question assuming that it is, "another point...that is almost entirely overlooked by KJOnlys who parrot Dabney's 'argument' about the 'insuperable and very bald grammatical difficulty' of leaving out I John 5:7." The question is essentially if the passage is genuine why didn't any of the scribes that copied I John 5 leave the passage as it stands and not alter it to a neuter. Even though this question does not have to be dealt with because it deals with the realm of the hypothetical and not the specifics of reality, I shall give Hudson my hypothesis since he was kind enough to render his:

1) The "original corrupter" as Hudson calls him, was as asinine as Hudson is and assumed that if he could find one area in scripture that had an "irregular gender agreement" that that would suffice for an explanation.

2) The "original corrupter" and subsequent copyists could have been ill acquainted with Greek (as is Mr. Hudson), as is so readily manifest by the manuscript tradition. Dean Burgon actually gives an excellent example of this historical flaw on pages 177-178 of the Revision Revised. "Some stupid scribe (as the reader sees) has connected the first syllable of nesos with the last syllable of Melite. That is all!" Again, on pg. 15 of "The Causes of Corruption of the Traditional Text," Burgon writes. "[And before the members of the Church had gained a familiar acquaintance with the words of the New Testament, blunders continually crept into the text of more or less heinous importance.] All this, which was chiefly done during the second and third centuries..." Besides, do all criminals consistently cover all of their tracks? **ABSOLUTELY NOT!**

3) The intent of the "original corrupter" might not have been the same as the subsequent ones. Hudson's question assumes that all scribes were as irreverent concerning the text as he is, and would change it if deemed necessary. Perhaps one scribe saw the blunder, but left the text as he found it in his exemplar!

Mr. Hudson's biggest blunder in his "refutation" is his strong reliance upon the relation of ekeinos to pneuma in John 16:13-14. Hudson explains:

"A. T. Robertson, in remarking on the use of ekeinos in John 16:13, says,

"Note ekeinos (masculine demonstrative pronoun), though followed by neuter pneuma in apposition" (Robertson's Word Pictures)."

"According to Robertson, pneuma is in "apposition" to ekeinos in John 16:13. "Apposition," according to the dictionary, when used in grammar, means "the placing of a word or expression beside another so that the second explains and has the same grammatical construction as the first" (Webster's New World Dictionary). Thus, "the Spirit" (neuter) explains "he" (masculine) in John 16:13."

"Furthermore, in John 16:14, ekeinos ("he") is used once again and has the direct antecedent of "the Spirit of Truth" in verse 13. Jesus said, "He [ekeinos--"the Spirit (neuter) of Truth"] shall glorify me" (verse 14). Robertson remarks:

"Christ is both the way and the Truth (14:6) and the Holy Spirit is the Guide who shows the way to the Truth (verse 14)" (ibid., referring to John 16:14)."

Above Hudson says that "in John 16:14, ekeinos ("he") is used once again and has the direct antecedent of "the Spirit of Truth in verse 13." This may sound half way decent to the unsuspecting reader, but in reality IT IS VERY POOR GREEK!

In three contexts that ekeinos (masculine demonstrative pronoun) is used in "apposition" to the NEUTER Spirit it is most certainly NOT because the Spirit is the "direct antecedent" of ekeinos. Nay, but the Spirit is in apposition to ekeinos BECAUSE THE DIRECT ANTECEDENT OF ekeinos IS THE COMFORTER

(parakletos) WHICH IS MASCULINE IN GREEK! Observe Wallace's comments on the subject, speaking of John 15:26:

"The use of ekeinos here is frequently regarded by students of the NT to be an affirmation of the personality of the Spirit. Such an approach is based on the assumption that the antecedent of ekeinos is pneuma: 'the masculine pronoun ekeinos is used in John 14:26 and 16:13-14 to refer to the neuter noun pneuma to emphasize the personality of the Holy Spirit.' (Wallace citing Young, Intermediate Greek, pg.78) Wallace continuing:

"But this is erroneous. In all these Johannine passages, pneuma is appositional to the masculine noun. THE GENDER OF ekeinos THUS HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE NATURAL GENDER OF pneuma. The antecedent of ekeinos in each case is parakletos, NOT pneuma. John 14:26 reads ho parakletos to pneuma to hagian, ho pempsei ho pater en to onomati mou, ekeinos humas didaxeai panta (Lit.- ho parakletos [The Comforter- MASCULINE]; to pneuma to hagian [The Holy Ghost-NEUTER]; ho [whom-NEUTER]; pempsei ho pater en to onomati mou [the Father will send in the name of me (or my name)]; ekeinos [THAT MAN (he)- MASCULINE] humas didaxeai panta [that man will teach you all things.]. Pneuma not only is appositional to parakletos, but the relative pronoun that follows it is NEUTER! This hardly assists the grammatical argument for the Spirit's personality. In John 16:13-14 the immediate context is deceptive: *otan de elthe ekeinos to pneuma tes aletheias hodegesei humas en te aletheia pase; ekeinos eme doxasei* (Lit. Whenever that man (he) comes-the Spirit of truth- he will guide you into all truth...he shall glorify me). The ekeinos reaches back to v 7, where parakletos is mentioned. Thus, since parakletos is masculine, so is the pronoun. Although one might argue that the Spirit's personality is in view in these passages, the view must be based on the nature of a parakletos and the things said about the Comforter, not on any supposed grammatical subtleties. **INDEED, IT IS DIFFICULT TO FIND ANY TEXT IN WHICH pneuma IS GRAMMATICALLY REFERRED TO WITH THE MASCULINE GENDER.**" -Greek Grammar Beyond The Basics, Daniel Wallace, pg. 331-332 (Emphasis mine, translational changes mine). Several things to notice here:

1) The masculine demonstrative pronoun ekeinos is in apposition to the Neuter noun pneuma BECAUSE THE ANTECEDENT of ekeinos IS parakletos, ANOTHER MASCULINE SUBSTANTIVE.

2) John is not ignorant or careless in his grammatical matchings because when discussing the pneuma in John 14:26 he refers to him by a NEUTER RELATIVE PRONOUN!

3) Therefore, any attempt to make a personalization of the Spirit out of these texts by Gary Hudson to justify the bald grammatical difficulty in I John 5:8 doesn't hold any weight due to a proper exegesis of Greek syntax.

If we recollect accurately, we will remember that part of the grammatical debate in I John 5:8 is due to three nouns being represented by a masculine participle. Gary

Hudson explains this by insisting that John purposely referred to the NEUTER spirit as a masculine by using a masculine demonstrative pronoun. However, as we observed the reason for the masculine pronoun was because of the masculine parakletos (Comforter). Therefore, Hudson's argument is nugatory and void. But, if I John 5:7 is retained, the Spirit in verse 8 picks up the masculine attraction placed upon the pneuma in verse 7 and can thus explain the difficulty with ease. Edward Hills brings an interesting point to light, which Hudson tried his best to skidaddle around. Dr. Hills says in "The King James Version Defended, pg. 211-212: "...the omission of the Johannine comma involves a grammatical difficulty. The words spirit, water, and blood are neuter in gender, but in I John 5:8 they are treated as masculine. If the Johannine comma is rejected, it is hard to explain this irregularity. It is usually said that in I John 5:8 the spirit, the water, and the blood are personalized and that this is the reason for the adoption of the masculine gender. But it is hard to see how such personalization would involve the change from the neuter to the masculine. **FOR IN VERSE 6 THE WORD SPIRIT PLAINLY REFERS TO THE HOLY SPIRIT, THE THIRD PERSON OF THE TRINITY. SURELY IN THIS VERSE THE WORD SPIRIT IS "PERSONALIZED," AND YET THE NEUTER GENDER IS USED.** Therefore, since personalization DID NOT bring about a change of gender in verse 6, it cannot fairly be pleaded as the reason for such a change in verse 8. If, however, the Johannine Comma is retained, as reason for placing the neuter nouns spirit, water, and blood in the masculine gender becomes readily apparent. **IT WAS DUE TO THE INFLUENCE OF THE NOUNS FATHER AND WORD, WHICH ARE MASCULINE.** Thus the hypothesis that the Johannine comma is an interpolation is full of difficulties." Emphasis mine.

1) Hills point is remarkable, namely, that without I John 5:7 there is no explanation for the masculine participle for the three neuter nouns in verse 8, when the Spirit was referred to with **A NEUTER PARTICIPLE IN VERSE 6.** Compare verse 6, -kai to pneuma estin to marturoun- (and the Spirit is the one that is bearing witness- NEUTER).

2) To this brilliant truth Hudson skates and says, "...Hills sets up a straw man about spirit, water, and blood being 'personalized' by some and relates how 'personalization' failed to change the gender to masculine in v. 6. **HE IS PERHAPS CORRECT** in saying this argument is NOT CONSISTENT, but he overlooks his own consistency by failing to note John's other treatments of the Holy Spirit with a masculine gender." Emphasis mine.

I pray it is all too clear how Hudson ruined his entire presentation by basing it on the relation of ekeinos to pneuma in John 16. As I have already documented, John was grammatically consistent in John 14:26, John 15:26, and John 16:13-14 which **ALL THREE** have parakletos as the antecedent of ekeinos. Gary Hudson, couldn't teach Greek to save his own life. He offered no response to Hill's excellent point, but to accuse the man of inconsistency, which he most certainly was not!

Hudson states: "To introduce the 'Trinitarian Formula' into verse 7 is to make an aberration into the passage that diverts the reader's attention away from the point John is making. John is not arguing or discussing the Doctrine of the Trinity anywhere in the context. It is thus impossible to do an accurate and consistent exegesis of the passage as it stands in the Textus Receptus!"

On the contrary:

- 1) If you remove the passage, you destroy the fact that Jesus Christ has TWO NATURES in him when he was born in Bethlehem of Judea. One is his divine nature (vs. 7), and one is his human nature as a sinless man (vs. 8)**
- 2) You destroy Jesus Christ's preincarnate witness to his own birth, which is the context of the passage, since it is not "the Son," but "THE WORD." (John 1:1,14)**
- 3) You destroy the fact that the things that agree in Jesus Christ in verse 8 are personalized in him due to their relation to the Godhead. The Spirit (The Holy Ghost; The Spirit of Christ); the water (his physical birth; John 3:4; John 1:14); the blood (God's blood! Acts 20:28)**
- 4) Not only do you destroy the two natures listed in number one, but you annul the Lord's own statements about the "witness of God" in John 3. You disallow the fact that the witness of God is not complete WITHOUT TWO SETS OF WITNESSES! John 3:11, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; AND YE RECEIVE NOT OUR WITNESS." That's a trinitarian statement on the first coming of Christ that the Jews rejected. John 3:12, "If I have told you of EARTHLY things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of HEAVENLY things?" Three witnesses in heaven, three in the earth in I John 5:7-8. Hudson missed the reference. John 3:13, "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man WHICH IS IN HEAVEN." There it is, just like I John 5:7-8, Jesus Christ testimony in two places at once. Consequently, "which is in heaven" is removed from the new Bibles that follow the corrupted Nestle's text!**

As in his debate with Peter Ruckman, Gary R. Hudson failed to demonstrate a working knowledge of Greek grammar. He failed to show that I Cor. 13:13 and Matthew 23:23 were examples of a 'Constructio ad sensum' while I John 5:8 was not; he failed to show that the real grammatical connection of ekeinos in John 16 was to another masculine, parakletos and not to pneuma. He failed to refute Hills' argument on the Neuter participle usage of the Spirit in I John 5:6 by arguing in a circle to John 16; and he failed to search the scriptures in reference to the doctrinal imports lost by removing I John 5:7.

An Apocryphal Amalgamation

By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson

There are many things, which through my own observations, a Bible-believing Christian should never have to spend his Lord's time studying in this life before he reaches the portals of heaven. However, because of the increase and perpetuation of heretical sects, cults and doctrines, it has become ever so apparent that in order for that same Bible-believer to equip himself for adequate apologetical discussion, he must indeed spend his precious, limited time in that which increases sorrow among men (see Ecclesiastes 1:18).

If you have ever opened a Roman Catholic Bible (such as the Duoay-Rheims, the New American Bible, etc.), or a Protestant imitation thereof (such as a New Revised Standard Version Catholic Edition), you should have come to the immediate conclusion that there are additional books contained in them that, of course, are not to be found in the A.V. 1611. But, if the case were that cut-and-dry (and naturally because of the depraved human mind it never is), it would be expedient for us to end our discourse at this juncture.

Nevertheless, the conflict arises because Bible-believers (or potential ones) seek to know why the Catholic Bible contains these additional, allegedly Biblical books, not generally found in the canon of the Protestant Bibles. Moreover, anyone who has delved into the study of final authority, multiple, contemporary Bible versions, manuscript evidence, King James Onlyism, etc., has soon discovered that one of the wide array of attacks on the King's English is that, "the 1611 KJV contained the Apocrypha." Notwithstanding, because the average person is so accustomed to relating the Apocrypha to Catholicism, they are subsequently inclined to believe that there might be some validity to the authenticity of the Apocryphal books when they learn the disturbing news (at least to themselves initially) that the A.V. 1611 originally contained these Apocryphal books. Therefore, by means of a brief history of the Apocrypha, it is necessary to provide the Bible-believer with the essential means by which to reject the authenticity of the Apocrypha, and, based on the preponderance of evidence, as King James himself, limit the Apocrypha, not to doctrinal truths, but to the confines of historical trivia.

I. THE CONNOTATION OF THE APOCRYPHA

As concerning the implications of the word "Apocrypha," it is (in the form that most of you have at one time or another observed it) a neuter, plural adjective of the second declension in Greek. Concerning the second declension neuter in Greek, the nominative and accusative singular have the same endings, as do the nominative and accusative plurals. Therefore, as touching the case of the words, it could be nominative or accusative, depending on how it used in context.

This word found its way into the New Testament in the form of adjectives and verbs. The verbal forms come in the words "kruphto" (from which is related your English

word, "Crypt," or "Cryptic"), "apokrupto," "enkrupto," kalupto," "parakalupto," etc. The adjectival forms include the words "kruptos," and more directly, "apokruphos."

Examples:

1) Krupto: This verb means to hide, conceal, lay up in store, etc. It can be used in a physical sense, such as Matthew 5:14 (used as an infinitive, "be hid"), or a metaphorical sense, such as Matthew 13:35 (used as a perfect, passive, participle, neuter, accusative, plural; "things which have been kept secret").

2) Apokrupto: This verb is obviously a compounded form of the above with the addition of the preposition "apo" (from) as a prefix. It is translated as, "thou hast hid," in Luke 10:21 (used as an aorist, active, indicative, second person, singular); "the hidden wisdom" (perfect passive participle, feminine, singular, accusative); other uses can be found in Ephesians 3:9, Colossians 1:26, etc.

3) Enkrupto: This verb is a compounded form of "krupto" with the preposition "en" (which generally means "in"). It is used in the sense of hiding in something, such as in Matthew 13:33, "hid" (aorist active indicative, third person, singular).

4) Perikrupto: This verb is yet another compounded form of "krupto" with the preposition "peri," which generally means "concerning, about, or around" (depending on if it is used with the genitive or the accusative). It is used intensively, such as in Luke 1:24, where it is translated, "hid" (imperfect active indicative, third person, singular). Notice how smoothly the A.V. 1611 translates this word as a simple aorist, "hid," correcting the Greek for better English, instead of the literal imperfect, which would be, "was being hidden." Completely refusing to follow the general rules of Greek syntax, the NKJV, NASB, and the NIV all follow the King's English in suit to correct "the Greek." The NKJV renders Luke 1:24 as, "kept herself hid...", the NASB, "kept herself in seclusion," and the NIV, "remained in seclusion." None of these Bible versions translated the imperfect literally in the passage under consideration. Question: Why do we constantly here all of the hypocritical backbiting toward the King James when it comes to translating verbs literally, when the modern versions do the very same thing?

5) Kalupto: This verb, as Vine states, "signifies to cover, conceal, so that no trace of it can be seen." (An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words, W.E. Vine, pg. 218). As an example, "kalupto" is utilized as a perfect passive participle, nominative, neuter, singular twice in II Corinthians 4:3, being translated as "hid." Consequently, the noun "kalumma" is translated as "veil" several times in the narrative of II Corinthians 3:13-18.

6) Parakalupto: This verb denotes the covering of something with a veil, and is translated by the A.V. 1611 as "hid" in Luke 9:45 (perfect passive participle, neuter, nominative, singular). The word is a compounded form of the verb "kalupto," with

the preposition, "para" (this preposition is used with the genitive, dative, and accusative cases, and generally means, "from," "beside, or in the presence of," and "alongside of" respectively) prefixed to it.

7) **Kruptos:** The principle thing to be considered when investigating into the sources behind the word "apocrypha" is the adjectival usage of the word, since of course, the word "apocrypha" itself is an adjective (as noted above). The adjective "kruptos" means "hidden," or "secret" and is translated as "hid" in the A.V. in Mark 4:22, but interestingly enough is rendered as "secret" in the parallel passage in Luke 8:17. The reason I say that this is interesting is because the compounded adjective, "apokruphos" is used respectively with "kruptos" in the so-said passages, and the A.V. 1611 translators (as if they could read the minds of 21st century Bible-critics), purposely switched the renditions of the words in both passages. In Mark 4:22, "kruptos" is rendered "hid," but "secret" in Luke 8:17." On the reciprocal, "apokruphos" is rendered, "kept secret" in Mark 4:22, but "hid" in Luke 8:17. This goes to show you that the A.V. translators were not in the least bit worried about "uniformity of translation" as the Bible-critics incessantly reiterate. Dr. Miles Smith, one of the A.V. translators, and author of the famous, "Translators to the Readers," said the following concerning uniformity of translation:

"And hereunto, that niceness in words was always counted the next step to trifling, and so was to be curious about names too: also that we cannot follow a better pattern for elocution than God himself; therefore he using divers words, in his holy writ, and indifferently for one thing in nature: we, if we will not be superstitious, may use the same liberty in our English versions out of Hebrew and Greek, for that copy or store that he hath given us." (Translators to the Readers, Dr. Miles Smith, pg. 26, which in the copy before me should correspond to the second to last paragraph of the work).

8) **Apokruphos:** Of course, as the reader has probably inferred by now, this is the actual word that corresponds directly to our English word, "Apocrypha." And, as you have discovered above, this word is closely linked with the word "kruptos," even being translated interchangeably by the A.V. 1611 translators in the above passages. This word is also rendered as a nominative, masculine, adjective in Colossians 2:3, translated as "hid," referencing the treasures of wisdom and knowledge in our Lord Jesus Christ.

Specifically, the word Apocrypha, as used in English, can carry a few different connotations:

A) Given above, the word as given in detail above, can mean hidden or concealed. This would deliver the idea that something in written form was written to be understood only by a select, specific group of people, operating in an inner circle. This would carry the weight of a secret, mysterious type of organization.

B) The word further developed into a more defined meaning to denote spurious,

forged, of unknown or fraudulent authorship or contents; hence, heretical.

C) Around the 4th century A.D., Jerome translated the Latin Vulgate (which was the official Catholic Bible for centuries), from which came not only the 1380-82 Wycliffe Bible, but also the 1582 Jesuit Rheims New Testament (the then official Roman Catholic English translation). In this translation, Jerome recognized 24 O.T. books as canonical (these 24 correspond to our 39 O.T. books), and even though the "Apocrypha" were included in his translation, after the 24 recognized, canonical books, he noted that, "anything outside of these must be placed within the Apocrypha." (General Biblical Introduction, H.S. Miller, pg. 108). Hence, the word "Apocrypha" came to be used in the sense of unrecognized, uncanonical books that were clearly inferior in authority and worth to the inspired Scriptures.

II. THE CONTENTS OF THE APOCRYPHA

When an individual ascertains a copy of an "original" 1611 edition of the King James Bible (meaning a reprinted edition published by Hendrickson or Thomas Nelson, etc.), they will observe within the Table of Contents a division between the Old Testament and New Testament. In between the two inspired testaments, the title thereof reads, "The Bookes called Apocrypha." There are 14 in number, and they can be named as follows:

- 1) 1 Esdras: (In the large part, a compilation of material found in 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah)**
- 2) 2 Esdras: (Apocalyptic in nature; contains a series of supposed seven visions)**
- 3) Tobit: (A religious romance of the Jewish Captivity; supposed to be based on history, but has no pure, historical basis)**
- 4) Judith: (Another religious romance, supposedly belonging to the time of Nebuchadnezzar. Intended to demonstrate Jewish bravery and devotion to the law; has no historical basis, and teaches that "the end justifies the means")**
- 5) The Rest of Esther: (Written in Greek; legendary in character; contains visions, letters, and prayers that are allegedly supposed to heighten and expound upon the story of Esther, and explain some of the difficulties in the book of Esther)**
- 6) The Wisdom of Solomon: (Ethical Treatise commending wisdom and righteousness, yet condemning iniquity and idolatry)**
- 7) Ecclesiasticus: (Ethical treatise that is essentially patterned like and after Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes)**
- 8) Baruch with the Epistle of Jeremiah: (weak imitation of Jeremiah's book; contains prayers, Jewish confessions while in the Captivity, and the promise of**

restoration from the exile)

9) **The Song of the Three Holy Children:** (one of three additions to the book of Daniel; in the LXX it is added after Daniel 3:23; contains a prayer of Azariah (Abed-nego), who was one of the three Hebrew children cast into the fiery furnace)

10) **The History of Susanna:** (a story of a religious romance concerning the deliverance of a pure woman from the clutches of two immoral men during the time of Daniel; placed before Daniel 1 in the LXX, and as Daniel 13 in the Latin Vulgate)

11) **Bel and the Dragon:** (Recapitulates the story of Daniel's deliverance from the den of lions, as well as the heroic story of Daniel, in which two objects of Babylonian worship are destroyed)

12) **The Prayer of Manasseh:** (Supposed to be a penitential prayer of Manasseh, king of Judah, while he was in prison; supposed to follow the events listed in II Chronicles 33:18-19, but is usually found among the odes in the Psalms, and scattered elsewhere in the LXX. Even the Catholic tradition rejects this one as authoritative)

13) **1 Maccabees:** (This is a historical narrative that covers the time from the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes to the death of Simon Maccabaeus (175-135 B.C.). Evidently, it gives a pretty true account of the Maccabean War, and is considered important because of the history it gives between the silent years of Malachi 4 and Matthew 1)

14) **2 Maccabees:** (A supplement to 1 Maccabees, as it covers 15 years of that history (176-161 B.C.) The historical records are not as reliable as 1 Maccabees; it is prefaced by two questionable letters to Jews in Egypt. It contains material about the supernatural, places emphasis on moral and religious principles, the resurrection, etc.)

Out of these 14, the Roman Catholic establishment, accepts 11 as canonical. 7 are separately enumerated, while the remaining 4 coalesce with other books. The ones that are enumerated separately are, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, 1 Maccabees, and 2 Maccabees. Regarding the final 4, "The Rest of Esther," is incorporated in canonical Esther; "The Song of the Three Holy Children," "The History of Susanna," and "Bel and the Dragon," are all combined with canonical Daniel.

III. THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE APOCRYPHA

A. The books can be classified as follows:

1) Historical: 1 Esdras, 1 Maccabees, and 2 Maccabees.

2) Teaching or Wisdom: The Wisdom of Solomon, and Ecclesiasticus

3) Religious Romances: Tobit, and Judith

4) Apocalyptic: Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah, and 2 Esdras

5) Legendary: The Rest of Esther, The Song of the Three Holy Children, The History of Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, and the Prayer of Manasseh.

B. All of the writers associated with these apocryphal books are virtually unknown, save the writer of Ecclesiasticus, who is evidently one "Jesus ben Sirach."

C. All of the apocryphal books exist in the Greek language, although Ecclesiasticus, 1 Maccabees, part of Baruch, and possibly Tobit and Judith were written in Hebrew.

D. The dates of the original writings of these books are a subject of debate, and are speculative in nature. Of course, Ecclesiasticus is supposedly more certain, with an original date of around 180 B.C., and thus being translated into Greek around 132 B.C. The dates of the others book, as stated before, are a subject of debate, and range from 300 B.C. to 200 A.D. The oldest Qumran scroll of Tobit, dates around 100 B.C. The Qumran material found on Ecclesiasticus doesn't reveal anything different about the dating given above. The letter of Jeremiah, is represented by a single Qumran scroll, evidently copies about 100 B.C. (for more information, see James Vanderkam, The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls, pg. 184-187).

IV. THE CONSENSUS UNIVERSAL CONCERNING THE APOCRYPHA

In the thesis of this treatise, it was speculated that it would be demonstrated by a "PREPONDERANCE" of evidence regarding the anachronistic probability that the Apocrypha should be rejected as canonical, inspired, and authoritative by any Bible-Believing Christian. The following ensuing, pertinent bits of information demonstrate the afore mentioned point conclusively:

1) The Jewish canon, universally by the Hebrew people, thus settled and decided upon around 90 A.D. at the Council of Jamnia, regards the 39 books that correspond to the accepted Protestant Old Testament as inspired and authoritative. No Apocryphal books ever found their way into the Hebrew canon.

2) Upon consideration of the non-Septuagintal Greek versions in the second century A.D., we find that they were preponderantly against the inclusion of Apocryphal books into the standard canon. These Greek versions, three in number, were supposedly independent revisions of the Septuagint, although many readings therein support the Hebrew Massoretic text against the current text of the LXX. At any rate, regarding the state of the Apocrypha in the Greek versions in the 2nd century A.D., we find that the version manufactured by Aquila (128 A.D.), contained no

Apocryphal books whatsoever. The same can be said for the Greek version of Symmachus (200 A.D.). Similarly, the version produced by Theodotian contains no Apocryphal works, save the three additions to the canon of Daniel (History of Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, Three Holy Children, etc.)

3) Although the Old Latin translation of the 2nd century contained them, it is of equal consequence that the Old Syriac of the same time period did not originally contain the Apocrypha. Howbeit, they were added into that particular canon later.

4) The Latin Vulgate of the 4th century contained the Apocrypha, but they were confessedly uncanonical and uninspired by the translator, Jerome.

5) The Ethiopic version contained more or less of the Apocrypha, although not completely. However, the Armenian version did not contain these spurious books, and the Arabic translation in the early centuries probably did not contain them either.

6) The Canonical lists procured from Melito (170 A.D.), Justin Martyr (164 A.D.), Adamantius Origen (254 A.D.), and the Council of Laodicea (363 A.D.), recognized 22 books of the Old Testament (corresponding to our 39), as the authoritative and standard canon. Exceptions to this are Athanasius (died in 365 A.D.) and Cyril of Jerusalem (died 366 A.D.), who favored Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah. Consequently, these are all that practically appear conclusively in favor of the Apocrypha.

7) The Greek Orthodox establishment uses the Septuagint (LXX) with Apocrypha, and their confession repeatedly quotes these works as authoritative and were hence declared canonical in the Synods of Constantinople (1638), Jaffa (1642), and Jerusalem (1672). Nevertheless, in the most inconsistent fashion, at other sundry times, this religious establishment declined to use them as canonical, and even sported certain writers (such as the Patriarch Metrophanes who died in 1640 A.D.), and the Larger Catechism (1839), which, by the way, is the most authoritative standard within this Greek-Roman setup, expressly omits these dubious books on the premise that, "they do not exist in Hebrew." (see Miller, pg. 113-114)

8) Tertullian (150-220 A.D.) lists 24 as the number of canonical O.T. books.

9) Hilary of Poitiers, France (305-366 A.D.) lists 22 as the correct canonical number.

10) Ruffinus of Aquileia, Italy (died 410 A.D.) lists the same number as above as the correct number for the canon.

11) Even though Jerome (340-420 A.D.) has been mentioned, it is expedient to utilize this quote in reference to his position on the Apocrypha:

"As the celebrated Roman Catholic writer, Gigot, very frankly allows, 'Time and again this illustrious doctor (Jerome) of the Latin church rejects the authority of the deuterio-canonical books in the most explicit manner'" (Robinson, Where Did We Get Our Bible?, pg. 54, quoting from Gigot, General Introduction to the Holy Scriptures, pg. 56...see Miller, ibid, pg. 114)

12) Aurelius Augustine (354-430 A.D.), whom B.B. Warfield referred to as "...the creator of the Holy Roman Empire." (see The Otherside of Calvinism, Dr. Laurence Vance, pg. 40), a contemporary of Jerome and referred to by the Calvinist Boettner as, "the one who gave the doctrine of purgatory its first definite form." (Vance, ibid, pg. 56), was the leader in the three great councils of Hippo (393 A.D.), and Carthage (397 and 419 A.D.). From these, his O.T. catalogue contained 44 books, of which included the Apocrypha. Even though Vance points out that Augustine accepted the Apocrypha and believed in the inspiration of the LXX (Vance, ibid, pg. 53), it is Miller who distinguishes between Augustine's acceptance of the Apocrypha generally, and his subsequent distinction between proto-canonical (acknowledged), and deuterio-canonical (controverted), apocryphal books. Therefore, according to the learned H.S. Miller, Augustine, "...limited the word 'canonical,' in its strict sense, to the Hebrew Canon of inspired writings, and he refused to accept apocryphal books in support of doctrine." (Miller, ibid, pg. 114)

13) From the time of Jerome and Augustine (again, since they were contemporaries), some followed the strict canon of Jerome, and others seemed to follow the expanded list promulgated by Augustine. Miller explains why the list of Augustine was implemented by some when he states, "The list of Augustine, taken without his cautions, led to a result which he had not intended, taking away the distinction between the inspired and the uninspired, and placing all the books upon the same level." (Miller, ibid, pg. 115). Hence, because of this excellent point by the reverend Miller, individuals such as Cassiodorus (556 A.D.) and Isadore of Seville (636 A.D.), placed the two list together, and made no distinction between them.

14) Primasius and Junilius (550 A.D.) accepted 24 books as canonical and definitively postulated that the apocryphal books were not of the same caliber.

15) Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome (590-604 A.D.), adhered to the Hebrew canon, and made no provision for yielding to any additional books as canonical.

16) Pope Clement VII (1378-94 A.D.), once wrote concerning the topic under consideration, "The whole Latin Church is very greatly indebted to St Jerome for distinguishing the canonical from the non-canonical books, since he has freed us from the reproach of the Hebrews that we frame for ourselves books or parts of books of the old canon which they lack entirely. For Judith, Tobit, and the Macabees are reckoned by Jerome to be outside of the canonical books and placed among the Apocrypha, along with the Book of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus. These are not canonical books, that is, they do not belong to the rule for confirming those things which are of faith; yet they can be called canonical, that is, belonging to the

rule for the edification of believers. With this distinction what is said by Augustine and written by the Council of Carthage can be rightly apprehended." (Miller pg. 115, quoted by Green: General Introduction: The Canon, pg. 177)

17) Cardinal Cajetan (1517-34 A.D.) once declared concerning the same subject matter in the preface to his commentary on Hebrews, "We have chosen the rule of Jerome that we may not err in distinguishing the canonical books; for those which he delivered as canonical we hold to be canonical, and those which he separated from the canonical, we hold to be out of the canon." (ibid, Miller, pg. 115; Green, pg. 178)

The question might be apparent in the reader's mind at this point, that if the preponderance of the evidence conclusively demonstrates that the Apocrypha was not regarded as inspired and authoritative by the early Christian writers, and even other Catholics, then how did the Catholic hierarchy end up advocating 11 books of the Apocrypha as inspired Scripture? Well, the answer is that this question was settled definitively for the Catholics at the Council of Trent in 1546. Due to the influence of Luther and the reformers (Luther subscribed to the inspired OT canon as it is found in an A.V. 1611), something drastic and bold had to be done in order for the Catholic establishment to counter the reformation. Among other things, such as the institution of the Jesuit priests under the auspices of Ignatius Loyola, a group of only 53 prelates, among whom appeared no German, no recognized scholastic, and all of which were evidently historically mundane, gathered together at this council and concluded by official decree that the entire Old Testament, the Apocrypha, and unwritten tradition were of God. Hence, they were to be received and revered as such under the penalty of being anathematized.

However, historically, the Protestant churches and religious establishments have held to the Hebrew Canon, as the canon of the early church. Nevertheless, they have always differed somewhat as to the value of the Apocrypha. For example:

A) The Church of England (1562): "The Church doth read them for example of life and instruction of manners, yet it doth not apply them to establish any doctrine."

B) The Westminster Confession (1643): "The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of Scripture; and are therefore of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be otherwise approved and made use of than other human writings." (The Westminster Confession of Faith, Ch. 1, article 3)

C) Luther's German Bible placed the Apocrypha between the Testaments. This is very important to note because the A.V. 1611 does the very same thing, yet repugnant critics of the A.V. 1611, such as Daniel Corner, criticize the original 1611 for containing the Apocrypha. Then, upon discovery that the modern, apostate versions, remove verses of Scripture, someone of Corner's shallow learning states that the A.V. 1611 removed whole books, referencing the Apocrypha. However, it is

the preface to the Apocrypha, omitting 1 and 2 Esdras, in Luther's Bible that states, "These books are not to be held in equal esteem with the holy Scriptures, but yet are good and useful for reading."

D) Calvin's French version (1535 A.D.) separates the Apocrypha from the canonical books.

E) Wycliff's English Bible (OT complete in 1382), after enumerating 25 canonical, O.T. books, stated, "Whatever book is in the Old Testament besides these 25 shall be set among the Apocrypha, that is, without authority of belief."

F) Coverdale's Bible (1535 A.D.) groups these books under a separate heading, "Apocrifa."

G) The Matthew's Bible (1537 A.D.) groups them by themselves as uninspired, and Taverner does the same in like manner (1539 A.D.)

H) The following English Bibles place the Apocrypha in between the Testaments as uninspired or in an appendix: The Great Bible (1639-40); The Geneva Bible (1560); The Bishop's Bible (1568); and the King James Bible (1611). The Geneva began to omit the Apocrypha in editions after 1599, and the same with the A.V. 1611 after 1629 in certain editions. In 1827, they were excluded from the A.V. permanently.

V. THE CONTRADICTIONS AND CORRUPTIONS WITHIN THE APOCRYPHA

Besides the many historical facts and evidences given above, the Apocrypha abound, and can be characterized by a plethora of doctrinal, historical, and moral errors. For example:

1) Even though the lifespan of Tobit was only 158 years, he claims to have been alive when Jeroboam revolted (931 B.C.), and when the Assyrians took the Northern tribes captive (722 B.C.). See references in Tobit 1:3-5; 14:11)

2) In order to eradicate evil spirits and devils and cure certain eye diseases, Tobit advocates the superstitious use of fish liver oil to accomplish those purposes. See Tobit 6:6-7. This can easily be construed as withcraft, which of course is a thing that is an abomination to our Lord and Saviour (I Samuel 15:23; II Chronicles 33:6; Galatians 5:20)

3) Judith claims that Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, was the king of Assyria, which he most certainly was not. (see Judith 1:1,7)

4) The Wisdom of Solomon teaches that the world was created from elements of matter that already existed. (Wisdom 7:17)

5) II Maccabees endorses prayers for the dead in II Maccabees 12:45-46. These verses are also the precise verses that the Roman papists use to depict their hellish doctrine of purgatory.

6) Tobit 12:9 teaches that, "...alms doth deliver from death, and shall purge away all sin. Those that exercise alms, and righteousness, shall be filled with life."

7) Tobit 1:15 contains certain historical blunders such as stating that Sennacherib was the son of Shalmaneser, instead of Sargon II.

8) In Tobit 14:5 Nineveh was captured by Nebuchadnezzar and Ahasuerus instead of by Nabopolassar and Cyaxares.

9) Judith, besides containing other errors in chronology and history, compasses itself about with wild stretches of the imagination, with such stories as Judith only eating on the sabbaths, new moons, and the feasts of Israel. And of course, if you know anything about the ordinances established under the Mosaic law, some of these feasts only came monthly and yearly! (see Leviticus 23:4-17, 23-32; 25:8-12, etc.)

10) Suicide is maintained in II Maccabees 14:37-46.

VI. THE CONCLUSION CONCERNING THE APOCRYPHA

Given the fact that the Apocrypha is historically asinine, frivolous in nature, heretical in content, spurious in origin and inconsistent in perpetuation, the following reasons should suffice for any Bible-Believing Christian to reject the books of the Apocrypha as inspired, authoritative, or attachable to any such claim of inspiration by the breath of God (II Timothy 3:16):

1) They never had a place in the Hebrew canon, as noted earlier in this treatise.

2) They were never utilized nor quoted by our Lord Jesus Christ, his apostles, or any New Testament writer. This is important because it is most probable that at least most of them were in existence at that time.

3) Josephus, the first century Jewish historian, omits them in his list of divinely inspired books, which he limits to 22.

4) Philo, the first century Alexandrian, Jewish philosopher, who was a strong advocate of the Letter to Aristeeas (which supposedly gives the story of the origin of the Septuagint Greek translation of the Old Testament law), never mentions or quotes the Apocrypha even though he widely referenced the Old Testament.

5) They are not found in any canonical lists of Biblical books during the first four centuries A.D.

- 6) As mentioned previously, although he inserted the books into his Latin Vulgate translation, Jerome separated the Apocrypha confessedly from the rest of the Hebrew Canon.
- 7) There is no divine authority claimed by any of the writers, while some certainly disclaimed inspiration.
- 8) None of the writers speak with the authority of "thus saith the Lord," for prophetic revelation ceased with Malachi until the heralding of John the Baptist in Matthew 3. Notwithstanding, none of the writers were prophets or scribes.
- 9) As noted in the last section, the books contain many chronological, historical, and geographical blunders, which contradict themselves, the Bible, and known secular facts.
- 10) Heretical doctrines are advocated and condoned, as mentioned above. They include magical incantations, salvation by works and alms-giving, prayers for the dead, lying, etc.
- 11) Compared to the beauty and style of the Canonical books, the Apocryphal works are stylishly weak, and lack any sort of originality, or eloquent expression.
- 12) A great amount of the material is legendary and contain asinine, fictitious accounts.
- 13) The moral and spiritual standards of the Apocrypha are way below that as demonstrated by pattern in the Old Testament books.
- 14) The books were written after the close of the Old Testament canon, including some that were written very shortly before the birth of Jesus Christ.
- 15) The majority of the books are not written in Hebrew, although the oracles of God are committed to the Jew (Romans 3:2).
- 16) Jesus Christ appeals to an established, strict, definitive collections of writings by his words in Matthew 23:35, which cover events from Genesis through II Chronicles. Consequently, the Hebrew Canon, which includes all of the 39 books in our Authorized Version, begins with Genesis and has II Chronicles as its last book. Jesus Christ also defined the canon as the things written, "...in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms..." (Luke 24:44).
- 17) Although some of the Apocrypha books were permitted to be read for instruction and historical significance, none of them were considered canonical or inspired by an prominent church historian, Christian writer, church, or council until the Roman Catholic Council of Trent in 1546.

Therefore, with these evidences in hand, I wholeheartedly agree with the words of Dean John William Burgon who stated, " The Apocryphal books are not one atom more inspired than Bacon's essays." (Inspiration and Interpretation, Dean Burgon, pg. 76).

Finally, in the spirit of "King James Onlyism," I concur with the assertion of King James himself concerning the inspiration and worth of the Apocrypha when he stated in 1616:

"As for the Scriptures, no man doubteth I will believe them. But even for the Apocrypha, I hold them in the same accompt that the Ancients did. They are still printed and bound with our Bibles, and publicly read in our churches. I reverence them as the writings of holy and good men. But since they are not found in the Canon, we accompt them to be *secundae lectionis* or *ordinis* (which is Bellarmine's own distinction) and therefore not sufficient whereupon alone to ground any Article of Faith, except it be confirmed by some other place of Canonical Scripture; concluding this point with Rufinus (who is no Novelist, I hope) that the Apocryphal books were by the Fathers permitted to be read, not for confirmation of doctrine, but only for instruction of the people."

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1616james1.html>

The Case of the Alleged Perpetual Misprint

By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson

Once again we have been deceptively entreated by the awful elements of benighted commentators. Their deliberate dark sayings forever echo in the halls of our minds. They burden our souls; they crush our hopes; they lay destitute our hearts. They coerce us into believing their words buttressed in the decadence of knowledge. They persuade our naïve consciences by educating us out of our first love. They belittle our faith; they flout our intellects; and, only through them is any deft channel of truth to be secured. They impress us with their flattering titles, only to bemoan us with the realization that our Guide is inaccurate, replete with errors, and besmirched with inferiority. They lead us down the primrose path of sensual wisdom, leaving us empty handed in the end. They slander our mentors; they extinguish our zealous flames of passion; they establish themselves as little gods. In the midst of it all, they silence our convictions, and stagnate the words of God. O, how they leave us as miserable, hopeless, and inconsolable wretches; we journey throughout the world grim and forlorn thereby. What did they do that we so decry? They have taken our Book, our sustenance, our eternal instruction, and have asserted that it is in dire straits, in desperate need of correction at every turn. Moreover, they have bargained with their influence to rewrite, and, to an unrelenting degree, insist that a portion of the words of our Bible have transcended time in the form of a misprint; not revised and uncorrected. Yes, they speak of Matthew 23:24.

Matthew 23:24 states, “*Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel.*” The centuries of compiled objections to the reading of this verse in the King James Bible rest on the proposition that the word *at* is a bit of an anachronism introduced by the printers (not translators) in 1611. The accusations as such are almost innumerable. “*The classic misprint which has been perpetuated by modern editions is Matthew 23:24, ‘strain at a gnat’ instead of ‘strain out a gnat.’*” ¹A major contributor to the misprint conjecture is the scholar, Edgar Goodspeed. In a thesis published by the University of Chicago, Mr. Goodspeed insisted, “*The one original misprint to survive is the famous ‘strain (straine) at the gnat’ in Matthew 23:24 (for ‘strain out a gnat’), which has so endeared itself to users of the King James that no modern publisher has the temerity to set it right.*” ²As of yet, we have not taken any occasion to discover the originator of such a presumptuous little rumor. Howbeit, this sort of estimation found root even in the 18th century: “*It is strange, that glaring false print, strain at a gnat, which quite alters the sense, should run through all the editions of our English Bibles.*” ³Another source exacerbated the issue by claiming, “*‘Strain at a gnat’ (Matt. xxiii.24) is a mistranslation which was almost certainly a printer’s error.*” ⁴Accordingly, an additional adulteration of history is fortified with, “*‘Strain at’ is an old misprint perpetuated.*” ⁵Satisfying the ungodly appetites of Biblical scholarship with more surfeiting, another commentator quells our eyes with, “*The strange ‘strain at a gnat’ in the KJV is due to a printer’s error made in 1611 and never corrected.*” ⁶Once again, in typical, scholastic, dictatorial fashion, the editors of the Interpreter’s Bible declare, “*Strain at is a typographical*

error for 'strain out.'" *The English printers, not the King James translators, are to blame for it."* [7](#) The only dazzling feature within this entire enclave of citations is the fact that all of them exhibit a tremendous obsequious nature by virtue of their dogmatic proclamations, and thus offering no evidence for their seemingly indisputable pontifications of truthfulness.

However, no one has had the effrontery to garb their efforts and cloak their malicious intents with the baseless and circumstantial reiteration of others, as much as Rick Norris has. It is indeed a clever stride to the unsuspecting reader for a man professing to be well versed in the Scriptures to take a fabricated statement and justify it by a compilation of laconic conjectures from recognized scholars; Rick Norris has mastered it. In his book *The Unbound Scriptures* (which both [myself](#) and [others](#) have addressed at sundry times and in divers manners), Mr. Norris devotes two paragraphs detailing this alleged, perpetual misprint in the A.V. 1611. Constituting hearsay by utilizing a variety of secondary quotations with no original, source evidence, Mr. Norris languidly states:

"In his 1833 revision of the KJV, Noah Webster wondered how an error remained uncorrected in the KJV for more than two centuries in Matthew 23:34 (misprint 'strain at a gnat' for 'strain out'). The Cambridge History of the Bible noted that 'strain at' (Matt. 23:24) 'was almost certainly a printer's error' (Vol. 3, p. 362). At this verse in his 1847 edition of the KJV with commentary, Adam Clarke wrote: 'It is likely to have been at first an error of the press, AT for OUT.' Eadie agreed that 'strain at' was 'probably a misprint in the first edition for 'strain out' (English Bible, p. 367). The Ryrie Study Bible has the following note at this verse: 'This misprint in the King James Version has never been corrected.' The Companion Bible's notes at this verse referred to 'at' as 'a mistake' (p. 1363). Concerning this verse in the KJV, Albert Barnes wrote: 'The common reading is a misprint and should be corrected. The Greek means, to strain out by a cloth or sieve' (Barnes' Notes on N.T., p. 100). A.T. Robertson commented: 'By filtering through (dia), not the 'straining at' in swallowing so crudely suggested by the misprint in the A.V.' (Word Pictures in N.T., I, pp. 183-184)." [8](#)

Immediately, the discerning reader should observe that absolutely no evidence of any kind has been offered for the claims cited above. Rick Norris simply expected you to take his animadversions at face value. What proof is there, then, that "strain at a gnat" is a palpable typographical error? Mr. Norris offers the following pat answer:

" 'Strain out' is in Tyndale's New Testament, Coverdale's Bible, Matthew's Bible, Coverdale's Duoglott New Testament, Taverner's Bible, Great Bible, Whittingham's New Testament, the Geneva Bible, and Bishop's Bible. The 1873 Cambridge Paragraph edition of the KJV edited by Scrivener has 'strain out.' Scrivener noted that T. Baskett's edition of the KJV (1754) has 'strain out' (Authorized Edition, p. 201). If more copies (a majority) were made of a Bible with a misprint, does this majority text make the misprint the standard for Bibles without the misprint?" [9](#)

Essentially, all of these fastidious pundits have taken the express liberty of stretching their imaginative capabilities to the point of precarious assumption. The simpleton's idea here is that because most, if not all of the pre-A.V. 1611 English Bibles render the Greek present active participle διωλίζοντες (lit.- the ones who are straining/filtering) as “*strain out*,” with no definitive examples of “*strain at*,” that it must be nothing more than an embarrassing error introduced and perpetuated by the typesetter. The *Companion Bible*, referenced earlier by Norris, further conveys this hypothesis. Not only does the *Companion Bible* say that “*at*” is, “*A mistake perpetuated in all editions of the A.V.*,” but then correlates Norris's impression with, “*All ‘the former translations’ had ‘out.’*” ¹⁰ Therefore, in reality, Mr. Norris's concoction, along with his scholastic companions who have all regurgitated each other's material in this regard, have done nothing more than amputate a perfectly good verse in the A.V. 1611 by implementing an illogical correlation/causation fallacy into the equation. Concisely, the fact that all English Bibles prior to the A.V. 1611 may have been translated “*strain out*” does not necessitate that the A.V. 1611 was intended to read the same way with any degree of certainty. What we have witnessed is precisely a mythological gloss in light of scholastic deference; that is all.

Furthermore, before providing evidence that the reading “*strain at*” is the original reading selected by the A.V. translators, I would like to address a subtlety imposed by Mr. Norris in his sentence above. He asked, “*If more copies (a majority) were made of a Bible with a misprint, does this majority text make the misprint the standard for Bibles without the misprint?*” Obviously, this insidious insertion is supposed to be a mild scoff toward the majority text theory entertained by certain A.V. defenders and text-critical proponents (although the text underlying the A.V. 1611 is not purely [though mainly] a “majority text”). The desired effect here is to show you that if an error is introduced at one point in the manuscript tradition, and is subsequently copied thousands of times over, do the manuscripts of the most recent type represent a pure and standardized text? However, the conundrum created in this scenario is the unproven theory that the resultant copies are indicative of a single, common archetype; for Norris's illustration began with an alleged typographical error being thrust onto all of the subsequent copies from a single source (i.e. the A.V. 1611). The illustration fails because with the majority of Greek manuscripts, the descent of the copies is not definitively vertical, but lateral. The Cambridge scholar Thomas Birks once aptly stated, “*Each witness or manuscript must have its weight determined by the series of copyings through which it has passed, and not by its agreement or disagreement with other copies of its own age, of which the steps of transmission may have been, and often must have been, wholly different from its own.*” ¹¹ This truth effectively repels the *one equals one thousand* ¹² diversionary lesson catapulted by text-critical authorities. Succinctly, one would have to concretely demonstrate the line of manuscript descent in order substantiate such a bold hypothesis.

Returning to our current focus, as for the frivolity surrounding this alleged “misprint”; we deprecate it entirely. Unlike our opponents' wanton writings, we are

prepared to offer an able defense of the reading *strain at*, thus vindicating such licentious exertions against the A.V. 1611.

I. “Strain at a gnat” Makes The Verse “Unmeaning” 13

To summate, Barnes contends that there is no sensible conveyance of meaning by reading, “*strain at*.” This was certainly the same type of objection foisted by Mr. Wesley earlier. However, neither gentleman considered that the phraseology intimating a forthcoming presence is to be rendered with the English idiom containing *at*. On the matter, Dr. Ruckman ingeniously writes:

“What was the problem with the text as it stood (Matt. 23:24)? We all understand what it means to ‘jump AT the crack of a whip’ or be ‘shocked AT the sight or something’ or ‘get up AT the first break of day.’ What was the problem? The gnat strainers of Matthew 23, like their contemporary kinfolk, began to strain ‘AT a gnat’: That is, they started to strain when the gnat showed up” 14

II. The King James Translator's Work In Progress

In 1646 the Bodleian Library acquired an annotated 1602 edition of the Bishops' Bible. 15 The notes therein distinguish between the works of three scribes; the Matthew scribe (MT); the Mark-Luke scribe (ML); and, the Luke-John scribe (LJ). These annotations represent scribal activity in direct proportion to the process of revision during 1607-1610 during the translation of the A.V. 1611. The results are beneficial to anyone wishing to delve into this area of interest. The scribal activity reveals the substitutions, additions, and deletions involved where the A.V. translators heeded King James's instructions that, “*The ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit.*” 16 The resultant collation and compilation of these scribal changes are recorded in the work by Ward Allen and Edward Jacobs, *The Coming of the King James Gospels: A Collation of the Translators' Work-in-Progress*. These two English literature scholars diligently systematized the threefold scribal activity in conjunction with transitioning from the Bishops' Bible to what would become the A.V. 1611. Hence, for another vibrant display depicting the utter lout created by insisting that *strain at* is a misprint in the King James Bible, one only need turn to the pages of this wonderful work. Mr. Allen and Mr. Jacobs inform us with a note that, “*A revision by the translators, which is below the main line, will always be the text of the Authorized Version.*” 17 Accordingly, there is a word substituted below the word “*out*” in Matthew 23:24 (Bishops' Bible: “*Yee blinde guides, which straine out a gnat, and swallow a camel*”), which of course, is the word “*at*” representing the reading in the A.V. 1611. 18 Even more deplorably obvious is the fact that Rick Norris has this work listed in his Bibliography, yet he blatantly neglected to consider it in this light. 19

III. Greek Lexicography

The word διωλιζω is only used one time in the New Testament (i.e. Matthew 23:24). It is a compound word, comprised of the preposition δια (translated by, through, for, because of, on account of, of, etc. depending on the context in which it is used [in a prepositional or infinitive phrase]) and the verb ωλιζω (I filter, strain). Eclectically, διωλιζω is defined as, “strain or filter thoroughly” or “strain off” [20](#); “to strain, filter thoroughly; to strain out or off, Matt. 23:24” [21](#); “I strain, put through a sieve” [22](#); “to strain, filter thoroughly; to strain out or off, Mat. 23.24” [23](#); “to filter through, strain thoroughly, pour through a filter: Matt 23:24.” [24](#) Thus, the extrapolated meaning is something like, “it signifies the act of straining a liquid through a gauze or the like, a practice apparently employed to make sure that small sources of defilement would be removed before one drank.” [25](#) Hence, we read, “strayne out” (Tyndale); “strayne out” (Coverdale); “straine out” (Geneva); “strayne out” (Bishops’); “strain your liquor for” (Mace-1729); “strain out” (Douay-Rheims); “strain out” (NKJV); “straining out” (ESV); “straining out” (Weymouth); “filter out” (ISV); “strain out” (NASB); “strain out” (NIV); “strain out” (HCSB); “strain out” (NRSV), etc. in a variety of English Bible translations. Therefore, because the “strain out” rendition obviously relates the sense that the Pharisees were percolating their drinks with some sort of filtration device in order to remove the gnats, it stands to reason that perhaps the A.V. 1611 translation with “strain at” is a superior translation in that it leaves open the possibility that the Pharisees were desiccating their drinks through another medium other than some sifting gadget.

We now come to the prestigious synthetic lexicon, commonly referred to as BDAG (current edition; 2nd edition- BAGD). The abbreviation stands for the authors, revisers, and editors whose indefatigable, collective efforts have produced such a monumental work: Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* now appears in its 3rd English edition, which is based on Walter Bauer’s 6 th German edition. The particular edition of BDAG consulted in this study is of tantamount importance to the reading of the lexicon itself when considering the meaning of διωλιζω . Specifically, the information provided in the 3rd edition not previously explained in the 1st and 2nd editions sheds additional light, which really illuminates the intent of the A.V. reading in Matthew 23:24.

In personal correspondence with Harold Holmyard (a translator for the Holman Christian Standard Bible), while discussing the validity of *strain at* in our Authorized Version, he made use of the 2 nd edition of the aforementioned lexicon, which states:

“διωλιζω (in fig. Sense in Archytas [c. 360 BC; Stob. III 1, p. 58, 7 H.]. In lit. mng., of wine Plutl, Mor. 692D; Diosc. 2, 86; 5, 72; Artem. 4, 48; Pox. 413, 154; Am 6:6) filter out, strain out (the KJ ‘strain at’ is widely considered a misprint [so Gdsp., Relg. In Life 12, ‘42/’43, 205-10 and Probs. ‘45, 38f], but for the view that it is an archaic usage s. Murray, New [Oxford] Eng. Dict. S.v. ‘strain,’ verb. 14e and esp. 21, and Chopf, Rev. of Engl. Studies 20, ‘44, 155f) ton kwnwpa a gnat fr. a drink Mt 23:24.” [26](#)

After quoting the 2nd edition in part (though the quote above is a full quotation), Dr. Holmyard made the following comments:

“Danker's work was saying that despite the widespread idea that 'strain at a gnat' was a misprint, it may have been the way English in 1611 expressed the idea of 'strain out a gnat.' However, the phrase does not have that sense today, which is why some on this list have suggested that the person never did get the gnat. He strained at it. They seem to think the words mean that he put a lot of effort into trying to get it but failed. However, the translators probably felt that 'strain at' gave a meaning like 'strain out.' So while it may have been a deliberate change from the Bishop's Bible, and it may have worked at the time, it does not really communicate well today.” [27](#)

In this instance, Dr. Holmyard is attempting to expound upon the meaning of the entry for δυνάμιζω in the BAGD lexicon. If there is one bona fide point to be gleaned from Holmyard's comments, it is this: The A.V. 1611 reading in Matthew 23:24 must be looked upon as inferior to the modern versions, and archaic in expression. This, of course, is after there was no more maneuvering room to bolster the idea that “strain at” was a definite misprint in the King James text. However, Dr. Ruckman's illustration above concerning the contemporary idiolect as reacting “at” something, truly betrays the purely archaic argument. Secondly, the obfuscation technique utilized by Dr. Holmyard, namely, that some readers have misconstrued the meaning of “strain” in this instance to mean something like expending a tremendous effort towards something instead of straining insects out of drink is effectively neutralized by the 3rd edition of BDAG. In this edition we read in the entry for δυνάμιζω essentially the same material as for the 2nd edition, excepting minor referential alterations and the addition of, “ ‘strain at’=‘strain [the liquid] at [seeing]’ a gnat” [28](#) after the pro and con citations for the misprint theory. Basically, the point is, that “strain at” is essentially not a misprint, hasn't been proven to be one, and upon dealing with evidence that it isn't a misprint, Bible correctors must resort to other convenient interpretations to preserve their dignified and intellectual appearances.

The bottom line regarding Greek lexicography is that the word δυνάμιζω means to strain or filter through; a thorough straining. Δυνάμιζω can be used to mean to “strain/filter out” something, but it can be used emphatically too. This was the predominate usage in Greek literature as well as the LXX. Although BDAG lumps all of the usages together with the definition of, “filter out, strain out,” one lexicon subdivides these points: “δι-υλίζω (<δια, υλίζω, to strain), [in LXX: Am 6:6;] 1. to strain thoroughly (Archytas; Am., 1.c.). 2. Later, to strain out: fig., Mt. 23:24.” [29](#) Granted that Mr. Abbott-Smith gives the later usage of δυνάμιζω as “strain out,” but the point here is to notice that the historical usage is that of a thorough straining no matter what kind of accompanying preposition is placed with it (through, of, off, at, out, etc.). This fact, combined with the A.V. translators' propensity for and instruction to, “when any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of faith” (the fourth rule of instruction from King James

to the Translators) [30](#), perhaps explains why they elected not to go with the then common reading, “strain out.”

IV. “Strain At” As A Viable English Expression

How reproachable and troublesome it is to discover that the whimsical dictions promulgated by Christian writers (albeit an A.V. Bible believer or an Alexandrian apostate) are exacerbated by their lack of enduring research and verification of sources. Such an example can be viewed above with Rick Norris. Mr. Norris simply took an assertion and decorated it with a variety of quotations. How riveting it would be to witness someone actually following mere speculation through to conclusion rather than embarking on a crash course with silly little ambivalent quotes from singular sources. With that thought in mind, let us then practice what we so mulishly preach.

All three BDAG editions reference the article written by Constantin Hopf and published in *The Review of English Studies* in 1944. Mr. Hopf initiates his article [31](#) by referring to the opposing viewpoint offered in Edgar Goodspeed's, *“The Misprint That Made Good”* (also cited in BDAG). Therein, as has also been the scope of this treatise, the contention is revived that “strain at” in the Authorized Version is a solidified misprint. Mr. Hopf demolishes such a scheme, and to his own credit, does so in the most concise manner.

Accordingly, Mr. Hopf was able to take Augustine Marlorate's 16 th century Latin Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew [32](#) in which he quotes Calvin's Latin exposition of Matthew 23:24 in his *Harmonia*, accompanied by Thomas Tymme's 1570 translation of the same, and effectively demonstrate the legitimacy of the phrase “strain at” in the latter half of the 16 th century prior to the translation of the A.V. 1611. Thus, Mr. Marlorate's Latin quotation of Calvin's exposition is as follows:

“...Ergo perinde faciunt, ac si quis tenuem panis micam colaret, integrum voraret panem. Culicem scimus pusillum esse animal: camelum ingentem belluam, nihil ergo magis ridiculum quam vinum vel aquam colare, ne culicem glutiendo fauces laedas, secure vero sorbere camelum...” [33](#)

Thomas Tymme's English translation [34](#) renders the previous Latin exposition as:

“...They do therefore euen as if a man shoulde straine at a small crumme of bread, and swallow a whole loafe. Wee knowe that a gnat is a small creature, and a Camell, a huge beast: there is nothinge therefore more rydiculous, than to strayne in, wyne and water, least in swallowinge a gnat thou hurte thy Jawes, but careleslye to suppe vp a Camell...”

Furthermore, Mr. Hopf also points out in his article that in 1584 a comprehensive English translation of Calvin's *Harmonia* (referenced just a moment ago) was

undertaken and successfully completed by Eusebius Paget. Hence, another independent English rendering of a Latin original by the phrase, “strain at.” Mr. Paget translated:

“...Therefore they doe as much, as if a man shoulde straine at a crumme of bread, and swallow downe a whole loafe. Wee know that a gnat is a small creature, and a camel a great beast: nothing therefore is more ridiculous then to straine wine or water, leaste thou shouldest hurt the iawes with swallowing vp a gnat, but carelessly suppe vp a camel...” [35](#)

The ramifications in these two instances are plain and simple enough. First, “...Tymme in 1570 and Paget in 1584 provide further evidence that ‘strain at’ was a usage in vogue before 1611.” [36](#) Secondly, Mr. Hopf states that, “...the English text which serves as lemma in Tymme has ‘strayne out’ immediately followed by ‘strain at’ in Tymme’s rendering of Calvin. The juxtaposition was thus not regarded as a discrepancy.” [37](#) Thirdly, it is interesting to note that in light of translating the Latin words *colare* or *excolare* by the phrases “strain in,” “strain at,” or “strain,” that the English translators didn’t necessarily consider the conveyed meaning to be pouring the liquid through gauze or some other sieve-type apparatus. They were under the distinct impression that the straining consisted of the individual using their lips and teeth to serve as the strainer, thus filtering the gnats while sipping the liquid. [38](#) Along these lines, John MacArthur acquiesced that “Fastidious Pharisees would drink their wine through clenched teeth in order to filter out any small insects that might have gotten into the wine.” [39](#)

Moreover, BDAG also cites the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) as a source for providing vitality to the “strain at” phrase. In effect, the OED smoothly reiterates and reinforces what the Hopf article unearthed. BDAG, as well as Hopf both cite meanings 21 and 14e as evidentiary of “strain at” not being a misprint. Definition 21 in the OED states:

“21. to strain at: to make a difficulty of ‘swallowing’ or accepting (something); to scruple at. Also (rarely), to strain to do something.

This use is due to misunderstanding of the phrase ‘strain at a gnat’ in Matt. xxiii. 24. It has been asserted that ‘straine at’ in the Bible of 1611 is a misprint for ‘straine out’, the rendering of earlier versions (see 14e). But quotes. 1583 and 1594 show that the translators of 1611 simply adopted a rendering that had already obtained currency. It was not a mistranslation, the meaning intended being ‘which strain the liquor if they find a gnat in it’. The phrase, however, was early misapprehended (perh. already by Shakes. in quot. 1609), the verb being supposed to mean ‘to make violent effort’ (see sense 18).” [40](#)

Naturally, it stands to reason that the two proceeding quotations absolutely justify the objection to the contention that “strain at” is a perpetual misprint. “[1583 [GREENE](#) Mamillia II . B3b, Most vniustly straining at a gnat, and letting passe an elephant. 1594 [J. KING](#) On Jonas (1599) 284 They have verified the olde proverbe in

strayning at gnats and swallowing downe camells.” [41](#) “Strain at” was a trendy expression in the latter 16 th century prior to the translation of the A.V. 1611. Let the Scholarship only advocates and anti-A.V. 1611 gainsayers recant their foundationless accusations of typographical errors, or else forbear speaking and writing on the subject.

Notwithstanding, definition 14e as cited early by BDAG and Hopf, doesn't really outline any supporting material regarding “strain at” per se, but it does, however, provide “strain a” as an equivalent sense to “strain out.” This carries substantial weight in proportion to our discussion earlier about διυλίζω fostering emphasis (i.e. strain thoroughly). Definition 14e specifies:

“e. *To take out (something) from a liquid by straining.*

This use seems hardly to occur exc. in strain out a gnat (after L. excolare), strain a gnat, in Matt. xxiii. 24. (For the better known rendering of this text see 21.)

1526 [TINDALE](#) Matt. xxiii. 24 *Ye blinde gydes which strayne out a gnat and swalowe a cammyll. [So also 1535 Coverdale, 1539 Cranmer, 1560 Geneva.] 1564 Brief Exam.*

*****b, *None of them..did strayne a Gnat, and swallowe a Camell. 1582 N.T.*

(Rheims) Matt. xxiii. 24 That straine a gnat. 1589 [WARNER](#) Alb. Eng. VI . xxxi.

(1602) 153 Precisians..In Loue doe swallow Cammels, whilst they nicely straine a

Gnat. 1616 B. P ARSONS Magistr. Charter 23 Straine not out gnats, then, neither

swallow downe camels. 1881 B IBLE (R.V.) Matt. xxiii. 24 Which strain out the gnat. ”

[42](#)

In the end, the A.V. 1611 thus becomes vindicated in yet another one its passages again. In recapitulation, the Alexandrian Cult has determined that Matthew 23:24 (“strain at”) is a misprint in the A.V. 1611, intending to be “strain out” due to the fact that most of the previous English translations read that way. However, other than this no evidence has been cited. The previous English versions argument is circumstantial argumentation made from inference that in reality constitutes a correlation/causation fallacy. And, that the continuance of this myth is the direct result of one Cult member thrusting it onto another, with each subsequent Cult member being duped into believing the fairytale, is certain. On the other hand, the A.V. 1611 reading has been shown beyond any reasonable doubt to be the continuance of a latter 16 th century method of stating that the gnats were filtered from the liquid when their presence was discovered; that διυλίζω can be rendered “strain” without the preposition “out” to convey emphasis, while other prepositions can equally be attached to it and still suit the purpose; and, that “*strain out*” was intentionally changed to “*strain at*” in the annotated 1602 Bishops' Bible by A.V. scribes, is invigorating. At least four concrete, fortified, and verifiable citations were examined from two trustworthy sources to counter the original misprint claim, is undeniable. The verdict? The A.V. 1611's reading “strain at” in Matthew 23:24 is absolutely correct, and any contradiction otherwise is nothing more than an ignorant ploy to create doubt in the greatest book in the universe; that the correctness and utter faultlessness of the King James Bible is becoming more and

more clear in spite of the petty attacks upon its text; though we believed in its inerrancy to begin with. We conclude our remarks on this subject with these timeless words:

“It is easy for some of the clergy to make an unseasonable display of learning in the pulpit, by telling their congregations that such and such a verse is not well rendered in their Bible. But, in so doing, they shew little wisdom. They needlessly unsettle the mind of their hearers on a subject in which comparatively few of these can ever be fair judges; and not one of them, perhaps, at the time the charge of unsoundness is brought from the pulpit, against the Authorized Version.

But we all know that assertion is no proof; and a clergyman in the pulpit has it all his own way. He makes what statement he pleases; and nine-tenths of his congregation believe him without further inquiry. Some few doubt, or at least think of, it: and fewer still determine to look into the matter if, or when, they can. They all leave the Church, however, with an uncomfortable feeling of their long-cherished associations and firm faith in their Bible being shaken or unsettled, they know not why; and they wish they had not heard it. Then, may be, one of the hearers, who happens to have just begun Hebrew and to know a little of Greek, thinks the preacher quite right; for he cannot think how such or such a word, which he has looked at once only, can possibly mean what is said in the English Bible. And thus a growing and ignorant discontent for the Best of books in the English language is fostered among the people by some, who would, perhaps, be the least able to improve it by shewing a better way.” 43

1 Gann, Windell H. The King James Version: A Study of A Scholarly Translation (Rogersville: 1974). www.rogersvillecoc.org/sermons/kjv-a%20scholarly%20translation.htm

2 Goodspeed, Edgar J. The Translators to the Reader: Preface to the King James Version 1611 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press- no copyright). www.ccel.org/bible/kjv/preface/thesis.htm

3 Wesley, John. Explanatory Notes Upon The New Testament (Salem: Schmul Publishers - Rare Reprint Specialists), 76.

4 Greenslade, S.L., Ed. The Cambridge History of The Bible (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 3:362.

5 Vincent, Marvin. “Matthew 23:24.” Vincent's Word Studies in the New Testament . (Biblesoft: Electronic Database, 1997).

6 Stagg, Frank. The Broadman Bible Commentary (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1969), 8:214.

7 The Interpreter's Bible Commentary (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1951) 7:536.

- 8** Norris, Rick. **The Unbound Scriptures: A Review of KJV-only Claims and Publications** (Fayetteville: Unbound Scriptures Publications, 2003), 190-91.
- 9** Norris 191.
- 10** **The Companion Bible** (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1990), 1363.
- 11** Birks, Thomas Rawson. **Essay On the Right Estimation Of Manuscript Evidence In The Text Of The New Testament** (London: Macmillan and Co., 1878), 21.
- 12** Robertson, A.T. **An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament** (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., 1925), 171-72, 184.
- 13** Barnes, Albert. **Barnes' Notes on the New Testament** (Biblesoft: Electronic Database, 1997), Matthew 23:24.
- 14** Ruckman, Peter S. **The “Errors” in the King James Bible** (Pensacola: Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1980 [Revised 1999]), 144.
- 15** Danner, Dan G. “*The Coming of the King James Gospels: A Collation of the Translators' Work-in-Progress By Ward S. Allen and Edward C. Jacobs.*” **Church History** 66:4 (Dec., 1997), 824-825.
- 16** Anderson, Christopher and William R. Williams. **An Argument Sustaining The Common English Version of the Bible** (New York: Printed by J.A. Gray, 1850), vi.
- 17** Allen, Ward S. and Edward C. Jacobs. **The Coming of the King James Gospels: A Collation of the Translators' Work-in-Progress** (Fayetteville: The University of Arkansas Press, 1995), 33.
- 18** Allen 150.
- 19** Norris 487.
- 20** Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. **A Greek-English Lexicon** (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1843, 9 th ed. 1940, 1968), Rev. Jones, Sir Henry Stuart and Robert McKenzie, 438.
- 21** Perschbacher, Wesley J. **The New Analytical Greek Lexicon** (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1990), 104.
- 22** Souter, Alexander. **A Pocket Lexicon To The Greek New Testament** (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916, reprinted 1956), 67.
- 23** Green, Thomas Sheldon. **A Greek-English Lexicon To The New Testament** (New York: Harper and Brothers, 21st edition), 47.

24 Thayer, Joseph Henry. New Testament Lexicon (Biblesoft: Electronic Database, 1997), diulizw .

25 Morris, Leon. The Pillar New Testament Commentary: The Gospel According to Matthew (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992), D.A. Carson, ed., 583.

26 Arndt, William F. and F. Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A translation and adaptation of the fourth revised and augmented edition of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Worterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der ubrigen urchristlichen Literatur 2 nd ed. Revised and Augmented by F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker from Walter Bauer's Fifth Edition, 1958 (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1979), 200.

27 Holmyard, Harold. "Re: [W-V] Matthew 23:24 Strain AT a gnat." E-mail to the author. 28 Nov. 2005.

28 Danker, Frederick William, Ed. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature - 3rd ed. (BDAG), (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), 252.

29 Abbott-Smith, G. A Manuel Lexicon of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, copyright under the Berne Convention), 118.

30 Malan, S.C. A Vindication of the Authorized Version of the English Bible (London: Bell and Daldy, Fleet Street, 1856), vii.

31 Hopf, Constantin. "Strain At A Gnat." The Review of English Studies 20:78 (Apr. 1944), 155-56.

32 Marloratus, Augustinus. Novi Testamenti Catholica Expositio Ecclesiastica , 1561- cited in Hopf, 155.

33 Calvin, John. Harmonia Ex Tribus Euangelistis Composita ...,1563, p. 526- cited in Hopf, 155.

34 Tymme, Thomas. A Catholike And Ecclesiasticall Exposition of the Holy Gospel After S. Mathewe ...Augustine Marlorate (London: 1570) - cited in Hopf, 155.

35 Paget, Eusebius. A Harmonie Vpon The Three Euangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke ...translated out of Latine into English (London: 1584), 617- cited in Hopf, 156.

36 Hopf 156.

37 Hopf 156.

38 Hopf 156.

39 MacArthur, John. The MacArthur New Testament Commentary: Matthew 16-23 (Chicago: Moody Publishers, 1988), 385.

40 The Oxford English Dictionary. “Strain v.1” (Troy University Electronic Database, 2nd edition, 1989), entry 21.

41 OED, “Strain v.1,” entry 21.

42 OED, “Strain v.1,” entry 14e.

43 Malan 345-46.

Rick Norris: The Independent Fundamental Immersionist
By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson

[Note by Nachimson: This article is only partially completed. Please see the explanation at the end of point # 2.]

In 2003, fresh off of the printing press in Fayetteville, North Carolina, came a most recent "Scholarship Only" publication peddled by one Rick Norris, "... to advocate the need for consistent principles that would result in a Scriptural, balanced view of this issue. In order to attempt to accomplish this purpose, it has been necessary to respond to many inaccurate, inconsistent, and even false claims made concerning Bible translations." (1) The name of this philosophical exudation is, "The Unbound Scriptures: A Review of KJV-Only Claims and Publications."

Throughout his literary concoction, Mr. Norris comes across as this objective, sort of a Bible-versional, "laissez-faire" constituent, seeking to, at last, reveal the falsehood of claims imposed upon "Bible Translations" "among some groups of believers." Howbeit, contrary to the first sentence of the second paragraph in his introduction, what he seeks to do is invalidate the "King James Only" position. He calls this, "a one-perfect-translation-only view such as the King James Version-only view." (2) As you can see, he uses a generalized plurality to inculcate the reader for 500 pages of King James Bible bashing techniques. His introductory generalization even conflicts with the basic title of his book, which see.

Earlier this year, after I had ascertained a copy of Norris' book for reviewing, I sent him a series of emails demonstrating various, amateur lies and concealments of evidence on his part in his book. Such items included were the truth about the English adjectival use of a Greek substantive ("hubristes" rendered as "injurious" in I Tim. 1:13) from pages 338-339; the inconsistency of insisting that a claim for A.V. 1611 inerrancy necessitates A.V. 1611 translator infallibility from page 11; the plainly stupid blunder of claiming that the A.V. 1611 rendition of "strain at a gnat" in Matthew 23:24 was a printer's error never corrected, from pages 190-191; The prejudicial inclination of assuming that Spurgeon was a full-blown Alexandrian apostate by only providing quotes of him correcting the A.V. text on pages 141-142, but not any of his many speeches claiming infallibility and inspiration for the very BOOK before him! (3) Naturally, the list of errors could go out into the Evolutionists' infinite, expanding universe, but those are a few that I sent him. As comical as it is, the response I received was, "I never said that my book was perfect." And, on another occasion, I got a list of false accusations (with no truth in them; i.e. "Nachimson only castigates those with whom he disagrees"; and "he doesn't support his family," etc.) from Norris sent to him by "another KJV-only advocate" that "knew" me. Therefore, he wasn't obligated to answer; he was only obliged to question me about purported slander. This method seems to be becoming common-place with me these days.

At any rate, this small treatise is not, however, a book review on Norris' "magnum

opus." For a general perusal and critique of Norris' book, see Will Kinney's 17-part review on his website, "Another King James Bible Believer" (I have a link on the sidebar on this website under "Bible Believing Material"). Nevertheless, the idea behind this article in particular, is to provide a thorough vindication of the words 'baptize,' 'baptism,' baptized,' 'Baptist,' etc., as found in the A.V. 1611 against the bigoted, one-sided, narrow, subjective claims of Rick Norris to the contrary.

In my estimation, Rick Norris is a true "Scholarship Onlyism" advocate. I say this chiefly because, when you observe the methods he employs to reinforce his points, they are done in a fashion where he makes a statement followed by numerous quotes from what he considers authorities on the given subject. Therefore, after you are visually mesmerized by the plethora of quotes bombarded by Mr. Norris, you are left with the impression that what he is saying is the absolute truth (at least from his intent and perspective). This fact is readily manifested when you consider the point that Norris, at least in the instances that I've both cited and will cite, doesn't inform the reader of a viable alternative. In light of that consideration, I now call your attention to pages 75-77 in Rick Norris' literary, querulous masterpiece:

"Among those words called "ecclesiastical words" which King James forbade to be translated into English or updated are the words "baptism" and "baptize." (4) William Shireff (1762-1831) noted: "The translators of the Bible have not translated this word at all" (Lectures on Baptism, pg. 146). Did God authorize the KJV translators to copy the other early English translators in not translating the Greek word baptizo and thereby cause so much confusion concerning the mode of baptism? Alexander Carson in his exhaustive study on this word noted: "Baptize has become an English word, but as an English word it has not the sense of the Greek word which it is employed to represent" (Baptism, pg. 279). Again he wrote: "We do not believe that baptism, as an English word, is synonymous with immersion. As an English term it respects not mode at all, but refers to what is considered the rite, apart from the mode" (Baptism, pg. 383)." (5)

Concerning, Norris' statements and quotes above, the following charges have been brought against the King's English and the word 'baptize':

A) The word was not "translated at all," implying that some sort of hideous textual atrocity has been committed because of such.

B) The word "baptize," though an English word, does not carry the meaning of the Greek word it represents.

C) Transferring the word "baptize" instead of translating it has caused so much confusion as to the mode of baptism.

D) The word "baptize" as an English word, is not a reference to the mode of baptism, but the "rite" of baptism.

E) Baptism is not synonymous with Immersion.

In the mid-19th century, The American and Foreign Bible Society envisioned to create what they called "A Baptist Version of the New Testament," wherein the words "baptize," "baptism," "Baptist," etc. would be updated respectively to "immerse," "immersion," and "Immersionist," or "Immerser." However, there were some Baptists who saw the most precarious outcome of attempting such a task. Among those were two notable Baptists who published works against A Baptist Version of the New Testament. Namely, they were William Brantley, who published, "Objections To A Baptist Version of the New Testament;" and John Dowling (pastor of Broadway Baptist Church in New York), who published, "The Old-Fashioned Bible, or Ten Reasons Against A Baptist Version of the New Testament." Now, with the above mentioned works, and along with my own studies on the subject, I have combined these "ecclectic" sources and formulated 11 points as to why the words "baptize," "baptism," and "Baptist," etc. should be left as they stand in our blessed King James Bible. These points will refute Norris' contentions above, along with the material he has on the ensuing pages, which I will quote when necessary.

I. THE PREPONDERANCE OF HISTORICAL UNDERSTANDING SURROUNDING THE WORD "BAPTIZE" PURPORTS IMMERSION OR DIPPING.

One crucial factor that Mr. Norris has conveniently omitted in his diatribe against the A.V. 1611 is the express historical understanding of derivatives employing use of the word "baptize." Brantley states emphatically:

"And we are now prepared to show, that all the versions in languages using the Roman character or alphabet, were made with the express understanding, that Baptizo was transferred and not translated, BECAUSE THERE DID NOT APPEAR TO BE, IN THOSE LANGUAGES WORDS OF AN IMPORT FULLY EQUIVALENT." (6)

First, we note that contrary to what Mr. Norris has asserted without proof, there does not exist an exact translational equivalent for the Greek word "Baptizo." Mr. Norris and his sources have concluded that "immersion" would suffice as an adequate equivalency from Greek to English to meet the demands of translational responsibility. However, I offer the fact that one of the oldest translations in existence, the Latin Vulgate of Jerome, when translated from Greek to Latin during the latter half of the fourth century, understood no other equivalent for the Greek "baptizo" than to just essentially transfer the words into Latin equivalents EXACTLY as our beloved English Bible has done! So, the words are left in their original form, only latinized.

Therefore, in order to locate the basic historical understanding behind the word baptize, we would be wise to consider the practices of Christians who frequented use of this particular version. Brantley states:

"If we find, that the administration of the ordinance of baptism, in those early times, consisted of the immersion into water of each candidate, and of the proper invocation of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, we may then assert, without fear of contradiction, that to baptize, in the then acceptation of the word, was to dip, plunge, or bury in water, with religious solemnity..." (7)

In his book, "The History of Infant Baptist," William Wall, discussing the time period under consideration before us, points out on page 462:

"Their general and ordinary way was to baptize by immersion, or dipping the person in the water. This is so plain and clear, by an infinite number of passages, that one cannot but pity the weak endeavors of such Pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it; so, also, we ought to disown and show a dislike of the profane scoffs which some people give to the English Anti-pedobaptists, merely for their use of dipping. It is one thing to maintain, that that circumstance is not absolutely necessary to the essence of baptism, and another to go about to represent it as ridiculous and foolish, or as shameful and indecent, when it was, in all probability, the way in which our blessed Saviour, and for certain, was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians, did receive their baptism. I shall not stay to produce the particular proofs of this. Many of the quotations which I brought for other purposes, and shall bring, do evince it. It is a great want of prudence as well as honesty to refuse to grant to an adversary what is certainly true, and may be proved so. It creates a jealousy of all the rest that one says."

Even though there were examples throughout church history of professing Christians adhering to and advocating baptismal methods other than immersion, it is clear that the common practice or the wide-spread general understanding of mode was immersion. Again, this MODE is clearly gathered from two lines of Biblical languages historically. Greek, which hosts the original word "baptizo," and Latin which, not being able to discover a suitable equivalent, transfers the Greek words into Latin, exactly as the English does. The following are points from individuals employing usage of Greek and Latin:

1) Brantley, on page 16 of his treatise, quotes Thomas Aquinas as saying: " Baptism may be given not only by immersion, but also by affusion of water, or sprinkling with it. But it is the safer way to baptize by immersion, because that is the common custom."

2) On page 17, he cites Bonaventur, " The way of affusion was properly used by the apostles, and was in his time in the churches of France and some others; but the way of dipping into the water is the more common, and the fitter, and the safer."

3) "Waldafridus Strabo, in the year 850, Rupertus and others, 1120, represent immersion to have been the general custom in Germany at those respective periods." (8)

4) "At the same time, the offices or liturgies for public baptism in the church of England, did uniformly enjoin immersion, without any mention of pouring or sprinkling" (Brantly, *ibid*, pg. 18)

5) "The 'Manuale ad Usus Sarum,' printed 1530, 21st of Henry VIIIth directs the priest to take the child, and, naming it, to dip him in the water." (Brantly, *ibid*, pg. 18-19)

6) "John Frith, in a treatise on baptism, 1533, styles the external action, 'the plunging down into the water, and the lifting up again.'" (Brantly, *ibid*, pg. 19)

7) The fact that the Catholics and the Anglicans baptized infants is not what is in dispute in this treatise, but the fact that during the time periods in question, whether or not the common MODE of baptism was immersion or fully plunging the body down into the water. As such, in all the books of common prayer, even to the beginning of the 18th century, "the formula always directs DIPPING, before pouring, in baptism." (Brantly, *ibid*, pg. 19).

Rapacious as it may appear, by the simple manifestation of his feeble evidentiary presentation of the subject at hand, that crooked deceiver, Rick Norris, has blessed us all with the solemn impression that the English word "baptize," "baptism," etc. was a confused term that didn't give a transparent understanding of the common meaning of the word in ecclesiastical circles. However, contrariwise, the exact **OPPOSITE IS THE CASE!**

On the reciprocal of transferring the word "baptizo" into the English tongue, following the example of hundreds of years of Latin believers who could not find a translational Latin equivalent for the same, what shall we say of a version that DID indeed translate the word "baptizo" into a native tongue? Did that translation in contrast from our transference, thus enlighten the recipients of that language's version with a more detailed comprehension of the Greek word "baptizo?" The answer is a resounding, **NO!**

Upon consideration that the German translation of Martin Luther actually translated the word "baptizo" into the German tongue and didn't transfer it as the Latin and English, what exactly did that translation do for the Lutherans? Why hasn't Luther's version kept them right? Have they not continued with almost one accord, from Luther's time to the present in the pretentious practice of sprinkling and pouring? Brantly correctly concludes, "The translation has been of no avail to restrain or correct their practical aberrations. Neither would a translation do us any good." (9) Therefore, we conclude, that there is indeed a more correct understanding of the word "baptize" historically through Christians with a transferred Bible version, than ones with a translated one in the particular instance before us.

II. THE PROBABILITY THAT IF "BAPTIZE/BAPTISM" WERE SOME OF "THE OLD ECCLESIASTICAL WORDS TO BE KEPT" BY THE AV TRANSLATORS, THAT THEY HAD NO CONNECTION TO ANY PARTIALITY FOR INFANT SPRINKLING.

As surprisingly peculiar as it may seem, when I quoted Mr. Wall for an instance on the mode of Baptism by believers who were indebted to a Bible version that transferred the Greek word "baptizo" and didn't translate them as our Immersionist critic has suggested that we should do above, I purposely omitted the fact that Mr. Wall was himself a "pedobaptist" or one that advocates infant baptism. Therefore, although Mr. Wall was not a baptismal advocate of adult believers only, his testimony should be all the more weighty in the matters at hand. As such, Mr. Dowling quotes Wall as saying, "DIPPING must have been pretty ordinary during the former half of King James' reign, if not longer." (10). In plainer words, the pedobaptist DIPPED their infants in water, rather than sprinkled or poured water upon them.

Continuing, it is of note among the works cited to prove the second point, that the testimony of the Rev. Mr. Blake, a clergyman of the Church of England, be taken into account. Mr. Blake authored a pamphlet in 1645, approximately 34 years after the release of the A.V. 1611, in which he stated:

"I have been an eye-witness of many infants dipped, and know it to have been the constant practice of many ministers in their places for many years together. I have seen several dipped, I NEVER SAW NOR HEARD OF ANY SPRINKLED." (11)

Dowling summerizes:

"What stronger proof could be required that immersion was the prevailing practice in England long after our present version was made, and that consequently this was understood to be the meaning of the English word Baptize? It was not until the time of the celebrated Westminster Assembly of Divines in the reign of the unfortunate Charles I., that sprinkling became at all current in England as a substitute for Baptism, and even then was it found was so difficult to pervert the evident meaning of the well-understood English word Baptize, that the learned Selden, himself a member of the Westminster Assembly, made the following pointed and striking remark. Speaking of the practice of sprinkling then coming into vogue, he says: 'In England of late years I ever thought the person baptized his own fingers rather than the child.' " (12)

At this juncture I would like to point out the most asinine, amateur tactics of our Immersionist constituent, Mr. Norris. In his literary debilitation, he attempts to support the notion that the English word, "Baptize," doesn't carry the weight of immersion or dipping. After quoting Alexander Carson as a source for saying that, "we do not believe that baptism, as an English word, is synonymous with immersion," this typical, scholarship worshipping peddler, employs the usage of

Noah Webster and Samuel Johnson in his etymological escapade. Norris states:

"An examination of old English dictionaries proves Carson's point. Samuel Johnson's first English dictionary of 1755 defined baptize as "to christen, to administer the sacrament of baptism." Noah Webster's dictionary of 1828 also defined baptize as 'to administer the sacrament of baptism; to christen.' Webster's 1828 dictionary defined baptism as follows: 'the application of water to a person, as a sacrament or religious ceremony, by which he is initiated into the visible church of Christ. This is usually performed by sprinkling or immersion.' After his definition of baptize, Noah Webster wrote: 'More generally the ceremony is performed by sprinkling water on the face of a person, whether an infant or an adult, and in the case of an infant, by giving him a name, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, which is called Christening.' Does this meaning correspond exactly to the meaning of the Greek word so that it is an accurate translation? Some of the early translations even used christen and baptize as synonyms, which is more evidence that the English word baptize does not indicate accurately the meaning of the Greek. For example, Tyndale's and Matthew's Bibles have 'christen' at I Corinthians 1:14. Wycliffe's Bible also used 'christen' for 'baptize' in some places."(13)

Immediately, I am most inclined to ask, is this really the sum of the matter? Are the generalized interpretations of two dictionary editors to be engulfed as the final word on the universal idea of this definition and etymology of the English word "baptize." Well, if it is, then we are most guilty of depriving our Baptist brethren of the following facts:

1) Surpassing by far, the 1755 A.D. date of the dictionary published by Samuel Johnson, I earnestly refer the curious reader to Robert Cawdrey's, "A Table Alphabetical of Hard Usual English Words (1604)," in which he defines the word "baptism" as thus:

"BAPTISME: DIPPING OR SPRINKLING"!

Therefore, as far back as 1604 (not just 1755 or 1828), Mr. Cawdrey defines the usage of "baptism" as DIPPING! So, to assume that historically there was some sort of devious concealment of the word "baptize" in the English tongue, is shallow research at best. But, you see, when people have a hidden agenda concerning the information that they postulate, bigotted research and prejudicial commentary become predominant to established facts. As I stated in my previous treatise on the Genesis Water Gap, history, unfortunately can be both interpreted and manipulated to fit the fancy of dishonest persons.

2) Dowling states: "...I am glad that one English lexicographer, at least, in one of the best dictionaries of our language ever published, has had the independence to give the word its true and undisguised meaning. I refer to Richardson, who in his Quarto Dictionary defines the English word Baptize without any equivocation, as signifying

"to dip or merge frequently, to sink, to plunge, to immerge." (14)

3) If the keen reader will notice Mr. Norris' quotes above, he will observe that Norris defines "baptism," and "baptize" as outlined in Noah Webster's 1828 dictionary. However, unfortunate as it is, as with many other details in Norris' book, he subtly omits much needed factual statements in his source quotes. For example, if you will notice the portion of Norris' book that I quoted above, you will see that he quotes two sentences from Webster's definition of "baptize":

"...To administer the sacrament of baptism to; to christen." " More generally the ceremony is performed by sprinkling water on the face of a person, whether an infant or an adult, and in the case of an infant, by giving him a name, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, which is called Christening."

Nevertheless, what is so spontaneously peculiar about Norris' two sentence quoted from Webster and what may be even considered serendipity in this instance, is the major sentence in the definition in which Rick Norris so conveniently omitted:

"BAPTIZÉ, v.t. [See Baptism.] To administer the sacrament of baptism to; to christen. By some denominations of christians, baptism is performed by plunging, or immersing the whole body in water, and this is done to none but adults. More generally the ceremony is performed by sprinkling water on the face of a person, whether an infant or an adult, and in the case of an infant, by giving him a name, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, which is called Christening." (15)

You see dear reader, there never was any obfuscation concerning the meaning of the word baptize. The sentence from Webster's 1828 omitted by Norris lets you know in no uncertain terms that there were Christians who knew of and purported BAPTISM as full-body immersion and plunging into water for adults only. Why was such an important sentence like this omitted? Did Mr. Norris not think that it was relevant to the discussion? I suppose such answers will await us at the Judgment Seat of Christ.

4) "The celebrated Richard Bentley, D.D. who flourished towards the closed of the seventeenth century and was one of the most eminent critics that England ever produced, is cited by that powerful opponent of infant baptism, Abraham Booth, as an authority for fixing the sense of the word baptism. In his discourse on Free Thinking, pp. 56, 57, he defines baptisms 'dippings,' and to baptize 'to dip.' (Brantly, ibid, pg. 25)

5) "Bishop Reynolds, probably a descendant of John Reynolds, D.D., one of the translators of the Bible under the authority of king James, expresses the import of the word to baptize: 'The Spirit under the gospel,' says he 'is compared to water; and that, not a little measure to sprinkle or bedew, but to baptize the faithful in; and that not in a font or vessel which grows less and less, but in a spring or living river.' - Works, pp. 226, 407" (Brantly, ibid, pg. 26)

6) "The observation of the learned Selden, ---see his works, vol. 6, fol. ed. col. 2008, - --is both pungent in application and comprehensive in sense. 'In England, of late years,' remarks that justly renowned scholar, 'I ever thought the person baptized his own fingers rather than the child.' [Note by Nachimson: See this illustrated succinctly in the A.V. 1611 text in Leviticus 14:16.] Selden was a member of the Westminster Assembly." (Brantly, *ibid*, pg. 26)

7) "Dr. Owen concedes, 'that the original and natural signification of the word baptize is to dip, to plunge, to dye.'"

8) "Dr. Hammond, speaking of the word to baptize, says, 'It signifies not only the washing of the whole body, as when it was said of Eupolis, that, being taken and thrown into the sea, ebaptizeto, he was immersed all over, and so the baptisms of cups is putting them into the water all over; but washing any part, as the hands, by way of immersion in water.' "

9) "Mathew Poole's Continuator declares, that 'to be baptized is to be dipped in water;'"

10) "Doddridge also makes baptism and immersion the same."

11) "Parkhurst renders the Greek word "baptizo," immerse, dip, or plunge."

12) "Dr. George Campbell maintains, that immerse is very nearly equivalent to baptize in the language of the Gospels." (16)

Clearly, the historical evidence points to the fact that the word "baptize" in universal consent among those who employed usage of a Bible version that transferred the Greek "baptizo" instead of translating it, meant "to immerse, to dip, to plunge, etc." It did not carry the common connotation of sprinkling, pouring, so on and so forth. Notwithstanding, it is abundantly clear that at the time of the translation of the A.V. 1611 and thereafter, that even though they were pedobaptists, the church of England adherents understood the meaning of the word "baptize" to signify immersion. The only confusion that exists historically on the meaning of the word "baptize" resides in the clouded mental faculties of one Rick Norris. Nevertheless, before indulging ourselves into the next point of vindication for this word "baptize" in our English Bible, let us seal the fact that even the very individual that ordered "the old ecclesiastical words to be kept," himself understood the meaning of the word "baptize" to denote DIPPING!
Observe:

"That James himself so understood the word baptize to signify immerse, we gather from a Speech which he delivered to his Parliament in the year 1605, about two years anterior to the commencement of the present version, on the discovery of the Gunpower plot. Speaking of the destruction of the old world by the flood, he says,

'For as God for the punishment of the first great sinners in the original world...did by a generall delluge and overflowing of waters, BAPTIZE the world to a generall destruction, etc.' And in another part, alluding to the overwhelming calamities that would have ensued but for the discovery of the treason, he says, **'I should have been BAPTIZED IN BLOOD, and in my destruction, not only the kingdom where I then was, but ye also, by your future interest would have tasted of my ruine.'** " (17)

[Note by Nachimson: Below are the other 9 points on which I will be expounding as time permits. As you can see, I have a lot of material just for the first 2 points, and the other 9 are just as voluminous. I have an online college program I am participating in, as well as a 6-day A.V. 1611 conference I will be speaking at next week. Therefore, my typing time is reduced drastically. Enjoy what I have thus far, and I will notify my mailing list when the other points are available.]

III. THE POTENTIAL THAT THE TRANSFERABLE EQUIVALENTS OF "BAPTIZO" ARE WEIGHTIER THAN THE TRANSLATIONAL SUBSTITUTIONS OFFERED BY NORRIS.

IV. THE PLURALITY OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES LINKING THE ROOT OF BAPTIZO TO IMMERSION, DIPPING, PLUNGING, ETC.

V. THE PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF "BAPTIZE" AS A VIABLE MEMBER OF THE ENGLISH TONGUE.

VI. THE PERTINACIOUS ADVOCATION OF ULTIMATELY FORFEITING "BAPTIZE" TO A PERMANENT IDENTIFICATION WITH AFFUSION; POURING; SPRINKLING, ETC.

VII. THE PERUSAL OF BIBLICAL WORDS RETAINED FROM OTHER LANGUAGES AND THE HYPOCRISY OF THE A.V. 1611 CRITICS IN NOT TRANSLATING OTHER WORDS IN THE MODERN VERSIONS

VIII. THE PREVENTION OF DEALING WITH THE PEDOBAPTISTS ON THEIR OWN GROUND

IX. THE PERSEVERATION OF SLANDEROUS CHARGES BY IMMERSION OBJECTORS

X. THE PAUCITY OF SUCCESS IN THE RAPID ADVANCEMENT OF BAPTIST PRINCIPLES BY UPDATING THE WORDS IN QUESTION

XI. THE PROVOCATION OF CONTINUAL ALTERATIONS TO THE A.V. 1611 TEXT

ENDNOTES:

(1) The Unbound Scriptures: A Review of KJV-Only Claims and Publications, by Rick Norris, Copyright 2003, Unbound Scriptures Publications, pg. 1

(2) Norris, *ibid*, pg. 1

(3) I sent Norris the following quotes from Spurgeon's, "Treasury of the Bible" Vol. 2, page 387; "We believe that we have the words of God preserved for us in the Scriptures...With this Book before us, what the Lord spake two thousand years ago, He virtually speaks now: for "He will not call back His words" (Isaiah xxxi.2). His word abideth for ever; for it was spoken, not for one occasion, but for all ages...By the Holy Ghost the words of Scripture come to us with a present inspiration; not only has the Book been inspired, it is inspired. This Book is more than paper and ink, it talks with us. Was not that the promise, "When thou awakest, it shall talk with thee"? We open the Book with this prayer, "Speak, Lord; for Thy servant heareth"; and we often close it with this feeling, "Here am I; for Thou didst call me." [Note by Nachimson: Notice how all of Spurgeon's words are a direct and only reference to a King James Bible. There was no "Greek text" before them, or any "Bible as originally written," only the A.V. 1611 text.]

(4) Although Mr. Norris is most likely correct in his assertion that "baptize," "baptism," etc. are some of the old ecclesiastical words to be kept, it is not noted in the list of actual rules. The word "church" is cited as an example of an old ecclesiastical word to be kept. However, I do say that Mr. Norris' assertion is likely because of the statement by Miles Smith in the "Translators to the Reader" where he criticizes the Puritans for not keeping "the old ecclesiastical words," then proceeds to cite two examples as "washed" for "baptize," and "congregation" for "church."

(5) Norris, *ibid*, pg. 75

(6) "Objections to a Baptist Version of the New Testament," William Brantley, 1837, pg. 12, emphasis mine.

(7) Brantley, *ibid*, pg. 13

(8) Brantley, *ibid*, pg. 17

(9) Brantley, *ibid*, pg. 30

(10) "The Old Fashioned Bible," John Dowling, pg. 22

(11) Dowling, *ibid*, pg. 22, emphasis mine.

(12) Dowling, *ibid*, pg. 22

(13) Norris, Unbound Scriptures, pg. 75

(14) Dowling, *ibid*, pg. 22-23

(15) Webster's 1828 Dictionary

(16) Numbers 7-12 from Brantly, *ibid*, pg. 26-27

(17) "Additional Objections to a Baptist Version of the New Testament", Ocatvius Winslow, pg. 57

1 Peter 3:19 and "The Spirits in Prison"

By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson

In January of 2003, at the onset of my second semester at the Pensacola Bible Institute, I received an interesting email from a pastor requesting my opinion on the controversial passage in I Peter 3:19 regarding "the spirits in prison." Therefore, today's article is a reproduction of the brief study that I submitted to that pastor in light of his request (with minor revisions and variations) on February 16, 2003.

The late Dr. J. Vernon McGee, former professor at Dallas Theological Seminary, and author of "Thru the Bible" (a voluminous edition of transcribed radio programs in which Dr. McGee went through Genesis to Revelation in an expository fashion), once postulated that since he believed that the "sons of God" in Genesis 6 could not refer to fallen angels, this passage in I Peter 3 had to be a reference to "the Spirit of Christ" preaching through Noah at the time of the flood to the spirits of disobedient "Sethites" intermarrying with disobedient "Cainites" who were in a "prison" of "spiritual darkness" and "dead and trespasses and sins"!

Dr. McGee unfortunately did this by inventing an antecedent that doesn't exist in verse 19 ("By which also HE..."), and by skipping in his exposition from "prison" to "when ONCE" without including "Which were sometime disobedient"! He ignorantly informs us that the "when ONCE" is the key that unveils the passage for us, distinctly referring it back to the "HE" in verse 19, thus making it Noah.

I would like to say that I believe that Dr. McGee was a saved man, and loved the Lord Jesus Christ. I would also like to say that I believe that Dr. McGee is in heaven at this very moment, but those facts will never stop me from pointing out and exposing any man who exhorts his opinion above the words of God. Nevertheless, did you ever wonder what Jesus Christ did from the time he was "put to death in the flesh", to the time he was "quickened by the Spirit"?

First, the Bible says in Matthew 12:40: "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

Well brethren, if Jesus Christ said that he was going to spend three days and three nights in the heart of the earth AS (called a "similitude" in Hosea 12:10) Jonas spent three days and three nights in the whale's belly (notice that the whale is a type of Satan in Ezekiel 32:1-2), then BOTH MEN MUST HAVE BEEN DEAD!

In Jonah 2:1, the prophet prays to God out of the fish's belly (also notice how a King James Bible clears up the faulty mammalian classification system of modern science by calling a whale a fish), and in verse 2 Jonah says "out of the belly OF HELL cried I..." So between verses 1 and 2 the man dies! Modern scholarship tries to limit

the passage to only Jonah awake in the fish's belly, but further reading in the chapter will yield otherwise.

Verse 3, "For thou hadst cast me into the deep, in the midst of the seas; and the floods compassed me about: (so far so good, you can apply it to only the physical state of Jonah in the whale's belly) BUT HORRORS! Verse 3 continues, "...all THY billows and THY waves passed over me." The problem is "THY BILLOWS" and "THY WAVES" are a direct reference to the wrath of God (see Psalm 42:7; 88:5-7, 16-17). Water is a form of God's wrath (see Genesis 1:2; II Peter 3:4-7; Genesis 7:21-22) and the "deep" must be a bigger reference than just the oceanic body Jonah's physical body was in (Genesis 1:2; Job 38:30; Job 41:31; Psalm 69:1-4, 15; 104::3; 148:4; Habakkuk 3:10).

If all of these were not enough, go to the next verse! "Then I said, I am cast out of thy sight; yet I will look again toward thy holy temple." The holy temple is in Psalm 11:4, it is in HEAVEN!! Clearly Jonah is in hell, just like the man said in verse 2!! "The waters compassed me, EVEN TO THE SOUL..." (Verse 5)!

And if none of that convinced you, verse 6 couldn't possibly be missed. "I went down to the bottoms of the mountains; THE EARTH (Ephesians 4:9) WITH HER BARS was about me FOR EVER: yet hast thou brought up my life FROM CORRUPTION, O Lord my God." The earth has "lower parts" as Jesus Christ is said to have went to in Ephesians 4:9, where he lead "CAPTIVITY CAPTIVE"! The earth in this passage has BARS, as in "GATES OF HELL" (Matthew 16:18), and bless my soul Jonah is brought up from CORRUPTION! The scriptures states that Jesus Christ was not to see CORRUPTION, and naturally that is talking about him WHEN HE WAS DEAD! (see Psalm 16:10 and Acts 2:27. The obvious correlaries are open and plain to the sight of him who isn't blinded by popular opinion.

Thus, the implications are clear: Jonah dies for three days and three nights in the whale's belly, at which time he is in hell until God hears his cry and "resurrects" (spits him up on dry land). His body didn't see corruption, although verse 6 implies for Jonah it had started. Jesus Christ is crucified, and spends three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, which turns out to be "HELL", or the lower parts of the earth! And again, in Acts 2:27-31 Simon Peter says that Jesus Christ's soul was not left in "HELL", neither did his "FLESH SEE CORRUPTION" i.e...just like Jonah.

So far we have determined that Jesus Christ by the Spirit of God, went to preach to some "spirits in prison" while he spent three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. This perhaps brings up one of the most important questions in this discussion: Who or What are these "spirits" in prison?

The direct reference to what "spirits" are in the Bible is to angels. Observe Hebrews 1:13-14, "But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I

make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not all MINISTERING SPIRITS, sent for to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" Angels are spirits that appear in "forms" and "images." Examine Job 4:13-18, and watch carefully text in regards to the emphasis put on certain words; "In thoughts from the visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth on men, Fear came upon me, and trembling, which made all my bones to shake. Then a SPIRIT passed before my face; the hair of my flesh stood up: IT stood still, but I could not discern the FORM thereof: an IMAGE was before mine eyes, there was silence, and I heard a voice saying, Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his maker? Behold, he put no trust in his servants; (NOW WATCH THIS!) and his ANGELS he charged with folly:"

This is a very interesting concept because if you look in II Peter 2:4-5 it says, "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment; And spared no the old world, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly."

At this point, you should notice several things relevant to our topic. One, there are angels connected with being cast into hell in the direct context as the days of Noah(notice Peter's two by two comparison method in verses 4-7; verse 5 goes to verse 4 as verse 7 goes to verse 6)! If that weren't enough brethren, back in I Peter 3, you have angels mentioned in the same context as the "spirits in prison" along WITH NOAH'S FLOOD(I Peter 3:22)! Thus, you have two water judgments that are connected with sinning angels (Job 4:18 with Job 38:7 and Genesis 1:1-2---then II Peter 2:4-5 connected with Genesis 6 and Noah's flood).

Next, the bible tells us in no uncertain terms that these angels are RESERVED IN CHAINS OF DARKNESS! I wouldn't hesitate to teach that "chains" are connected with a prison. This is most evident when one reads the future account of Satan being cast into the bottomless pit in Revelation 20:1. Satan is bound with "A GREAT CHAIN" by an angel from heaven that had "THE KEY" to the bottomless pit, and cast therein. And evidently folks, this is abundantly clear in Revelation 20:7: "And when the thousand years are expired, Satan SHALL BE LOOSED OUT OF HIS PRISON,"! And glory to God we know that this is HIS place when we read Matthew 25:41 because it was prepared "FOR THE DEVIL AND HIS ANGELS."

Back in II Peter 2:4 the angels are cast in "hell" which turns out to be a special place referred to as "Tartaros." "Tartaros" is a Greek nominative, singular, aorist active participle (from the verb "tartaroo" meaning to cast or thrust down to Tartarus or Gehenna; in pronunciation the first "o" is short, while the last "o" is long.) for "hell" in the passage! It is a mythological reference to the part of 'Hades' where the wicked are confined and tormented, or hence A PRISON. This brings up the question, what was Jesus Christ preaching to them about?

The scriptures give us several intricate details about the implications surrounding

the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, which of course, is our context in I Peter 3:18 throughout the rest of the chapter.

1- The gospel of Jesus Christ (death, burial, and resurrection--I Cor. 15:1-4) is the standard by which God will judge the secrets of men on judgment day (Romans 2:16).

2- The resurrection of Christ is the **PROOF** that God has appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ. This point is strongly demonstrated by Peter's statements in I Peter 4:5-6, "Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead. For this cause was the gospel **PREACHED ALSO TO THEM THAT ARE DEAD**, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit."

Notice Psalm 82:6-7 and observe the language God uses, "I have said, **YE ARE GODS, AND ALL OF YOU ARE CHILDREN OF THE MOST HIGH. BUT YE SHALL DIE LIKE MEN** and fall like one of the princes." These beings are said to be "gods" and "children of the most high", and obviously they are not human men, since they are said that they will "**DIE LIKE MEN**". (Note: the majority of commentators mistake this reference as quoted by Jesus Christ in John 10:34 as a reference to Old testament jewish judges. However, if you will notice the context of our Lord's words, he is attempting to prove his **DEITY** by this verse! Hence, he had just said, "I and my Father are one," thus implying that he is "God manifest in the flesh." While the Pharisees are trying to condemn him for blasphemy ("...because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God."), he refutes them by showing them that angels in the Old Testament are called gods and are subsequently men! (See Acts 27:23; Galatians 4:14; Revelation 21:17; Genesis 19:1-5; Mark 16:5.) Ultimately, the final point is that since the scriptures **CANNOT BE BROKEN**, the scriptures advocate the teaching that "God" can appear as a man! Praise the Lord that he can **AND THAT HE DID.**)

If there is any doubt in your mind about who "the Sons of God" are in Genesis 6:2, it will do you wonders to study this passage as well as Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7 where all of the references clearly teach that "the sons of God" are angelic beings. Interestingly enough, the Son of God Jesus Christ is called "the angel of God" (Galatians 4:14; Acts 27:23)! You can't beat it with a stick, as the saying goes. Christians in the church age are called "the sons of God" (John 1:12; Philippians 2:15) because they have received the new birth which no Old Testament saint did [John 3- After Jesus Christ tells Nicodemus about being 'born-again,' the means of the new birth is given in the context (the crucifixion-vs. 14); I Peter 1:10-11,23- the new birth is by means of the Gospel; I Cor. 15:1-4); in Psalm 22:30, the new birth is a prophetic reference.]

In Genesis 6:3 God says that his spirit will not always strive with man because "**HE ALSO IS FLESH.**" (see "strange flesh" in Jude 7) This again brings up an interesting point because in verse 4 you have the result of the union between "the sons of God" and "the daughters of men". **THEY ARE CALLED GIANTS.**

This means that they are humanoid creatures that are half angel, have human. If there is any doubt to this it should be noted that verse 4 says "...AND ALSO AFTER THAT, WHEN THE SONS OF GOD CAME IN UNTO THE DAUGHTERS OF MEN..." So, this intermingling didn't stop with Genesis 6, which besides the other piles of evidence that completely refutes Dr. McGee's frivolous idea that "the sons of God" are the "Sethites" intermingling with "the daughters of men", which would be the "Cainites". The verse clearly states that this cohabitation is going to happen again, which is fully attested to by our Lord Jesus Christ (Matthew 24:36-39: notice the "angels" right in the context), by the prophet Daniel (Daniel 2:43---these are the "ten toes" (kings) in Revelation 17:3, 11-12), and by the apostle John (Revelation 12:3-4, 7-9--and please observe that these passages are future in the book of Revelation, not a reference to Dr. McGee's past angels being cast out prior to Genesis 1).

So, what have we studied today brethren? Essentially that when our Lord Jesus Christ was "put to death in the flesh" he went into the heart of the earth (hell) and preached to the fallen angels and their offspring from Genesis chapter six who were "to die like men" because they "also were flesh" and had rejected Noah's preaching, which would also explain Peter's language in I Peter 4:6 when he says that they will BE JUDGED ACCORDING TO MEN IN THE FLESH! Now, when he went down there he went preaching the gospel to assure these beings and to assure even "the quick" that were down there (I Peter 4:5) that because of his death, burial, and SUBSEQUENT resurrection that judgment was not only assured to all men, but to these angels reserved in chains of darkness. He went down there and showed them that he had the "keys" of "hell and of death" BECAUSE HE CONQUERED DEATH (Revelation 1:18). I do believe that I have given sufficient scriptural support to substantiate this view in light of the precious A.V. 1611.

Evangelical Outreach: A Parroted Case of Scholastic Ignorance

By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson

One of the primary reasons for the establishment of the AV 1611 Answers Association blogsite was not only to reveal doctrinal truth for the benefit of Bible-believing Christendom, but for the exposure of the men and ministries given to the proposition that intellect and scholarship are superior to the definitive words of the living God. In order to fulfill the mission to expose this type of deception, a links heading was erected entitled, "Alexandrian Apostates." These apostates are persons who profess to believe the Bible while at the same time, destroy a Christian's faith in it. Hence, it comes down to the basic problem underlying Christian scholarship today: What and where is the final authority for the child of God? As was examined in the article, "An Inquiry into the Interpretation of Inspiration" (on this blogsite; which see), professing to believe the Bible without being able to present the Bible is an unattainable hypothesis that has no basis in factual reality. It makes for a wordy ideology, but in the end it isn't substantial whatsoever.

Hence, a most depauperated web establishment is that of the "Evangelical Outreach" (<http://www.evangelicaloutreach.org/>). As an apologetics website with information on various subjects such as cults, practical living, etc., Evangelical Outreach, so it seems, is primarily dedicated to proving that the Baptist doctrine of "eternal security" (mistakenly confounded with the Calvinistic doctrine of "Perseverance of the Saints" on the same website) is an erroneous teaching purported by those who have an ecclesiastical agenda for distorting verses of Scripture. Besides articles listed on the subject, the editor, Daniel Corner, has fabricated an 800+ page treatise entitled, "The Believer's Conditional Security," in order to bolster his obvious presupposed, doctrinal proclivity. However, among this emphasis on "conditional security," there is a section on the site provided for exposing the dastardly heresy of A.V. 1611 Onlyism.

In order to mass distribute anti-A.V. 1611 propaganda, Daniel Corner and his band of Bible Correcting malcontents have designed a pamphlet for the sole purpose of deterring an individual from faith in the words of the King James text by a series of secondary points, and implication tactics. The thesis of one of my articles, namely, "The Rudimentary Factor Underlying Infallibility" (on this blogsite; which see) was essentially that to prove that the King James Bible is not infallible, one would have to prove an actual error in the text of the A.V., conclusively. Taking a few examples, the article was able to show that supposed errors in the King James text were in fact mere preferences of the critic involved, with that same critic naturally omitting the necessary information that would otherwise exonerate the King's English. Therefore, it stands to reason that when put under the scope of criticism, that Mr. Corner's pamphlet will be shown to not only have not proven ANY error in the A.V. 1611 affecting the claim of infallibility, but he, as those before him whom he is parroting, omit factual information that is detrimentally pertinent to alleviating the King's English of these types of accusations.

The accusations brought against the King James Bible in this pamphlet can be summarized as follows:

- 1) The "KJV issue" is a demonic idea that is being used to divide the body of Christ.**
- 2) The A.V. 1611 contains archaic words**
- 3) The NRSV, NASB, and NIV are all "reliable versions" that use modern English and alleviate the contemporary English reader of the archaisms found in the A.V. 1611**
- 4) The King James Only position implies that there was no word of God prior to 1611.**
- 5) The A.V. 1611 went through revisions and therefore the edition that we have today is not an actual "1611."**
- 6) The King James translators recommended other Bibles.**
- 7) The King James translators never claimed inspiration.**
- 8) The translation "if they shall fall away" in Hebrews 6:6 is an intentional mistranslation by the A.V. 1611 translators to promote eternal security (or Perseverance of the Saints since Corner equivocates the two).**
- 9) The King James Only position implies that you must read the KJB to learn about salvation or be lost.**
- 10) When presented with the notion that the modern versions leave words out of the Bible, it is suggested that "perhaps the KJV added words in."**
- 11) The manuscripts that the modern versions are based on are not the same as the ones that underlie the A.V. 1611. Hence, the Textus Receptus that the A.V. 1611 was translated from was revised numerous times. Thus, this implies clearly, as will be proved later, that the texts underlying the modern versions are unrevised, unaltered, "pure" texts.**
- 12) Erasmus, the original textual editor of what would later be called the Textus Receptus in the 17th century, was a Roman Catholic who dedicated his first edition to the pope. Erasmus also stated that he wanted salvation, but not without Mary.**
- 13) The Homosexual on the NIV committee was removed, but the A.V. translator, Richard Thomson, "was a known alcoholic who was never removed" from the A.V. translating committee.**
- 14) The King James originally contained the Apocrypha. To claim that the A.V.**

1611 is infallible is to claim that the Apocrypha is infallible.

15) The A.V. 1611 contains two egregious errors in Acts 5:30 and 10:39 by saying that the Jews slew and hanged Jesus Christ on a tree.

16) A person that believes the King James Bible is a devil-possessed hippy that will reject anything "factual" that is given against the King's English.

17) The modern, "reputable" versions can increase "one's comprehension of Scripture."

Naturally, these things are being listed for your convenience so you can see what you are getting into prior to the full length critique of Corner's pamphlet. The main thing to note, at least at this juncture, is that the material and accusations against the King James text being circulated by Corner and his motley crew, is information and false propaganda that has been in print for years. You can find the above information in "The King James Only Controversy" (James White, 1995), "The Unbound Scriptures" (Rick Norris, 2003), "King James Only?" (Robert Joyner, 2000), "The Truth About the King James Controversy" (Stewart Custer, 1981), "Revised New Testament and History of Revision" (RV Committee, 1881), and any number of websites, such as Doug Kutilek's <http://www.kjvonly.org/>, etc. The material that Corner has printed in this pamphlet was copied material, ranging from Westcott and Hort (1881) to James Price (contemporary). Therefore, it is evident that Mr. Corner is a constituent parroting scholastic ignorance that has been dealt with over and over again, at length, by Ruckman, Evans, Hills, Grady, Riplinger, Gipp, Burgon, Mauro, Heaton, Fuller, Kinney, Streeter, so on and so forth. Hence, we are embarking upon an investigation of redundancy, but necessary to answer the critical objectors as an encouragement for the defenders of the A.V. 1611.

The first of many very disappointing errors and misrepresentations on the part of Mr. Corner has its original manifestation on the very cover of the pamphlet. In order to evidently mock the King James position, Corner takes a King James' Bible with a crown on it, that sits on top of a hill. Coincidentally, this is the precise picture that was originated by the Bible Baptist Bookstore, although not exact to avoid plagiarism. However, it is not that that is in error, but the question that is posed on the cover, namely, "Understandest What Thou Readeth?"

As minute as this point may seem, I think it is a substantial one because it goes to show that an individual that has ordained himself to critique the King James position cannot even manage to get his scoffing quotes correct. However, as always, the A.V. 1611 will correct Mr. Corner. Acts 8:30 states in part, "...Understandest thou what thou READEST?" Therefore, in seeking to make light of the Elizabethan English utilized by the King James Bible, Corner is too frivolously oriented to make use of proper wording. It is "READEST," not "READETH." So, in the subsequent points in Corner's pamphlet, it will not be the least bit surprising to see his lack of

attention to detail in other such matters also.

Mr. Corner's pamphlet is divided into 17 cartoon-type pictures in which a clean-cut, shirt-and-tie wearing advocate of the modern "reputable" versions is participating in a dialogue with a t-shirt and jeans wearing, long-haired advocate of the A.V. 1611 position. In picture one, there are two "devils" in the background stating, "This KJV issue being God's only word is a good way for us to divide the Body of Christ and hinder Christians from understanding the Scriptures. Also in the picture are partial quotes from II Corinthians 6:11-13. Hence, at the very beginning of this sly, quasi-political type of propaganda, the reader is given the impression that the A.V. 1611 position is a doctrine of devils purported by rebellious Christians who aren't interested in presenting a clean appearance or practicing clean living.

The second picture in Corner's pamphlet must be examined in light of the first picture because this is where the dialogue actually starts. Notice that this conversation begins AFTER you are given the initial implications in the first picture with no conversational words being exchanged. First, the modern version advocate asks, "Do you understand what he's reading from the KJV?" The A.V. 1611 hippy replies, "Very little. I have to guess what those archaic words mean and how to pronounce them like everyone else does." Hence, several important factors must be gleaned immediately:

1) Mr. Corner is exaggeratingly LATE in his implication that it is the "KJV issue" that is dividing the body of Christ. In the 19th century, the following Baptist minister had these things to say while Corner was "yet in the loins of his father" (Hebrew 7:10 where "father" is a reference to a great-grandfather):

"The proposed abandonment of the words...will doubtless attract to itself the favourable suffrage of a few. Its plausibility will beguile and its novelty will charm them. But the more reflecting, perceiving that nothing is to be gained by the alterations while much will be hazarded; caught by no specious reasoning, and won over by no puerile argument, will withhold from the translation their sanction and their patronage, and still retain at the domestic altar, in the study and in the pulpit, the good old English Version, endeared to them by a thousand tender and hallowed associations. Such we think, will be the disorganizing tendency of the question agitated either at the present, or at any future time. Brother will be arrayed against brother, church against church, and association against association, and the Book, that should have been to us as a heaven wrought ligament, binding each to the other, and all to it, will thus become the organ of strife, discord and dissension. From such a catastrophe, may the GOD of the BIBLE preserve us!" (Objections To A Baptist Version Of The New Testament, William T. Brantly, pg. 65-66)

Howbeit the antiquated words of Mr. Brantly presently sound forth in the ears of modern version, anti-A.V. 1611 advocates. Only if one were to consider the final authority issue from a contemporary perspective, would it even be of the slightest consideration to assign the blame of division onto the King's English. However, just

as the Lord Jesus has taught us, division is oftentimes the necessary consequence of righteousness (see Matthew 10:34-36). In this case, the "foes" of one's own "household," would be other members of the body of Christ who are the foes of the authority of God's holy words (Ephesians 2:19; Galatians 6:10; I Timothy 3:15).

2) Secondly, besides the bold assertion and accusation that "this KJV issue being God's only word," is dividing the body of Christ, Corner also conjectures the idea that perhaps "this KJV issue" hinders "Christians from understanding the Scriptures." The example provided to illustrate this A.V. 1611 Only lack of understanding is a partial quotation of II Corinthians 6:11-13. Mr. Corner introduces the passages in the following fashion: "...our mouth is open unto you, our heart is enlarged...be ye also enlarged." After the partial quotation, the A.V. Only advocate is asked, "Do you understand what he's reading from the KJV?" The Bible-Believer replies, "Very little. I have to guess what those archaic words mean and how to pronounce them like everyone else does."

It borders on the brink of absurdity to insinuate that any of the afore cited words are "archaic," or difficult to "pronounce." Perhaps Mr. Corner was slightly premature in his presentation of anti-A.V. antics in this particular illustration. A better accusation would have been for the fabricated, ignorant, A.V. Bible-Believer to say that the passages were somewhat ambiguous. But, to say that the words, "enlarge," "heart," "open," "ye," etc., are archaic is a mighty wonder at best.

The refutation to Mr. Corner's philosophical speculation is quite simple. If the point is that an individual cannot understand a particular passage due to the supposed difficult phrasing of the words, then what is to be said concerning an individual of the same doctrinal persuasion that has the ability to expound on the texts when summoned to so do? In order to provide ample proof o this point, I shall expound on the so stated passages: "O ye Corinthians, our mouth is open unto you, our heart is enlarged. Ye are not straitened in us, but ye are straitened in your own bowels. Now for a recompense in the same, (I speak as unto my children,) be ye also enlarged." (II Corinthians 6:11-13)

In the context of the chapter Paul is discussing he and Timothy (see II Cor. 1:1) being approved as the ministers of God (vs. 4), and not giving offence in anything, so that the Lord's ministry couldn't be truly blamed for it (vs. 3). Then, Paul proceeds to list the great paradoxes of his ministry. (such as "sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing..." [vs. 10]. So, when Paul says, "...our mouth is open unto you...", he is making the solemn point from all of the things that he has experienced serving the Lord Jesus in verses 4-10, that he is being completely honest with them. Haven't you ever heard someone say, "Just be open and honest..." Well, the same is true with the apostle Paul and the Corinthians. When he states that his mouth is open to them, then he is assuring them that the things that the is speaking to them (hence, MOUTH), are open and honest, true to the point, etc. Now concerning, "...our heart is enlarged," that has to do with the fact of Paul's love for the Corinthians; that it was open to them and included all of them. He told them expressly, "And I will very

gladly spend and be spent for you: though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved" (II Corinthians 12:15). Paul often wrote to his converts emphasizing that they were his children through the gospel of Jesus Christ, and therefore loved them to that purpose. He stated in I Corinthians 4:14-15, "I write not these things to shame you, but as my beloved sons I warn you. For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." Even in the passages under consideration in II Corinthians 6, Paul told the Corinthians, "...I speak as unto my children..."

In verse 12, Paul continues to the extent of informing the Corinthians that, "Ye are not straitened in us, but ye are straitened in your own bowels." The word "strait" can be learned by comparing Scripture with Scripture. Later in his cartoon, Corner goes on to criticize King James Believers for using "the right kind of dictionary." Therefore, in this instance, we shall glean the sense of the Scriptures by the Scriptures. Jesus Christ said in Matthew 7:13-14, "Enter ye at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." It is most evident that the meaning of the word "strait" is NARROW by simply reading a verse of Scripture. As Gail Riplinger has so rightly observed, "My examination of the 1000 most difficult words in the KJV reveals that God defines all of them, in the context, in their first usage, using the very words of the Webster's or Oxford English Dictionary." (The Language of the King James Bible, Gail Riplinger, pg. 3). Although her liberal use of elipsis in quotations from her first book, New Age Bible Versions, is most disappointing, her assertion here is both Biblical, and extremely precise. Ultimately, Paul is telling the Corinthians that they are closed up and narrow inside of themselves concerning him, but such is the opposite concerning Paul and Timothy's condition. "Bowels" is a reference to the inside of a person (like the "bowels of Jesus Christ," (Phil. 1:8); see Jeremiah 4:19 too). Finally, in verse 13, Paul says that "for a recompense," which is a "payback" that the Corinthians should be enlarged too, or that their love should include Paul and Timothy as their love encompasses all of the Corinthians.

The gist of the exposition is that if the A.V. is to be discredited because an adherent thereof cannot understand some passages, then the point becomes void when an adherent thereof can explain the passage with relatively no trouble at all.

Notwithstanding, but Mr. Corner's seemingly shallow approach to this angle of the final authority issue ultimately overlooks and ignores the real issue behind an individual not comprehending passages. One, that individual might not study like they should. According to II Timothy 2:15, a Bible-Believer is to study, to not only demonstrate himself as approved to God, but to RIGHTLY DIVIDE THE WORDS OF TRUTH. Also, as taught and illustrated by Daniel, Joseph, and the Lord Jesus Christ, interpretations belong to God and he is the one that must open up one's eyes to the words of the holy Scriptures (see Genesis 40:8; Daniel 2:28; Luke 24:44-45).

Pictures three and four in this shameful demonstration of a cartoon, continue the

dialogue between Bible-Believer and Bible-Corrector as well as the unseen persons in the background stating supposed archaic words in the King's English. The Bible-Corrector states, "To understand what the Word of God says, I study three reliable versions- the NRSV, the NASB, and the NIV which all use modern English." Again, in the background, "straitened" (II Cor. 6:12); "abjects" (Psalm 35:15); and "daysman" (Job 9:33) are being given as "archaisms."

1) I take the position of Arthur Cleveland Coxe from the 19th century (whom I have quoted in previous articles), concerning such matters. Mr. Coxe stated, "Even the antiquated words of the English Bible will never become obsolete, while they are preserved in the amber of its purity." (Arthur Cleveland Coxe, *An Apology for the Common English Bible*, pg. 8). Again, Coxe postulates, "He who would rub off those graceful marks of age which adorn our version, VULGARIZES AND DEBASES that venerable dignity with which the first ideas of religion came to the youthful mind and heart from the old and hoary Bible." (Coxe, *ibid*, pg. 9) Coxe poses an excellent question, "For, granting all that can be said against the present translation, the question is, can any other that can now be made, become what this is, to the world?" (*ibid*). The answer is a resounding, NO!

Has Mr. Corner, in his own self-purported scholarship, never considered the timeless words of Mr. Coxe, yet once more? "Every generation has its fashions; and the Bible, set and set again, according to prevailing whims, would become as untrustworthy as an old town-clock, continually corrected by private watches." (*ibid*, pg. 11-12) Yet, those who put much faith in Greek scholarship have not even the slightest inclination of the effects of their so-called intellectual proliferations. Can individuals such as Daniel Corner and Douglas Kutilek not conceive of the atrocious effects that their textual philosophies and contemporary perfidious presentations have had upon society in reference to man's attitude towards the words of God? That atheists and infidels alike utilize the works of Greek and textual scholarship to battle against Bible-Believers when presented with the Gospel of Jesus Christ? The material located on

<http://www.atheists.org/christianity/realbible.html> is an excellent demonstration of how closely related the words, language, terminology, and arguments are between atheists, "Christian scholars" and anti-A.V. 1611 advocates. You will see first-hand the same tactics implemented (archaic words, multiple Bible versions, variant readings, a mounting number of available manuscripts, etc.)

2) The definitive work on archaic words is published by Vance Publications in Pensacola, FL (<http://www.vancepublications.com/>). The book is excellent, a must have for every Bible-Believer's library, and is written by Dr. Laurence M. Vance. It is entitled, "Archaic Words and the Authorized Version." It is hardbound and costs around \$21.95 (check with Vance Publications for availability). The first edition of Vance's book was published in 1996, which means that the answers to Mr. Corner's archaic contentions have been in print for approximately 8 years.

Dr. Vance informs us on page 89-90 of his book that the word "daysman" means

"umpire," "mediator," or "arbitrator," and he points out that while the word is admittedly archaic, what do we say to the word, "acloves" (used in the NIV in Ezekiel 40:29), and the word, "antimony," (used in I Chronicles 29:2 in the NASB)?

Concerning the word "abjects" that Mr. Corner uses to ingratiate himself with the scholarly community, to evidently further degrade the King's English, Vance is able to give us an interesting bit of information. We are told that the word, "abject" means, "a castaway," or "a degraded person." Vance states that, "...although not used substantively as in the AV, the word abject is employed as an adjective countless times in the modern liberal cliché 'abject poverty. It also commonly appears in other contexts such as this from the Washington Times: 'The only international accord governing land mines- Protocol II of the 1980 Convention on Conventional Weapons- has by general agreement been an abject failure. (Vance, *ibid*, pg. 2; quote from the Washington Times by Dr. Vance appeared in the August 28, 1994 issue. For further inquiries, the article is by Ron Miller, entitled, "Seeds of Terror: World's 85 Million Land Mines Await Victims.") The devastatingly depressing conclusion is that when a supposedly "archaic" word is employed by a modern journalist it is to be applauded as a plateau of rhetorical genius. However, when it appears in the King James Bible, it is incomprehensible for society at large.

For a brief discussion on the word "strait," please see my comments about II Cor. 6:12 above. Nevertheless, although Mr. Corner states in his cartoon that, "...I study three reliable versions- the NRSV, the NASB, and the NIV which all use MODERN English," he must have failed to see that the word "strait" is used by the NASB (that he just stated uses MODERN English) in I Samuel 13:6 ("When the men of Israel saw that they were in a strait [for the people were hard-pressed], then the people hid themselves in caves,...")

In picture 5, Daniel Corner brings up the following words found in the King James Bible: superfluity of naughtiness (James 1:21); vain jangling (I Timothy 1:6); unicorn (Numbers 23:22); wimples (Isaiah 3:22); ouches (Exodus 28:11); ambassage (Luke 14:32); cracknels (I Kings 14:3); wot (Genesis 21:26); trow (Luke 17:9); and sod pottage (Genesis 25:29). These words are supposed to finalize the blow that the A.V. 1611 is archaic and needs updating for the modern reader.

Vance discusses every one of these alleged "archaisms" in detail in his aforementioned book on pages 329, 202, 385-386, 256, 12, 82, 387, 350-351, and 305-306 respectively (not including the word "unicorn"). For an interesting study on the word "unicorn" in the A.V. 1611, it would do the inquiring Bible-Believer much good to use a concordance and run the reference on the word. What one will find is that the "mythological" word "unicorn" shows up as a spiritual entity in heaven (Psalm 22:21- notice the context is the Lord's prayer to God the Father during his crucifixion [verse 1]), denotes strength (Job 39:9-10; Numbers 24:8). Perhaps the most spectacular detail about the unicorn is its connection with the second advent (Isaiah 34; Deuteronomy 33- both chapters deal with the second coming). Notwithstanding, in Habakkuk 3:3,8,10,12,13,15, the Lord comes back riding

"horses" (Revelation 19:14). Evidently, these are spirit horses, like the ones that raptured Elijah in II Kings 2:11. Also note that in the context of Isaiah 34, besides the mention of unicorns coming through the land of Idumea (34:7), you have other spirit creatures as well. Namely, there are satyrs (34:14); wild beasts (34:14); owls (34:13); dragons (34:13); raven, cormorant, bittern, etc. (34:11). The interesting thing about these unclean animals is that they are all in hell in the land of Edom during the millenium (34:9-10). Such details are not surprising if one had first believed the details about the creatures coming out of the bottomless pit in Revelation 9, or the descriptions of the other spirit horses in Revelation 6 and Zechariah 6:1-8. Therefore, "unicorns" could very well be the "horses" that you show up on at the second advent, O Christian, when the Lord comes back with his "troops" (Habakkuk 3:16)! So, I would leave the words as they stand in the A.V. 1611, lest ye be guilty of closing the eyes of revelation.

An obvious, yet ignominious demonstration of self-contradiction is given by Mr. Corner in his assertion that the A.V. 1611 is archaic, outdated, and difficult to comprehend in exchange for contemporary versions that use "modern English." In the back of Vance's book, there are many, many helpful and enlightening appendices. Among those appendices are the ones that list "archaic" words located within the modern versions, along with more difficult words utilized by the modern versions over easier to understand words employed by the A.V. in certain passages. For example, when considering the NRSV first we shall endeavor to list approximately 10 cases out of perhaps more than 250 listed by Dr. Vance. "Bitumen" is substituted for "slime" (Gen. 11:3); "cicada" for "locusts" (Deut. 28:42); "denarius" for "penny" (Matt. 22:19); "dishevel" for "uncover" (Lev. 21:10); "fledglings" for "young" (Deut. 22:6); "gossamer" for "cut off" (Job 8:14); "insatiable" for "cannot cease" (II Peter 2:14); "marauder" for "troop" (Jer. 18:22); "mantelet" for "defence" (Nahum 2:5); "Nephilim" for "giants" (Gen. 6:4).

In the NIV we have the following: "abutted" for "over against" (Ezek. 40:18); "brooches" for "bracelets" (Exo. 35:22); "colonnade" for "porch" (I Kings 7:6); "denarii" for "pence" (Matt. 18:28); "fomenting" for "speaking" (Isa. 59:13); "goiim" for "nations" (Gen. 14:1); "Hades" for "hell" (Revelation 20:14); "satraps" for "lieutenants" (Esther 3:12); "sistrums" for "cornets" (II Sam. 6:5); "terebinth" for "elms" (Hosea 4:13).

The "modern English" (so says Mr. Corner) yielded in the NASB, is thus rendered: "amulets" for "earrings" (Isa. 3:20); "chalice" for "cup" (Isa. 51:22); "domineered" for "bare rule" (Neh. 5:15); "encumbrance" for "weight" (Heb. 12:1); "filigree" for "enclosings" (Exo. 28:20); "flogged" for "beaten" (Acts 5:40); "obelisks" for "images" (Jer. 43:13); "Negev" for "south" (Gen. 12:9); "jettison" for "lightened" (Acts 27:18); "Wadi" for "valley" (Num. 21:12).

What may we depict is the conclusion of the matter? Does the A.V. 1611 contain archaic words? Certainly. Does it contain as many as the modern Bible-corrector would have us to think? Absolutely not! Do the modern versions that use "modern

English" (according to D. Corner), contain archaic words and render words in passages more difficult than the A.V. 1611? Without a doubt. So, how is there an archaic word dispute in the King James text if the modern versions (some written with the excuse of A.V. archaisms) fair no better? The simple answer is that there is not. The dispute has always been, is, and will always be the issue of the Final Authority for the English-speaking Christian. Is that absolute standard found in the antiquated and majestic words of the King James Bible, or in the opinions and subjective declarations of Greek scholarship? O Lord, deliver us from Greek Scholarship!

Vance so precisely states the matter concerning archaic words and the A.V. 1611, "Just as a certain vocabulary is necessary to understand science, medicine, engineering, or computers, so to learn and understand the Bible one must be familiar with its vocabulary instead of dragging it down to one's own level. And just as no one revises Shakespeare or Milton, but instead learns the vocabulary necessary to understand those particular works, so every man who desires to read and understand the Bible must first become acquainted with the vocabulary of the Authorized Version rather than revise it." (Vance, *ibid*, pg. viii) The point is well illustrated by the following statement: "1. What is the thing? In other words, what is its form? Aristotle called this the formal cause of the thing. WE DO NOT USE THE WORD CAUSE THAT WAY, BUT ARISTOTLE DID, AND WE JUST HAVE TO ACCEPT THAT." (Philosophy: The Power of Ideas, Fifth Edition, Moore and Bruder, pg. 57) Well the King James Bible uses certain words "that way," and we just have to accept that!

(Article currently in the process of being written)

**The Rudimentary Factor Underlying Infallibility
Alleged "Errors" In The A.V. 1611
By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson**

The continuing saga which shadows the arena of the Bible-Believing Christian's daily walk upon this earth, is this never-ending phenomenon as to whether or not the Book that he holds in his hands is indeed infallible and subsequently free from error.

Well into the second half of the year 2004, "Christian" bookstores and web-pages are full of articles and slander that range anywhere from, "King James murdered born-again Christians," to "The King James Bible has had over 100,000 changes since 1611." These dung-heaps are designed to get the faithful A.V. 1611 Believer to doubt the veracity of his preserved text, in order to convince him to trade that faith in for more "refined sensibilities" in modern, professing "Christian" Scholarship. To help assist in the final destruction of the Bible-Believer's faith in the A.V. text, several offensive mechanisms are employed by your average Alexandrian clone to bring this feat to a plateau. For example, one of the first things a Bible-Believer might hear is that the A.V. 1611 comes from inferior manuscripts; that, as modern science and philosophy, the amount of knowledge ascertained and thereby perpetuated concerning the development of the New Testament text has increased drastically since the time of the A.V. translators. This foundation is laid when the unsuspecting reader is told that the A.V. 1611 is essentially a Roman Catholic Bible, because the first published Greek text editor was a Roman Catholic named Desiderius Erasmus. The seed of doubt is further implanted when the reader is informed next, that Mr. Erasmus was not only a Roman Catholic, but a "Humanist" as well. After this, they are given the impression that Erasmus was a Roman Catholic "humanist," the textual wolves move on to tell the inquiring mind the lack of manuscripts that Erasmus had at his disposal to construct a proper Greek text.

Consequently, if the underlying Greek text of the King James Bible (developed further in later editions by Robert Stephanus and Calvin's disciple, Theodore Beza) was inferior and came from a Roman Catholic liberal, then how in the world can such a Bible as the A.V. 1611 be "infallible?" However, these types of statements only scratch the surface as the firstfruits of deception to rid the body of Christ of the God-honored English text. We could indulge ourselves into pages upon pages, regurgitating the minute attacks on our beloved English Bible. Some of the favorites on the front lines of attack are, "Wasn't King James a homosexual?" Which edition of the A.V. 1611 are you talking about?" "Where was the word of God before 1611?" "What about the archaic words?" "What about the italicized words?" "Didn't the A.V. fail to translate the Greek article in many places?" "Didn't the A.V. fail to properly render Greek verb tenses as they should be?"

In the A.V. 1611 conferences I hold in local churches upon invitation, I go over those questions with the audience and many more as well. But, the question comes up,

what does all of this mean? Why all of these petty attacks on one English Bible? What is the RUDIMENT of the whole matter? Well, it is simply this: if the King James Bible can be demonstrated to have an "ERROR" in translation, then the entire premise for translational infallibility is diminished. The entire rigmarole practiced by the "scholarship" community is to convince you that the King James Bible that you hold in your hands, preach and read from, HAS ERRORS, and IS NOT INFALLIBLE! Hence, we hold to the proposition that the A.V. 1611 text is innocent until proven guilty. That is, until some scholastic scum like R.L Hymers can show us definitively that there is an "ERROR" in the A.V. text, then he can keep his "leasing" mouth shut and cease from filling the air with anymore anti-Biblical prevarications! Therefore, in holding to our proposition that our Bible is completely without error, we will examine the claims of the Bible correctors in naming supposed errors in our English Bible and answer such self-conceited individuals accordingly.

I. ERROR: REVELATION 22:14

Robert Joyner, pastor of the Community Baptist Church in Newport, NC has this to tell us about "Errors" in the King James Bible:

"Revelation 22:14 teaches salvation by works in the KJV. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life." This is a verse taken from the Latin Vulgate and inserted by Erasmus because he did not have a complete Greek manuscript of the book of Revelation. The KJV translators continued this error. THERE IS NO GREEK MANUSCRIPT IN EXISTENCE THAT HAS THE KJV READING. The NASB says, "Blessed are they who have washed their robes, that they may have right to the tree of life." (Joyner, King James Only?: A Guide to Bible Translations, pg. 16, Emphasis mine)

1) Joyner's first error is assuming that this was one of the verses that Erasmus had supposedly retranslated from Latin (which Hoskier disputed according to Edward Hills). To refute Joyner's statement I quote Dr. Edward Hills:

"The last SIX verses of Codex 1r (Rev. 22:16-21) were lacking, and its text in other places was sometimes hard to distinguish from the commentary of Andreas of Caesarea in which it was embedded. According to almost all scholars, Erasmus endeavored to supply these deficiencies in his manuscript by retranslating the Latin Vulgate into Greek. Hoskier, however, was inclined to dispute this on the evidence of manuscript 141." (Hills, The King James Version Defended, pg. 202)

"Erasmus in 1516 relied mainly on 2, a late fifteenth century miniscule. In his editio princeps Erasmus used also 1 and 1r (for the Apocalypse). Since 1r stopped at Rev. xxii.15 Erasmus retranslated the Latin into Greek for Rev. xxii.16-21, for which he had no Greek manuscript whatever." (Robertson, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, pg. 96)

Sadly, the reader can clearly see the frivolous nature of Joyner's ERROR. The GREEK manuscript used by Erasmus for Revelation in his Greek text DID HAVE Rev. 22:14. The section retranslated from Latin began with verse 16. Robert Joyner was so anxious to prove an error in the King's English, that he lied in the process. Such are the ways of stupid Alexandrian Cultists who fool around with a supernatural book!

2) Just to add a little "insult to injury," I will show you the deficiency level in "Dr." Joyner's study habits. Upon inspection of the Nestle/Aland 27th edition Critical Greek text on pg. 680, the variant reading "poiountes tas entolas autou" in the critical apparatus is supported by the MAJORITY OF ALL EXISTING GREEK MANUSCRIPTS; the Syriac versions, the Bohairic versions, and Tertullian with variation (200 A.D.). So, where did he get this idea that "no Greek manuscript in existence has the KJV reading"? On the contrary, only a minority of Greek manuscripts support the reading in the NASB!

3) Coincidentally, about the only thing made in Joyner's statements above that has any validity to it is that, "Revelation 22:14 teaches salvation by works in the KJV." The problem isn't IF the A.V. teaches salvation by works, the question is WHEN does the A.V. 1611 teach salvation by works?

In the context of Revelation 22, at least in the beginning of it, the Bible is discussing eternity or a type of it before it starts, after the destruction of the earth and the heavens by fire (II Peter 3). This is what Larkin refers to as a period of 33,000 years in fulfillment of God's promise to Israel in Deuteronomy 7:9 to a "thousand generations," making it a generation of 33 years each. Hence, in conjunction with "the dispensation of the fullness of times" in Ephesians 1:10, this is a period of time of unspecified years (speculated as 33,000 by Clarence Larkin) in which God will gather together in one all things in Christ, both in heaven, in earth, etc. At the climax of this period of time, Jesus Christ will deliver up the kingdom to God, and even subject himself as the Son to the Father, that God may be all in all according to the set-up in I Cor. 15:27-28 (notice this last verse especially). So, if you get nothing else from this, understand that the passage in Revelation 22:14 is in a context containing some pretty heavy doctrine.

The passage says, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

Well, the city has to be New Jerusalem, for the old one was destroyed with the first heaven and earth in Revelation 21:1. So, outside of this new city are some folks in the lake of fire according to Rev. 22:15; this would also seem to match the same group in Rev. 21:8. Nevertheless, in both passages, the White throne Judgment has taken place and those on the outskirts of the city are in the lake of fire. However, all of this is trivial. The question is, if YOU are saved by grace through faith apart from works (Eph. 2:8-9; Titus 3:5; Romans 4:5), then who is the passage referring to here in Revelation 22:14?

Comparing scripture with scripture, the first time the tree of life shows up in the Bible is in Gen. 2:9. Consequently, this tree WAS NOT forbidden to be eaten by Adam and Eve. Howbeit this was the tree that Eve confounded with the tree of knowledge of good and evil in Gen. 3:3 (the tree of life was in the midst of the garden, not the other one). As in Revelation 22:14, the condition for partaking of this tree was "keeping his commandments." Adam was told he could FREELY (notice the same word in the context of Revelation 22:17) eat of ANY tree of the garden, except for one. Unfortunately for them, they missed the import. Adam and Eve had the ability to eat off of the tree of life and live forever, but they blew it. You ask, how do you know that tree was for eternal life? Well, look at Genesis 3:22 AFTER Adam and Eve had disobeyed God. "And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, AND LIVE FOR EVER:" If they had eaten off of that tree after they had sinned, they would have lived forever as sinners; imagine that!

Now, with that in mind, come back to Revelation 2:7 and notice this tree shows up again: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches; To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the TREE OF LIFE, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." That's the set up we just read about in Revelation 22. Typically, the 7 churches in Revelation 2-3 are given a double application. One, they are recognized as 7 actually local churches in Asia Minor during the time of the Apostle John. Secondly, they are purported as representing the 7 periods of church history prior to the Second coming of Jesus Christ. But, with all of the emphasizing on works in the two chapters (Rev. 2:7;11;17;23;26;3:4;5;12;), there is no doubt that the doctrinal application is to local churches in the Tribulation period (and yes, you'll run into trouble here if you are a local church only advocate and deny the universal body of Christ). Naturally, some of these verses can be explained away with I John 4:4, but you'll have a hard time getting around 2:7; 3:4-5, etc. The entire context of those two chapters is works, works, and having patience to hold out until the end! The end of what? Well, the end of the Tribulation period, where an individual NOT going to hell is conditioned upon him not receiving a mark (Revelation 14:9-10). Another point to consider is that these same Tribulation saints that are in this period of time, on an equivocal basis are said to "...keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." (Rev. 12:17). Again, "...here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." (Rev. 14:12). Now, the question is, is that you? Do you get eternal life by eating off of a tree by holding out to the end of the tribulation period? Of course not! You have eternal life right this minute if you are saved (I John 5:20). What happens if YOU don't "keep the faith of Jesus?" According to II Tim. 2:13, if we believe not, he abides faithful, FOR HE CANNOT DENY HIMSELF. If you are saved right now, you are a member of Jesus Christ's body (I Cor. 12:12-13).

The other ERROR manifested by Joyner is this assumption that "wash their robes" is a confession that it is opposite of works. On the contrary, no church age Christian

washes their robes for anything. Notice, that according to the holy scriptures, if you are a saved, born-again, child of God at this moment, then you ARE WASHED, not your robes. "...Unto him that loved us, and WASHED US from our sins in his own blood," (Rev. 1:5. Again, "And such were some of you: but ye ARE WASHED. but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." (I Cor. 6:11). Now according to the King James Bible, if you want to get your robes washed, then you have to come "out of great tribulation." (Rev. 7:14). I gave the verse from Revelation 3:4-5 that shows that a man in the tribulation can defile his garments and get his name blotted out of the book of life. My question is, is that you? So, who gives a flip if the King James Bible teaches "salvation by works?" Question: How in the world is someone in the millenium going to place faith in a resurrected Messiah when he is visible and right in front of them? (Rev. 1:7; Zechariah 14:16-17; Ezekiel 48:35) How are you going to preach the Gospel of the Grace of God (Acts 20:24) to someone in the Tribulation, when two other Gospels are being preached? (Matthew 24:13-14; Rev. 14:6) According to the apostle Paul, you'd be accursed, right? (Gal. 1:8-9). I guess nobody will be doing too much Gospel preaching in the millenium, according to what that Book says in Jeremiah 31:34. The answer is that they are saved by "keeping his commandments"; faith/works in the Tribulation period; works in the millenium.

POINT: LEAVE REVELATION 22:14 AS IT STANDS IN THE A.V. 1611 AND CHANGE YOUR DOCTRINE TO FIT WHAT THE BOOK SAYS INSTEAD OF VICE-VERSA.

ERROR: JOHN 5:44

Elgin Hushbeck, an engineer and apologetic writer, shows us what an engineering degree can do for the text of the King James Bible:

" The other type of problem involved poor translations. Translation is a difficult task and humans are not perfect. As a result, no translation the size of the Bible is perfect. While the King James Version is a good translation, it does have a few minor problems. Again here are two examples: John 5:44 and Hebrews 10:23. In John 5:44 the Greek text very clearly reads "...and seek not the honor that comes from the only God." Among other things this is a strong statement of monotheism. Yet for some reason the King James Version translates this as "and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?" Here any reference to monotheism is removed, and it becomes a statement that honor only comes from God. In Hebrews 10:23, the Greek text reads "let us hold fast the profession of our hope." Yet the King James Version translates the Greek word for "hope" as "faith" and reads "let us hold fast the profession of our faith." I have yet to hear of any explanation of either of these translations except that the King James Version translators must have known what they were doing. " (Hushbeck, "King James Version Only" article)

In Greek, the passage looks like this:

"pos dunasthe humeis pisteusai doxan para allelon lambanontes, kai ten doxan ten para tou monou theou ou zeteite;"

(Unfortunately this blog site doesn't have the Greek cursive characters, so you'll have to deal with the transliterated characters)

In Greek, you have an idiom called, "The attributive use of the prepositional phrase." As with an attributive adjective, when you have an article before the adjective in front of a noun with or without the article, the adjective gives attribute to the noun. For example, if I gave you in Greek, "ho agathos logos," or "ho agathos ho logos," it would be translated, "the good word." Thus, the adjective attributes to the noun. Also, such is the case with prepositional phrases. Hence, in the verse in John 5:44, the words "ten para tou monou theou" constitute an attributive prepositional phrase. Literally, it would be translated, "that comes from the only God" just as Mr. Hushbeck has asserted. You have an article (ten), a preposition (para), an article (tou), an adjective (monou), and a noun (theou). So, the question comes up, is this a "mistake," or an "ERROR" in the A.V. 1611?

The problem with Elgin Hushbeck is that he failed to notice two things:

- 1) That the context of the verse renders a literal adjectival translation of this passage senseless.**
- 2) That there are other translational possibilities that he didn't bother to look into or inform his readers due to his prejudicial bias against the King's English.**

Beginning in verse 30 in John 5, Jesus Christ discusses the plethora of witnesses that testify to his ministry and authority. He lists the testimony of John the Baptist (vs. 32-35); his works (vs. 36); the Father (vs. 37); the scriptures (vs. 39); and notice in verse 41 where Jesus Christ states exactly where he DOESN'T GET HIS HONOR FROM! Why the discussion is how to know if something or someone is from God, AND THE HONOR THAT ONLY GOD CAN GIVE! No one in this context bats an eye about monotheism! There isn't an inclination anywhere in 47 verses that one person (including the lost Pharisees) is discussing the necessity of monotheism. For Hushbeck to conjecture that the A.V. rendering doesn't uphold monotheism in the passage because it doesn't translate the prepositional phrase as an adjective, is bordering on the realm of the absurd. The point is where do REAL testimonial witnesses and honor originate? REAL honor comes from God ONLY, not the only God.

Nevertheless, Hushbeck's real problem is his ignorance of Greek grammar. Here I shall quote, "A Grammar of New Testament Greek," by James Hope Moulton, Vol. III-Syntax, by Nigel Turner, pg. 225-226:

"There is therefore not surprisingly some confusion of monos with the adv. monon: Mk 6:8- meden ei me rhabdon monon (D monen); Acts 11:19- medeni ei me monon

(D monois) Ioudaiois; Heb. 12:26 OT seiso ou monon ten gen, alla kai...; 2 Tim. 4:8; I Jn 5:6- ouk en to hudati monon (B mono). In Jn 5:44 monou is best TAKEN ADVERBIAL; not from him who alone is God, but only from God (Jewish monotheism was unimpeachable; Jesus was referring to their love of human praise), IN SPITE OF THE WORD ORDER. Lk 5:21 adv. monos."

It would do the reader good to examine the passage mentioned by Nigel Turner; Luke 5:21. This passage states:

"And the scribes and the Pharisees began to reason, saying, Who is this which speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins, but God alone?"

In this passage in Luke you have a similar set-up, where the discussion is centered around something ONLY GOD CAN DO! There was never any question about monotheism! Such are the devious of ways of amateur Bible critics who fool around with Greek New Testaments. It is like a toddler trying to handle a 9mm pistol. Nevertheless, in Greek, the last phrase of Luke 5:21 appear as thus:

"... ei me monos ho theos;" - Lit. "Except only God?" Hence the Greek indicative "ei," and the Greek subjunctive particle "me," together form an idiom that means, "except/unless." However, in this case better English is "but." However, the point is, you have the adjective "monos" functioning as an ADVERB just like John 5:44 even though the sentence structure is different. The point is still the same because both contexts are discussing entities that are limited to God's discretion.

However, lest there be any doubt as to the authenticity of the claim above for the more idiomatic translation of "monos" adverbially instead of adjectivally, let us employ the usage of Dr. Daniel Wallace in his book on Greek syntax:

"The basic role of the adjective is as a modifier of a noun or other substantive. As such, it can be modified by an adverb. Not infrequently, however, it deviates from this role by one step in either direction. That is, it can either stand in the place of a noun OR IN THE PLACE OF AN ADVERB. Its nominal role is a natural extension of the adjective in which the noun is elided; its adverbial role is MORE IDIOMATIC, usually reserved for special terms." (Wallace, Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, pg. 292)

Again, Wallace postulates:

"The adjective is sometimes used IN THE PLACE OF THE ADVERB. Some of the uses are analogous to colloquial English, such as "I am doing good," or "Come here quick!" Other, more frequent, instances involve idiomatic uses of the adjective, such as the accusative adjective in the neuter used adverbially. (Surprising as it may seem, this idiomatic adverbial use is frequently, if not normally, ARTICULAR.) These include a large group of stereotyped terms, such as Brachu, loipon, mikron, monon, polu, proton, husteron, ktl." (Wallace, ibid, pg.

Therefore, it is evident that based upon the context of John 5, and the clear fact that adjectives (even if in the attributive position in a prepositional phrase) can function adverbially to form a more idiomatic structure in the English translation. Thus, the A.V. 1611 preserves the better reading "that cometh from God only?" instead of, "that comes from the only God?" in the modern translational perversions.

POINT: LEAVE JOHN 5:44 AS IT STANDS IN THE A.V. 1611 AND LEARN SOME MORE DETAILS ABOUT GREEK GRAMMAR AND CHAPTER CONTEXTS BEFORE YOU MESS WITH THE GREATEST BOOK IN THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

ERROR: MATTHEW 14:9

James May, who purports himself to be some sort of up-and-coming scholastic intellectual as he shows exhibit "C" of the "ERRORS" in the A.V. 1611. In his article, "The Great Inconsistency of King James Onlyism," located on The King James Only Resource Center website (this same website hosts articles for top Alexandrian Cult nincompoops such as Doug Kutilek, Bob Ross, Rick Norris, Gary Hudson, James Price, etc.), May informs us:

"Matthew 14:9. Earlier in this paper there is a quotation from David Sorenson in which he states his belief that although the first edition of the King James Bible contained errors of punctuation and printing, over the years these errors have been corrected so that the KJV now contains no errors whatsoever. This assertion can be easily disproved:

And the king was sorry: nevertheless for the oath's [1611: oaths] sake, and them which sat with him at meat, he commanded it to be given her. ~ Matthew 14:9

All editions of the Greek NT in this verse have the reading, "dia de tous orkous," "nevertheless for the oaths' sake." The word "oaths'" (orkous) is plural in Greek. The KJV 1611 failed to insert the necessary apostrophe for the possessive of its translation ("nevertheless for the oaths sake"). This makes it impossible in English to determine if "oaths" is singular or plural. Later editors "corrected" the problem by inserting the apostrophe in the wrong place, thus rendering "oath's" as singular. Under Sorenson's view of the KJV, we must believe that God made an error when he had this corrected, for he had the apostrophe inserted such that "oath's" is now singular in current editions of the KJV, "nevertheless for the oath's sake." All editions of the Textus Receptus have the plural. The King James Bible (current edition) has the singular. The KJV is in error." (May, "The Great Inconsistency of King James Onlyism," article)

In the passage before us, the alleged ERROR in the A.V. 1611 text is that the A.V. translators were completely blind and oblivious to the basic rules of Greek syntax;

that even though each member of the group of translators had read through and inspected this verse a minimum of 14 times, somehow this "oversight" passed by 47 men. The ERROR presented here by this translational schizophrenic, James May, is that the King James Bible translated a Greek plural accusative as an English singular! Therefore, the reading shouldn't be "nevertheless for the oath's sake," but "nevertheless for the oaths' sake." May is kind enough to tell us at least twice in the paragraph above that "all editions of the Greek NT" have the plural. But, as with the other two previous examples, James May is going to end up in the same ship as Joyner and Hushbeck, sailing off into the sunset of abysmal ignorance.

1) May takes a 1611 reprint edition of the A.V. text and states that no apostrophe was located on the word in the verse in question. This much is true. However, his first ERROR is that he assumes that this problem was corrected by a later "editor" who inserted the apostrophe "in the wrong place." Nevertheless, an inspection of the Holman 1611 King James Bible reprint reveals that no marks of possession were placed upon words in that edition. I didn't do a full collation of possessive words in the entire 1611 text, but I did manage to view a few of them. Among the singular possessives now clearly in the A.V. text, the following were without punctuation marks in the 1611 edition:

I Sam. 2:8- "...for the pillars of the earth are the LORDS, and hee hath set the world vpon them."

II Sam. 18:18- "...: And hee called the pillar after his owne name, and it is called vnto this day, Absaloms place."

Psalms 113:3- "...: the LORDS name is to be praised."

Micah 6:2- "Heare yee, O mountaines, the LORDS controuersie, and ye strong foundations of the earth..."

Matthew 19:12- "...which haue made themselues Eunuches for the kingdome of heauens sake..." (notice this verse has an identical construction to the passage in Matthew 14:9)

Other such passages include Romans 14:8; 15:30; 16:10; I Cor. 7:22; 10:28; 11:26; 11:29; Gal. 1:19; 3:15; 3:29; Phil. 2:21; Rev. 1:10, etc.

The point is, apostrophe marks of punctuation weren't used in the 1611 editions. Therefore it is circular reasoning for Mr. May to assume that because the word for "oath's" is plural in Greek, then it is automatically a "mistake" by a future A.V. "editor" to add the singular possessive instead of the plural.

2) May's second ERROR is a manifest failure to read simple English. The A.V. 1611 told you in no uncertain terms in Matthew 14:7 in the context, that the OATH was indeed SINGULAR! Note:

**"Whereupon he promised with AN OATH to give her whatsoever she would ask."
(Matthew 14:7)**

There isn't one word in the context about more than one oath being made, thereby warranting plural possessive punctuation. The only way someone could come to such a ridiculous conclusion is by spending their time in Greek texts that they evidently don't know how to read. Verse 7 has "horkou" as as Genitive singular in "the Greek."

3) The next writhing blunder manifested by this half-baked Bible critic is his lack of study in the realm of consistency. Here you have James May complaining about the A.V. 1611 translating an accusative plural (horkous) as a singular possessive in English (oath's), when that reprobated sucker didn't say two words about the following:

A) "and saying, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand!" (Matthew 3:2, New King James Version). In this passage you have a GREEK GENITIVE PLURAL (ouranon) translated as an English singular (heaven) in a modern Bible translation. Do we now have an error in subsequently 99% of all English versions extant in this passage? Did all of them miss the Greek plural and make a mistake by translating it as an English singular?

B) "After the Sabbath, at dawn on the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary went to look at the tomb." (Matthew 28:1, New International Version). In this particular case, you have a GREEK GENITIVE PLURAL (sabbaton) translated as an English singular (Sabbath). Again I submit the question, did literally 99% of the extant English versions miss the difference completely? I think not! The simple truth is that it is only an "ERROR" when it is committed by the King James Bible.

C) How James May could miss the following is completely beyond any sort of rational comprehension. For this point I quote Dr. Peter Ruckman discussing this verse in his book, "King James Onlyism versus Scholarship Onlyism":

"... in the same book, by the same author (Matthew), we find 'dia ten Basileian ton ouranon' which is translated by the NKJV as 'the kingdom of heaven.' Better than that, this time the 'dia' precedes the expression exactly as the 'dia' was found before 'tous horkous.' That isn't all. The manner in which the ASV, NASV, RV, RSV, NRSV, NIV, and NKJV translated Matthew 19:12 was IDENTICAL to the way the AV translated the plural in Matthew 14:9."

"Observe! 'For the kingdom of heaven's sake' (Matt. 19) with 'HEAVEN' as a PLURAL in all manuscripts."

" 'For the oath's sake' (Matt. 14), with 'OATH' as a plural in all manuscripts. Both constructions were identical." (Ruckman, King James Onlyism versus Scholarship Onlyism, pg. 70)

4) Nonetheless, because James May isn't a faithful student of the Bible (II Tim. 2:15) or a decent student of Greek syntax, he failed to notice the most egregious error of all in his tirade against the most magniloquent book in history; that this phenomenon of a Greek plural being rendered with an English singular is a viable rule with a reasonable syntactical point to it:

" A difficult pl. which may be explained in this way is Mt 2:23 prophets: the reference is to one prophet only. Zerwick calls it pluralis categoriae (4a) and he further suggests it as an explanation of Mt 27:44 (after Jerome, Aug., Ambrose): both robbers are said to reproach Jesus whereas it was only one, and we need not call in another tradition to help us out. OTHER DIFFICULTIES ARE THUS SOLVED: MT 14:9 MK 6:26 horkous oath..." (Moulton/Turner, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. III-Syntax, pg. 26)

Furthermore, if you read my article on "Why Gary Hudson Could Never Teach Greek at The Pensacola Bible Institute," you should have noticed my explanations on basic Greek grammar as to how nouns, adjectives, etc., must match in gender, number, and case. Well, such is the case in Greek in Matthew 14:9. The reason that "horkous" is used as a plural in that passage is because it matches the participle, "tous sunanakeimenous" ("them which sat with him at meat") in gender (masculine), number (plural), and case (accusative). Since the singular (see Matt. 14:7 again in Greek and English) oath is applied to the multiple dinner guests, it is therefore rendered as a plural in Greek to match the plural participle with which it goes. Wallace calls this "a categorical plural." He states in his Grammar book:

"The categorical plural is also used when a SINGLE grammatical object [Note by Nachimson: like horkous in the accusative case] (not subject) is in view." (Wallace, Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, pg. 405)

POINT: LEAVE MATTHEW 14:9 AS IT STANDS IN THE A.V. 1611 AND REALIZE THAT IT IS YOU WHO ARE IN "ERROR" AND NOT THE BOOK. ADMIT THAT THERE ARE SOME AVENUES THAT YOU DIDN'T EXHAUST IN YOUR HASTE TO RID BIBLE-BELIEVING CHRISTENDOM OF THE GOD-HONORED TEXT. FINALLY, START APPROACHING PROBLEM TEXTS WITH A BELIEVING HEART, AND ALWAYS GIVE THE BOOK THE BENEFIT OF THE DOUBT.

ERROR: I CHRONICLES 5:26

James White, Director of Alpha and Omega Ministries (www.aomin.org) and an "elder" at the Phoenix Reformed Baptist Church (Calvinistic set-up), is most

concerned enough to give this "ERROR" in the A.V. 1611 as a part of his entrance into the Alexandrian Apostate hall of shame:

"Another problem related to a name, this time of a king, is found in I Chronicles 5:26:

KJV- "And the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul king of Assyria, AND the spirit of Tilgath-pilneser king of Assyria, and he carried them away..."

NASB- "So the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul, king of Assyria, EVEN the spirit of Tilgath-pilneser king of Assyria, and he carried them away into exile..."

"As the NASB correctly notes, Pul was Tilgath-pilneser. The KJV rendering makes it look as if Pul is one king, and Tilgath-pilneser another, possibly a co-regent with Pul, when such was not the case." (White, The King James Only Controversy: Can you trust the Modern Translations?, pg. 228)

White's comical contention with the A.V. 1611 is that the A.V. lists Pul and Tilgath-pilneser as both being kings of Assyria, while the NASB says "EVEN" thereby rendering the two kings as simply ONE king. It should also be noted at this point that the NKJV endorsed by Jerry Falwell, of which Curtis Hutson and W.A. Criswell were committee members, makes the distinction between the A.V. 1611 and other modern versions even more apparent. It states in the passage at hand, " So the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul king of Assyria, THAT IS, Tiglath-Pileser king of Assyria..." The question is, which one is right, and is the A.V. FINALLY in "ERROR" here in I Chronicles 5:26? Well, we knew the answer coming into this thing, so let's just demonstrate how we came to the conclusion that the A.V. is right and everyone and everything else that is contrary is wrong!

1) There was clearly more than one king of Assyria at the time of Tiglath-pilneser. Observe II Chronicles 28:16: "At that time did king Ahaz send unto THE KINGS OF ASSYRIA to help him." Even if by this time the other king wasn't Pul (for a number of years had lapsed; Pul is only mentioned in connection with king Menahem which was several years prior to Ahaz, and isn't mentioned again), the verse still demonstrates that the concept of their being more than one king in Assyria during the time of Tiglath-pilneser. Could it be that Pul was one of them (II Kings 15:19-20) at one point, and Shalmaneser (II Kings 17:3) was another much later? Either way their had to be more than one, which vindicates the A.V. 1611 in I Chron. 5:26 against the charges of James White.

2) If Pul and Tiglath-Pilneser were the one and same king as the NASB, NKJV and James White purport, then they teach a direct lie contrary to the plain words of scripture which never says that any PUL led anyone away captive. Notice this intricate detail about Pul in II Kings 15:19-20:

"And Pul the king of Assyria came against the land: and Menahem gave Pul a thousand talents of silver, that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand. And Menahem exacted the money of Israel, even of all the mighty men of wealth, of each man fifty shkels of silver, to give to the king of Assyria. So the king of Assyria turned back, and stayed not there in the land."

According to this passage that you just read, Pul didn't lead anybody captive away anywhere. Menahem, who began reigning over Israel in Samaria in the 39th year of Azariah (II Kings 15:17), paid him off with silver to turn around and leave. Evidently, the Lord stirred up Pul's spirit to invade Israel (I Chron. 5:26; II Kings 15:19) during Menahem's 10-year reign. God allows Menahem to succeed in the payoff (which is nothing more than God extending more grace to his people), then Pekahiah takes over after Menahem kicks the bucket (II Kings 15:22-23) in the 50th year of Azariah. If you will notice carefully, Pekahiah continues to do evil (II Kings 15:24), even though the Lord had let Menahem have a break earlier. So, the Lord allows Pekah to rise up in rebellion against Pekahiah, and subsequently succeed in a conspiracy to take Pekahiah out. Now, the Israelites still haven't been led away captive by any king of Assyria yet! However, after Pekah blows it by doing evil in the sight of the Lord after he becomes king (II Kings 15:28), the Lord finally sends Tilgath-pileser in (II Kings 15:29), AND NOW they are led away captive. In between Pul getting the payoff and Tilgath-pileser coming in to complete the verse in I Chronicles 5:26 and II Kings 15:29, you have a minimum of 10-33 years in between the reigns of Menahem, Pekahiah, and Pekah from the start of Menahem to the end of Pekah. Therefore, if Pul's payoff hypothetically were at the end of Menahem's reign, and Tilgath-pileser's invasion was at the beginning of Pekah's reign, then you still have a minimum of 3 years that lapse. However, the chances are, that they were longer. Clearly, Pul was one king and Tilgath-pileser was the other. God started the stirring up of spirits against Israel with Pul, but gave them a bare minimum of 3 years additional grace time to get it right (by allowing Pul to be paid off), then sent in another king to take them captive for their idolatry and transgressions (I Chron. 5:25). Such are the ways of comparing scripture with scripture in the plain English text of the A.V. 1611, while dismissing the infantile ramblings of a Bible-correcting egomaniac like James R. White.

POINT: LEAVE I CHRONICLES 5:26 AS IT STANDS IN THE A.V. 1611 AND LEARN TO COMPARE SCRIPTURE WITH SCRIPTURE THAT YIELDS ACCURATE HISTORICAL INFORMATION THAT EASILY VINDICATES THE TEXT AGAINST GAINSAYERS.

Consequently, as I stated at the beginning of this treatise, the underlying fundamental behind whether or not the A.V. 1611 is infallible, is the notion as to whether or not some deluded nut can conclusively prove an error in the A.V. 1611 that is a clear error that cannot be reconciled.

James White tells us: "When they claim the KJV is inspired and inerrant, the demonstration of errors in that translation effectively (for anyone willing to follow

the truth to its logical conclusions) ends the debate." (White, King James Only Controversy, pg. 224)

1) Anyone willing to follow the truth through to conclusion will realize that the methods employed by text-critical proponents like James White are one-sided and never give the full spectrum of the evidence. I have shown you 4 clear cases like that today.

2) Anyone willing to follow the truth through to conclusion will realize that the opposing viewpoint, (Originals only inspiration) is a factor that has a lovely premise, but an faulty conclusion. As I demonstrated in my article on Inspiration, these A.V. Only opponents cannot produce the text which they claim was originally inspired. With the King James position, that conclusion can be demonstrated, and the SCRIPTURES can be produced!

3) White's sentence above goes on further to show that the rudimentary factor underlying infallibility is indeed the alleged errors in the King James Bible.

Therefore, as I stated in the beginning, and so say I now again, until an "ERROR" can be proved in that Book beyond all conceivable doubt, I say let that text stand until the end of time! When it comes to the notion of correcting the King James Bible or castigating its critics, I'll stick with castigating its critics.

"Dirty" Dirk Wood in a Tainted Meat Locker

By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson

The individual you are getting ready to read about, in my estimation, is nothing more than a Bible correcting, foul-mouthed "castaway" (I Cor. 9:27), who claims to be some sort of international, travelling missionary. The material in the ensuing paragraphs is a result of the reply I submitted to Dirk Wood on August 3, 2003 in connection with his subsequent attacks on the A.V. 1611 and a Bible-Believing Baptist pastor. As the other article posted before this one, there are minor revisions and variations from the "original."

Several months back, Mr. Wood sent a rapacious email to Pastor Steve Ertzberger of South Carolina, bashing not only Bro. Ertzberger, but condemning the translation of "Iesous" (Jesus) in Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8 as it is rendered in the A.V. 1611. Somehow or another, the trash (which I will quote from for you all to see) postulated by Mr. Wood ended up being forwarded to me to review. Of course the argument is a regurgitated misnomer, essentially parroted from persecutors of the A.V. 1611 from the ASV 1901 up to the New Century Version endorsed by Max Lucado via Thomas Nelson Publishers. Mr. Wood is going to show Brother Ertzberger that his Bible is a "dry bone" and that the New International Version is "strong meat" because the NIV reads "Joshua" in the above mentioned passages, while the AV 1611 reads "Jesus" instead.

About a month prior (5/2003-7/2003) to the writing of this article, I had just completed a very long and drawn out textual debate with a professing Canadian Bible College professor named David Yates. The material is in editing stages right now, so it can be published for the benefit of Bible-Believers to study. However, if you were a part of the mailing list during the debate, you observed that New Age Bible Correctors have a natural affinity for LYING! That is, they hide behind a voluntary humility (Colossians 2:18), delivering good words and fair speeches (Romans 16:18), in order to justify absolutely destroying your faith in the WORDS that God has given you. In other words, you can never read your Bible and know for certain, "Thus saith the Lord", unless you first consult with these types of men in order to discover, (1) If you have the correct text that they approve of, and (2) That the text that you have is translated properly according to what they declare to be the proper rendition of the words being translated. Notwithstanding, in order to accomplish this task, these types of men (and yes I am stereotyping) will LIE at least five times per page in order to save face and look like they know what they are talking about. For example, in this debate Mr. Yates employed the usage of a work by Dr. Bruce Metzger of Princeton Theological Seminary. As a matter of fact, he employed it so much, that he typed it out as his own thoughts instead of Bruce Metzger's. However, what is very peculiar about that is that Mr. Yates insisted in his Mark 16 presentation, that the verses in the chapter (verses 9-20) were not known before the 4th century. So, I sent him a list of 6 church fathers and 3 or 4 early versions of the New Testament that contained the disputed passages in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. In his rebuttal he informed us all that he didn't mean to imply

that the verses were not known prior to the 4th century, but that the disputed passage was a late "2nd century scribal emendation." Naturally, he offered no evidence for that claim, and I'm sure it cost him the victory in that Round for not proving his assertion.

Now, while David Yates was plagiarizing Dr. Metzger, he managed to question me about the location of the quote from Justin Martyr in Justin's First Apology. This definitely proves my point; for Bruce Metzger had given the location of the quote in Justin's Apology in the very paragraph that Yates' plagiarized. Mr. Yates simply omitted that portion of his "rebuttal." They will LIE everytime folks because they are USING a Book that they don't believe in order to look smart and in most cases to make a living. But in the end, "...be sure your sin will find you out." (Numbers 32:23)

Perhaps the most prevalent demonstration of utter failure on behalf of modern "Biblical Scholarship" is a universal display of ignorance in comprehending simple English syntax. For example, the phrase "the word of God", or "the words of God", or "the word of the Lord", or "the words of the Lord", etc., are, every time they appear in the canonical scriptures, A DIRECT REFERENCE TO LITERAL WORDS SPOKEN BY GOD ALMIGHTY HIMSELF (Jonah 1:1-2, Ezekiel 12:1; Hebrews 4:12; I Thessalonians 2:13; Luke 4:4; Psalm 12:6; Job 23:12; Proverbs 30:5; Jeremiah 1:1-2; 2:1; 7:1; 11:1; Hosea 1:1; 4:1; Joel 1:1; Micah 1:1; Genesis 15:1; John 6:63; John 17:17). The frivolous fairytale imagined by the scholarship community is that the above terms are a reference to "the message of God". The idea is to convince naive Christians that you should only be concerned with "the overall message" God is trying to convey to you. So, essentially ANY English version of the "Scriptures" constitutes "The Bible" and "the word of God" for these individuals even though they conflict in literally thousands of places.

Going forward with this method of scholarship, modern Bible correctors (they call themselves "Textual Critics") are able to set the defining point of what constitutes truth versus what constitutes error by THEIR OWN OPINION. For example, IF any Bible version will suffice then who gets to decide WHAT GOD SAID in let's say a passage like Mark 9:29? The NASB states: "And He said to them, This kind cannot come out by anything but prayer." The AV 1611 declares, "And he said unto them, This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer and FASTING." The NASB removes the word "fasting" from the passage causing confusion in what is required to exorcise certain devils. A similar OMISSION occurs in I Corinthians 7:5 where the word "fasting" is removed in regards to dealing with Satanic temptation! So, the textual scholar gets to decide which reading is correct? Would that not set HIM up as the Final Authority? Yet these multi-version advocates insist that any Bible version is sufficient since you can find fundamental doctrine SOMEWHERE in the passages, thereby rendering individual passages irrelevant. However, knowing fully well that the issue is WITH WHAT GOD HAS SAID (Genesis 3), how can we turn our backs on such a phenomenon as OMISSION of words and passages? I don't know about you, but I'm going to BELIEVE "Thus saith the LORD" and know that

the Book that I have in front of me constitutes the very WORDS that my God wants me to have as my ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY! (I Thess. 2:13)

This point brings us to the current topic at hand, namely that of Dirk Wood insisting to Bro. Ertzberger that the A.V. 1611 is in error in Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8 by translating the word "Iesous" as "Jesus" instead of "Joshua" as the New Age bible versions have it. However, as I have mentioned in the past, the A.V. 1611 is quite capable of taking care of itself. In that, I have discovered time and time again that when the Lord wants to reveal something to his people from his own Book, which are his own words, that he himself spoke, it is that very place in the Holy Bible that becomes a place of ridicule and attack from "biblical scholarship" and amateur critics of the Bible seeking to make a name for themselves by correcting the AV 1611 (i.e. Gary Hudson, David Yates, Doug Kutilek, Robert Joyner, etc.). Nonetheless, in this case it happens to be Dirk E. Wood who wishes to take on the book that rules the universe. And, as has been the case with David Yates (I Tim. 3:16; I John 5:7; Mark 16:9-20), Gary Hudson (Acts 2:40; Romans 8:24; II Peter 1:1; I Corinthians 1:21), James White (Revelation 16:5; Acts 19:37; I John 5:7; Hebrews 10:23; Jeremiah 34:16; Luke 2:22; Acts 5:30), Dr. Wade (Acts 5:30; Matthew 27:44), and Bryan the self proclaimed "Prophecypreacher" (Acts 12:4; I Chronicles 1:36), the case will now be with "Dirty" Dirk Wood in Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8, chiefly, to PROVE ERROR in the AV 1611 and FAIL MISERABLY!

Dirty Dirk states:

"Puke Preacher states...'See it dont just contain the word of God like the niv & nkjv... but it IS the infallible, enerrant WORD of God! Every infidel hates it and tries to destroy it or make it obsolete by the power of satan but IM sorry it will never happen. Nearly 400 yrs. tried & true! Glory!' Ok Vomit Preacher of the dry bone(kJV)...so the KJV is infallible and inerrant answer me this. Why does your Bible have Jesus leading the children of Israel into the Promise Land and conquering the nations. Look at it you thick headed lethargic nitwit...Acts 7:45 Which also our fathers that came after brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles, whom God drave out before the face of our fathers, unto the days of David; KJV. Now you have a problem because it was not Jesus but Joshua. Wow the KJV is miraculas.....Now lets see which Bible is inerrant lets look at the Meat fresh off the grill(NIV) and not some dry bone(KJV). And now ladies and gentle men(music begins) THE NIV...Ac 7:45 'Having received the tabernacle, our fathers under Joshua brought it with them when they took the land from the nations God drove out before them. It remained in the land until the time of David,' Ok we have seen which Bible is inerrant. There is no doubt about it your Bible is not inerrant that dry bone needs some NIV meat on it."

At this specific point in the article, I'd like to apologize for some of the commentary that you are going to have to endure from this man Dirk Wood. However, in the spirit of fairness I believe it is necessary for you to receive the full textual import of what Mr. Wood is saying, no matter how "DIRTY" it may be. As you can see this

"proof of error" in the A.V. 1611 starts off with a statement of faith by Bro. Ertzberger, and you can see how quickly it absolutely enrages Mr. Wood that an ole' Hell fire, damnation, country preacher like Steve Ertzberger would have faith that his "tried and true" Bible of NEARLY 400 YEARS is INERRANT AND INFALLIBLE! I have always been interested to know who would insist that the Bible is perfect, holy, and without proven error OTHER THAN THE HOLY SPIRIT? It couldn't be Satan, for the Lord Jesus Christ himself said in Matthew 12:26, "And if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand?" If the devil would say that God's WORDS are perfect and without error, how could Satan stand when he questions them? ANSWER: HE CAN'T!

Secondly, before moving on, several points should be noted and considered:

- 1) A Bible-Believing Christian (Steve Ertzberger) is being mocked and foolishly jested (Eph. 5:4) against for his stand on Biblical inerrancy.**
- 2) So called "Ruckmanites" and "KJV ONLY Advocates" are not the only people capable of "name calling." This makes the point abundantly apparent that an Alexandrian apostate can "dish it out" with the best of them! See Wood's "Dirty" mouth above; and this character is a "missionary"!**
- 3) Mr. Wood is obviously oblivious to the natural use of English words because as can easily be seen by the context of this discussion, THERE WAS NOTHING "LETHARGIC" ABOUT BRO. ERTZBERGER! But hey, if Mr. Wood would like to implement a new rendition of the word "Lethargic" to mean "stubbornness in respect to a person's view on biblical inerrancy" instead of the usual historical meaning of "Indifferent", "Lazy," or "Sluggish" CALL ME LETHARGIC!**
- 4) The automatic assumption that the name "Jesus" is referring to Jesus Christ and nobody else.**
- 5) That a name CAN indeed have more than one English rendering, especially when coming FROM TWO DIFFERENT LANGUAGES. For example, the name "Maria" can be translated from Spanish or Italian as "Mary" into English, yet the name "Mariam" in Greek can be translated to English as "Mary" (following the Latin) or "Miriam"!**
- 6) According to Alexandrian Cult methodology, it is perfectly acceptable to forsake the usual cries of translational "FORMAL CORRESPONDENCE" (word-for-word translation) as long as it is ostensible to them. To make the meaning clearer, IT IS FINE TO CORRECT THE KING JAMES BIBLE BY TRANSLATING WORDS THAT ARE NOT USUALLY EMPLOYED IN THE TRANSLATION PROCESS AS LONG AS THE A.V. 1611 CANNOT DO THE SAME! A perfect example of this are the horrific screams of etymological misrepresentation by "Biblical Scholars" towards the King's English in Acts 12:4 by the use of the word "Easter" instead of**

"Passover." SARCASM: You can always count on CONSISTENCY in modern Bible translating!

Dirty Dirk continues:

"I AM NOT FINISHED...Since you say your Bible is inerrant you must say it is true and all of it. Then your Bible has JESUS FAILING...FAILING...FAILING!!! You say Prove it! I'll prove it but your the one who says the dry bone of the KJV is inerrant so you can't change a word you have to explain it away because you can't accept it. Hebrews 4:8 'For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day.' Ok to get the truth out of this ask any lost soul or little kid or even a teenager what it says and he will tell you it says what it says. Jesus didn't give them rest so we have the promise of another day. Right but the KJV is clearly WRONG!!! Lets look at the Bible with some meat on it...ladies and gentle again I introduce to you the NIV (applause begins KJV Harebrains sneer) Heb 4:8 'For if Joshua had given them rest, God would not have spoken later about another day.' Now ask the same lost soul, little kid, or teenager what it says and he will say it says what it says...Joshua didn't give them rest so we have the promise of another day. The JESUS DAY. Don't you love honest people...don't you despise deceived, dishonest, demented, and weak minded people. Now I know what there going to say...Joshua means Jesus? I know but lets face the facts...Joshua is Hebrew and Jesus is Greek. Oh that's right Ruckman hates the Greek. Well still in all if you go by your argument then it want matter if we change the name to Joshua every time. Joshua died on the Cross for our sins...Joshua walked on water...Joshua rose again...Joshua is coming back again. Sorry KJV Weary Ones...You will never find that in the NIV...meat is better than a dry bone. There is only one Name given under heaven where by Men can be saved...JESUS...JESUS...JESUS. Your KJV has Jesus a failure and you can't admit it! Can you? Will you? THE NIV has Jesus a success and you can't admit it! Can you? Will you? Go soak your head in some Greek manuscripts that have some meat on them and correct that dry bone you errant ones. Your humble servant.....Dirk Wood"

1) The first morally destitute red flag that should have immediately popped-up in your head is this nonsensical idea that you have to get a "lost soul" to make an honest commentary on the word of God. Now listen folks, I didn't make that up, you have the exact "word of Dirk Wood" (YES the words that he wrote not his "overall message") as it is in plain English. He stated, "Ok to get the TRUTH out of this ask any lost soul..." and "Now ask the same lost soul...he will say IT SAYS WHAT IT SAYS...Don't you love HONEST people..." Step number one in order to prove ERROR in the A.V. 1611 is to get the HONEST statements of a "lost soul"! I wonder what the BOOK has to say about that?

A) "But the natural man RECEIVETH not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: NEITHER CAN HE KNOW THEM, because they are spiritually discerned." (I Corinthians 2:14)

B) "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins, wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that NOW WORKETH IN THE CHILDREN OF DISOBEDIENCE: " (Ephesians 2:1-2)

C) "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." (John 8:44)

Mr. Wood has started off with a faulty premise in order to get rid of the A.V. text in Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8. The most disappointing factor involved in this "lost soul" inquiry is the fact THAT DIRK WOOD NEVER TOLD YOU TO READ IT AND SEE THAT IT SAYS WHAT IT SAYS! This will bring up another important factor, which is the fact that a man of Wood's caliber simply cannot believe what he reads. Evidently he IS interested in having someone admit that the text says what it says, nevertheless he is not at all inclined just to believe the passages whether he understands them or not. "Jesus said unto him, If thou canst believe, ALL THINGS are possible to him that believeth." (Mark 9:23). Those are some of the greatest words in recorded history because they reveal a general point about the nature of faith and the heart. THOSE WORDS ALSO DICTATE TO YOU GOD'S THOUGHTS ABOUT THE STATE OF A PERSON'S ATTITUDE TOWARD WHAT HE SAID! Do you readers know what that should tell you? It should reveal to you the rudiments of what you see in THAT BOOK. No matter what passage you come across, no matter how difficult it may seem, no matter the seeming possibility of irreconciliation, ALL THINGS ARE POSSIBLE TO YOU if you will just BELIEVE WHAT GOD SAID! Do you believe what God has said dear reader? Are you willing to stand for that no matter what it costs you? Bro. Steve Ertzberger is willing to take that stand. Dirty Dirk Wood IS NOT!

2) "Dirty" Dirk asks Bro. Ertzberger, "Ok Vomit Preacher of the dry bone(kJV)...so the KJV is infallible and inerrant answer me this. Why does your Bible have Jesus leading the children of Israel into the Promise Land and conquering the nations? Look at it you thick headed lethargic nitwit...Acts 7:45 'Which also our fathers that came after brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles, whom God drove out before the face of our fathers, unto the days of David;' KJV. Now you have a problem because it was not Jesus but Joshua. Wow the KJV is miraculas...Now lets see which Bible is inerrant lets look at the Meat fresh off the grill(NIV) and not some dry bone(KJV)."

A) It is dastardly statements such as these that "inspired" me to name this article "Dirty Dirk Wood In a Tainted Meat Locker". The utter audacity of a man to think that any portion of a New International Version is "Meat fresh off the grill" is beyond the current definitions of sanity. Is it not this "Tainted Meat NIV" that claims that Isaiah wrote a verse that Malachi wrote in Mark 1:2-3? Isaiah wrote the material in verse 3, NOT verse 2! Fresh off what grill may I ask? A busted George

Foreman one?

B) Mr. Wood now wants to know why the AV 1611 has "Jesus" leading the children of Israel into the promise land. Well the answer is right in front of your face IF YOU'D ONLY BELIEVE WHAT YOU READ!

1)Exodus 23:20-23: "Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: FOR MY NAME IS IN HIM. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries. FOR MINE ANGEL SHALL GO BEFORE THEE, AND BRINGTHEE IN UNTO THE Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites: and I will cut them off." I wonder who that Angel is?

2)Joshua 5:13-15: "And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and, behold, there stood a man over against him with his SWORD DRAWN in his hand: and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries? And he said, Nay; but as CAPTAIN of the host of the LORD am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my lord unto his servant? And the CAPTAIN of the LORD'S host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoes from off thy foot: for the place whereon thou standest is holy, And Joshua did so." Now keep that word "Captain" in mind for just a few minutes. But for now whoever that Angel is, he is also the captain of the Lord's host. The Angel is said to bring the Israelites into the land of the Gentiles (Acts 7:45) and the Captain is said to be for them AND ACCEPTED WORSHIP AND SAID THE SAME THING TO JOSHUA THE LORD DID IN EXODUS 3:2-6! There can be no doubt who that Angel/Captain is. It is the Lord Jesus Christ himself. I know this is more Bible than most of you are used to, but you need it.

3)Numbers 22:22-23: "And God's anger was kindled because he went: and the angel of the LORD stood in the way for an adversary against him. Now he was riding upon his ass, and his two servants were with him. And the ass saw the angel of the LORD standing in the way, and his SWORD DRAWN in his hand: and the ass turned aside out of the way, and went into the field: and Balaam smote the ass, to turn her into the way." "Dirty" Dirk Wood wants to know why the A.V. 1611 has "JESUS" leading the children of Israel into the promise land? Well, praise God, because HE WAS LEADING THEM! Exodus 23 and Joshua 5 told you that! Who do you think the CAPTAIN IS?

4)Hebrew 2:10: "For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make THE CAPTAIN OF THEIR SALVATION perfect through sufferings." That is none other than Jesus Christ, the one that tasted death FOR EVERY MAN (see verse 9). Do you see why

Mr. Wood didn't have the answer to his own question? Because he didn't believe what he read! Had he believed what he read, he could have compared scripture with scripture and found out exactly why the AV 1611 has Jesus in Acts 7:45.

5)Galatians 4:14: " And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, EVEN AS Christ Jesus." There can be no doubt who the Captain is or who that Angel is. It is "Jesus" exactly as it is written in that old black backed King James Bible. So, Wood's "fresh grill" turns out to be a TAINTED MEAT LOCKER! See also Acts 27:23 for verification that Jesus Christ is the angel of the Lord.

C) The insertion of "Jesus" into Acts 7:45 instead of "Joshua" points out the fact that the Book of Joshua is a type of the 2nd advent of Jesus Christ.

1) When Jesus returns he will enter the land of Palestine by the same route Joshua entered, by attacking an accursed city (Babylon-Jericho) (Revelation 17-18) after a 7 year period (Daniel 9:27-Joshua 6:15) rebuilt by a Roman Catholic Baal Worshiper (Ahab-Pope), which will be destroyed instantly (Revelation 18-Joshua 6) in the presence of the Lord (2 Thessalonians 1-Joshua 6).

2) As Joshua did, the Lord Jesus Christ will rule the land through a military dictatorship (Psalm 110; Revelation 19) and the supernatural phenomena of Joshua 10:12 will accompany his 2nd advent (Matthew 24:29; Luke 21:25).

3) At this time also the Jews will divide and repossess the land give to them just like they did under Joshua. This is outlined in Joshua 13-19 and Ezekiel 48. The implications could NOT be any CLEARER.

4) The A.V. 1611 says "Gentiles" while the inferior, tainted meat NIV reads "nations", thus confining the verse to the section of past history fulfilled in Joshua's time. By translating it "Gentiles" you have a clear point that the future inhabitants of the land will not be merely Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, Hivites, Jebusites, etc...but modern occupants of the land as well (Jordanians, Syrians, Saudi Arabians, Iraqis, etc.) See Endnote (1) at the bottom of the article.

3) Dirty Dirk Wood from his Tainted Meat Locker states: "I AM NOT FINISHED...Since you say your Bible is inerrant you must say it is true and all of it. Then your Bible has JESUS FAILING....FAILING...FAILING!!! You say Prove it! I'll prove it but your the one who says the dry bone of the KJV is inerrant so you can't change a word you have to explain it away because you can't accept it."

A) Wood's point here is that since the AV 1611 has "Jesus " listed in Hebrews 4:8, and the "rest" that the passage is discussing wasn't given to the children of Israel, then they didn't get it BECAUSE JESUS FAILED! So since the Nutty Idiot's Version (NIV) has the reading as Joshua, the blame gets cast down to

Joshua instead of Jesus, because after all "Jesus" has to be Jesus Christ according to Wood.

1) There is no other Greek word for Joshua or Jesus other than "Iesoun" which is translated uniformly as "Jesus" by the AV 1611 every time it shows up in the New Testament. However, if you were to translate "Jesus" or "Joshua" into Hebrew it would come out as "Yehoshua and similarly into Greek as "Iesous"! What does that mean? It means that Dirk Wood is playing games with two English names that only have a SINGLE name in Hebrew or Greek. He says a few lines down, "Now I know what there going to say.....Joshua means Jesus? I know but lets face the facts.....Joshua is Hebrew and Jesus is Greek. Oh that's right Ruckman hates the Greek. Well still in all if you go by your argument then it want matter if we change the name to Joshua every time. Joshua died on the Cross for our sins...Joshua walked on water...Joshua rose again...Joshua is coming back again."

A) Of course in his ignorance of Hebrew or Greek, Mr. Wood didn't mention the intricate, simple fact of which you were just informed. The words are absolutely the same in Hebrew and Greek. There is only one name per language. What that means is that you cannot take several English names and play the "scratch and run" game with one Greek or Hebrew noun. Why don't you just stick to the one God gave you and BELIEVE it and find out why he put that there even thoughtit may seem awkward to you for a season?

B) He says, "...it won't matter if we change the name to Joshua every time. Joshua died on the Cross for our sins..." That might sound appealing if JOSHUA HIMSELF DIDN'T HAVE MORE THAN ONE NAME FROM THE SAME HEBREW WORD, and it might very well sound appealing if the whole debate here was not about CHANGING THE W-O-R-D-S. The issue concerns leaving the text as it stands. Preying on the ignorance of Christians or more advantageously of unregenrate persons does nothing for the cause. The following instances use the Hebrew name for Joshua in other renditions that Wood conveniently overlooked:

1) HOSHEA: Deuteronomy 32:34

2) OSHEA: Numbers 13:16

3) JEHOASHUA: Numbers 13:16; I Chronicles 7:27

4) JESHUA: Nehemiah 8:17---Now this name was not directly given to Joshua, but it is from the same Hebrew name. As a matter of FACT ALL of these names are derived from ONE Hebrew noun! Dirk's assertion about name changing just landed him in a first rate mess since there are FOUR others to choose from!

C) In regards to that slanderous, belly aching, LYING statement about "Ruckman hates the Greek" (see Wood above) I'll give you words straight "out of the horse's mouth":

1)"Throughout three years, our Greek students are taught that a knowledge of Greek is good for two things, and two things only: To shut the mouths of half-educated idiots whose bellies are bigger than their brains, and to reinforce TRUTH ALREADY REVEALED IN THE ENGLISH BIBLE (AV). Not once is the student given the impression that "WORD STUDIES" can bring to light anything "hidden" in the Scriptures...Our students are taught to compare Scripture with Scripture and use "word studies" in the light of what the Scriptures say about the Scriptures.....Not once is the student given the impression that a knowledge of Greek grammar and syntax will aid him in PREACHING or TEACHING on verse in either Testament. He is taught that the Author of the Scripture (which he has) is the Interpreter of the Scripture (which he has), and that "light on the text" will come through a prayerful study of the entire Bible, if the HEART is kept right." (How to Teach the Original Greek, Dr. Peter S. Ruckman, Copyright 1992, pgs. 124-125)

2)There isn't one mention above of any "Ruckman hating the Greek." Dr. Ruckman simply doesn't think that a dead language that God has been through with for several hundred years is sufficient to correct the God honoured English text in the hands of half baked pseudo intellectuals who think they are smarter than God.

3)Also, I would like to note that there is no such things as "the" Greek. There are Greek manuscripts, Greek Lectionaries, Greek Papyri, and a variety of "eclectic" Greek texts, but no such entity as "the" Greek. Perhaps Mr. Wood would in future attempts to show his ignorance of what is inside the AV 1611, he would kindly state which TEXT he is referring to when he says "The Greek."

B)Hebrews 4:8: "For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day."

1) I gave you all the references in Exodus 23 and Joshua 5 where the Angel of the Lord, the Captain of the Lord's host was said to have been there and brought them into the land of the Gentiles.

2) With a short Bible study I showed you that that person is none other than Jesus Christ himself, therefore whether Jesus Christ (the Captain) or Jesus (Greek for Joshua), the AV has it right with the rendering of "Iesous" in this passage as "Jesus."

3) This brings up the question; "What grounds does Mr. Wood have for saying that the A.V. 1611 rendering of Hebrews 4:8 has "Jesus "as a failure? "ANSWER: NONE!

A) Hebrews 4:6: "Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached ENTERED NOT IN BECAUSE OF UNBELIEF:" No, "Jesus" failed in anything or for anybody. The people didn't enter that rest because of THEIR OWN unbelief!

B) Hebrews 3:18-19: "And to whom swore he that they should not enter into his rest, BUT TO THEM THAT BELIEVED NOT? So we see that they could not enter in BECAUSE OF UNBELIEF." Let's get it again folks! "Jesus," "Joshua," "Jackal," "John," or whoever never FAILED anybody or anything in the passage!

C) Hebrews 4:11: "Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest anyman fall after THE SAME example OF UNBELIEF."

1) Given the solemn fact that Dirk Wood has absolutely no idea what he is talking about in regards to the A.V. text, we have seen by a simple examining of the passages in Hebrews that the REASON that these individuals didn't enter into the rest "Jesus" and "Joshua" were involved in was undoubtedly due to their own wicked UNBELIEF, NOT due to the failure of the Captain or the son of Nun! Therefore the implications of Hebrews 4 are clear:

A) The original sabbath was a 7th day rest of God himself (Gen. 2). It was revealed to Moses on Mt. Sinai (Neh. 9:13-14) and was given to Israel as a sign (Ezekiel 20:12) because God knew from the beginning (Hebrews 4:3; Acts 15:18) that Israel would be converted and be the head of the Gentile Nations in the SEVENTH millennium (Rev. 20:16). Therefore THAT sabbath is mentioned in Hebrews 4:4.

B) This final entry (Millennium - Hebrews 4:6,8,11: all entered by works... see Matthew 24:13-14; 25:14-30; Rev. 12:17; 14:12) was rehearsed in type in Numbers 13-14, where the Israelites would NOT enter THEN BECAUSE OF UNBELIEF! The unbelief spoken of here is located in passages such as Numbers 13:30-31; 14:9-11; and Exodus 34:11. It is a sort of "Gospel of Armed Victory" as Dr. Ruckman would put it. And naturally there is not a reference to any "Gospel of the Grace of God" (Acts 20:24) anywhere. This is extremely important to note because it explains the use of the word "gospel" in Hebrews 4.

C) Joshua 14:5-14 refers to the "Gospel of Armed Warfare" for lack of a better term. Naturally, since this is what is being discussed in Hebrews 4:6,8,11 regarding the future, it is then THIS "gospel" that is being given to a generation of Hebrews after 2003 A.D. (Zech. 12:1-7). Consequently, NOW, they have to believe on Jesus Christ as their Messiah and "CAPTAIN"! Of course, as we knew at the beginning of this little study, there was never any problem with the text of the A.V. 1611 to begin with. Nothing a little faith and a little Bible reading can't figure out. In both verses the A.V. 1611 is correct in having the word Jesus instead of Joshua like the new versions because according to the passages we examined Jesus Christ was with these people in the OT the entire time as THEIR CAPTAIN! We also found out that the only FAILURES in Hebrews 4 were the individuals that didn't enter THAT rest then because of their own unbelief. See Endnote (2) at the bottom of the article.

Finally, "Dirty" Dirk Wood informs us that we should: "Sorry KJV Weary Ones... You will never find that in the NIV... meat is better than a dry bone. There is only

one Name given under heaven whereby Men can be saved... JESUS... JESUS... JESUS."

This reference is to Acts 4:12, but Mr. Wood should be more careful how he words his sentences for the context of Acts 4:12 where it says there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved is Acts 4:10! This passage states, "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of JESUS CHRIST OF NAZARETH, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand before you whole."

1) You better know which Jesus you are talking about, for there is "another Jesus" according to the apostle to the Gentiles in II Cor. 11:4.

2) You better know which Jesus you are talking about for there was a man named "Jesus, which is called Justus" in Colossians 4:11.

3) You better know which Jesus you are talking about because "at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow...and that every tongue shall confess that JESUS CHRIST IS LORD to the glory of God the Father."

Now, to sum this article up I'd like to give you all a list of 13 examples of TAINTS in "Dirty" Dirk Wood's beloved NIV "fresh grill" mix:

- 1) The NIV is missing Acts 8:37**
- 2) The NIV is missing I John 5:7**
- 3) The NIV is missing the name "God" in I Timothy 3:16**
- 4) The NIV contains a lie in Mark 1:2 as I explained earlier**
- 5) The NIV teaches a lie in Hebrews 3:16 if you will study Deut. 29:2; 5:1-3; Joshua 5:4; and Numbers 13-14**
- 6) The NIV removes all references to "sodomites" in Deut. 23:17; I Kings 14:24; 15:12; 22:46; and II Kings 23:7**
- 7) Christ is not God's "holy child" in the NIV, but his "servant" (see Acts 4:27,30)**
- 8) The NIV removes the name Christ 25 times, "Lord" 352 times, "Jesus" 292 times, and "God" 466 times!**
- 9) The NIV gives Satan the title for the Lord Jesus Christ (Rev. 22:16) in Isaiah 14:12**
- 10) The NIV teaches that Elhanan kills Goliath in II Samuel 21:19, not David as we all know**
- 11) The NIV does not contain the name "Jehovah," or the phrase "the mercy seat," or the title "Godhead"! And "hell" is found NOWHERE in an NIV Old Testament.**
- 12) The NIV makes a sinner out of Jesus Christ by removing the phrase "without a cause" in Matthew 5:22!**
- 13) According to the contents of the New International Version in Matt. 12:40, Jesus Christ was a bald-faced liar by giving the advanced revelation that the "great fish" that swallowed Jonah was a WHALE!**

Of course this is some "strong meat" isn't it? If you have an A.V. 1611 you have the right Bible. May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be upon all those who strive to keep the words of God as they are written (Rev. 3:8). And remember, "If it ain't King James, it ain't Bible!"

Endnotes:

(1) Material from letter "C" and subsequent numbers 1-4 are adapted in part from "The Bible Believer's Commentary on Acts," Dr. Peter S. Ruckman, pg.255). Also see "The Errors in the King James Bible," Dr. Peter S. Ruckman, pg. 342, Copyright 1980, Revised 1999).

(2) Notes "A" through "C" are adapted in part from "The Bible Believer's Commentary on Hebrews," Dr. Peter S. Ruckman, pg. 92-93, Copyright 1986)

These Being Dead Yet Speaketh
By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson

Thanks to organizations such as [Vance Publications](#), [Good Books](#), and [Sola Scriptura Publishing](#), we have access to a number of out-of-print literary masterpieces presented by "men of old," who dedicated themselves to defending the A.V. 1611. What I consider so surprisingly interesting about this phenomenon is that the research, study, and development of these 19th and early 20th century scholars would be utterly sequestered from this generation by textual scoundrels such as James White, Gary Hudson, Doug Kutilek, Robert Joyner, Robert Gromacki, Roy Beecham, Harold Camping, etc., had it not been for the gallant efforts of these aforementioned organizations. They would continue without a pricking of the conscience to promulgate their fictitious ideas that some of the points of lucubration made by contemporary proponents of the King James Bible have no foundation in history.

However, on the contrary, we solemnly declare that a variety of objections presented by these modern apostates against the A.V. 1611 as a colloquial vindication for the modern Bible versions are indeed a practical lucidity in favor of the King James by these venerable gentlemen of times past. Therefore, in this article we will examine the claims of modern anti- A.V. 1611 advocates and compare them with the apparent contradictory evaluations of the scholastic personalities now departed.

First, one of the primary frontal assaults on the King James Bible used to justify further emendations to the Authorized text, is to incessantly reiterate the notion that the A.V. 1611 allegedly contains "archaic words" that need to be updated for the modern anti-intellectual, American reader. Mr. Doug Kutilek in his rapacious article entitled, "[Restating the Obvious About Bible Translations](#)," is ecstatic to conjecture the following:

"Let us come to specifics. By now, almost everyone involved in the King James Bible controversy knows or should know that there are archaic and obsolete words in KJV which either puzzle (at best) or mislead (at worst) the common Christian reader. "Prevent" in I Thessalonians 4:15 does not mean what we today always mean by that word, namely, "to stop, hinder." That word as used in 1611 meant "to precede" and the reader back then would not have stumbled over its meaning. The reader today, however, will stumble over it. "Well, why not just put a note in the margin telling the reader that 'prevent' means 'precede'?" Rather, why not simply put 'precede' into the text so there is no need here to search the margin?"

"Spoil" in Colossians 2:8 invokes images of decay and putrefaction, whereas the underlying Greek--and "spoil" to a 17th century English reader--means "to despoil," or, to use a more common synonym, "to plunder, take as plunder" Even though "spoil" in the text here will surely "spoil" the understanding for the modern reader, some still insist that it must remain in the English translation at all costs, regardless of

the effect on the reader's understanding. "Plunder" should be the reading in the text. "To the margin! To the margin!" they cry. "In the text! In the text!" the basic principle of translation replies."

In Mr. Kutilek's assertion above, Doug is concerned that the average English reader will experience undo hardships because of words contained in the A.V. 1611 that our modern readers are simply too lazy to open up a dictionary or a word study guide and discover the meaning of the words they don't understand. Although, I strongly disagree with Mr. Kutilek due to my own experiences in reading the King James Bible (since I was a senior in high school), he also obviously forgets the fact that even words such as "plunder," or "precede" are too much vocabulary for many of the constituents in the "receptor language." However, two 19th century scholars didn't feel the same way Mr. Kutilek does about the issue at all. The first being dead that yet speaks is Arthur Cleveland Coxe, the author of the treatise, "An Apology for the Common English Bible," who states:

"Can it be necessary to argue that no one can inflict a graver wound on the unity of the race, and on all the sacred interests which depend on that unity, under God, than by TAMPERING WITH THE ENGLISH BIBLE? By the acclamation of the universe, it is the MOST FAULTLESS VERSION of the Scriptures that EVER EXISTED IN ANY TONGUE. To complain of its trifling blemishes, is to complain of the sun for its spots. Whatever may be its faults, they are less evil, in every way, than would be the evils sure to arise from any attempt to eradicate them; and where there is so much of wheat, the few tares may be allowed to stand till the end of the world." (Coxe, pg. 8)
Coxe again reiterates:

"The care with which the Hebrews guarded every jot and tittle of their Scriptures was never reproved by our Saviour. It is our duty and interest to imitate them in the jealousy with which God's Holy Word is kept in our own language. EVEN THE ANTIQUATED WORDS OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE WILL NEVER BECOME OBSOLETE, WHILE THEY ARE PRESERVED IN THE AMBER OF ITS PURITY; and there, they have a precious beauty and propriety which they would lack elsewhere." (Coxe, ibid, emphasis mine)

The keen reader should observe immediately observe that Mr. Kutilek unwittingly adorned his generic use of the word "Bible" (as in "Restating the Obvious About BIBLE Translations") by straightway opening his dissertation with, "...almost everyone involved in the King James Bible controversy," thus recapitulating the point that A.V. advocates have made years. Namely, that point is the solid fact that THE BIBLE is the A.V. 1611, and as such defines the meaning of the word BIBLE. You see dear Christian, the apostate simply can't get away from the fact that ONE BOOK determines his speech and thought patterns whether he acquiesces or not. This point is reinforced very strongly by the early 20th century scholar Philip Mauro as thus:

"But what we wish specially to emphasize for our present purpose is that, when reference is made to the bible and its influence, what is meant in most cases is the ENGLISH VERSION thereof. For the undeniable fact is that the English Version of the Scriptures is the "BIBLE" to most of those who read or consult the HOLY SCRIPTURES; and the English Version has been, moreover, the basis for the translation of the Scriptures into many other languages and dialects." (Which Version? Authorized or Revised? Philip Mauro, pg. 9)

Now, just to demonstrate the utter stupidity and frivolous scholarship (fueled by bias and disdain for the King James Bible) of Douglas Kutilek, let us take a brief examination of Kutilek's lack of consistency with this word "spoil" in Colossians 2:8.

1) Kutilek's entire thesis was that the TEXT should be updated do to this supposed archaic usage of the word spoil. However, Vance pointed out to the contrary in 1996, thus showing the Biblical usages of the word spoil, AND EVEN THE MODERN VERSIONS' USAGES OF THE WORD "SPOIL." Nevertheless, Mr. Kutilek never purported these facts in his quest for " *in the text, in the text the basic principle of translation replies* " rubbish; not once. Observe:

"Although the word spoil can be found in the AV as a noun just like it is used in our modern versions, the AV also employs it as a verb thirty-one times. Spoiling is also similarly used five times, spoileth once. The nouns that describe one who spoils, spoiler and spoilers, are used nine and seven times respectively. Spoil is from the French espoillier, "to strip." To spoil is to strip of skins, goods, or possessions; to rob, plunder, or pillage; or to damage, ruin, or affect detrimentally. Like the word "skill," the verbal forms of spoil have been deemed to be archaic because they are not used as nouns like the word spoil is today. The usual replacement for the forms of spoil in our modern versions is a form of "plunder." However, the NIV one time employs "spoil" as a verb in a verse where the AV did not contain the word spoil in any form. The NKJV does likewise, but also follows the AV reading one time. The NRSV retains "spoilers" as the AV one time, just as the NKJV keeps "spoiler" once. The NKJV also inserts the word "spoiler" into a passage where the AV did not use it. When the AV does utilize the word spoil as a noun, the NRSV and NASB both transform it into the word "spoiler" that they corrected elsewhere. The NRSV and NASB even change "marred" in the AV to "spoiled." But although they corrected the verbal forms of spoil the vast majority of the time, our modern versions did use occasions, both as replacements for spoil and spoiled, and where the AV did not contain either form of these words. All unnecessary anyway, for not only do we say that food has spoiled, the word spoil is still used as a verb in other contexts: "The boycotting parties could not even agree on whether opponents to Fujimori should abstain (potentially subjecting themselves to a fine in the \$15 range), spoil their ballots, or vote for collegial parties." (Archaic Words and the Authorized Version, Dr. Laurence M. Vance, Copyright 1996, pg. 314-315)

Kutilek also ignored the fact that Dr. Robertson kept the translation of the nominative, present active participle "ο σπυλαγωγων" as "that maketh SPOIL."

(Robertson's New Testament Word Pictures, notes on Colossians 2:8, PC Study Bible version 4).

Douglas Kutilek is also guilty of inventing an etymological chevaldefrise (a piece of wood with projecting spikes that hindered escaping enemy horsemen) by the assumption that because the word "spoil" carries a meaning of "purification" is SOME CONTEXTS now, that that would hinder the A.V. reader from gleaning the meaning of its usage in the A.V. text. The word spoil, as demonstrated by Vance, means to RUIN, just as it is used in Colossians 2:8, and is thus STILL used that way as demonstrated by Vance. Notwithstanding, I wonder if Mr. Kutilek ever said to his wife in the modern vernacular, "honey, don't SPOIL the kids." If he said that to her, did she become exasperated with "images of decay?" OF COURSE NOT! We know what it means, don't we? It is given in the context; "Beware lest any man SPOIL you,...through vain DECEIT..." There was never any doubt about what the word meant in the King James Bible, Kutilek simply invented a phantom that didn't have any basis in factual reality. Perschbacher's lexicon, page 384, says that the verb "σὺλαγωγέω" means literally "to make victims of imposture." THAT IS BEING RUINED (hence, Spoiled) BY DECEPTION FOLKS!

Notwithstanding, before indulging ourselves into further "dark sayings" of modern biblical illiterates, let us absorb the observant words of James Lister, Minister of Lime Street Chapel in 1820. He writes:

"A still small number is familiar with Hebrew and Greek, the languages of the sacred scriptures. And it must be very painful to the common people to hear the teachers in whose learning, piety and judgment they confide, insinuate, THAT OUR ESTABLISHED VERSION GIVES A DISTORTED PICTURE OF THE ORIGINAL." (The Excellence of the Authorized Version, James Lister, pg.5)

Lister continues in blatant contradiction to modern scholarship:

"Great pains have been taken to point out the blemishes and faults which exist in our authorized version, as in all works merely human. Alterations and improvements have been suggested, one after another, till an impression has been made, that no dependence can be placed on the established version in such places as refer to the great doctrines of Christianity." (Lister, *ibid*, pg. 6)

In plainer words, the three writers from the past have affirmed what Bible Believers have been asserting all along. One, the words of the King James text should be left unaltered. Two, the term "Bible" is a generic term that has no meaning unless it is defined by a specific usage, such as THE KING JAMES BIBLE. This is due to the simple fact that these pseudo- intellectual stuffed shirts will say "bible, bible, bible" all the livelong day, but WILL NEVER tell you what the TEXT is in its entirety! And three, that constant correction of the A.V. text by Bible correctors causes a person to doubt the veracity of God's integrity, namely, THE WORDS OF HIS MOUTH.

The next example of the "shining lights" of the past rebuking modern, mundane, "Christian" scholarship comes by way of Arthur Coxe correcting James White on the translation of "πασχα" in Acts 12:4. According to Mr. White, the amateur five point "reformed" Calvinist, "Easter" is an anachronistic (erroneous in date; outdated historically) translation as found in the King James text. Mr. White boldly fabricates the following:

"One might well include the KJV's unusual rendering of Acts 12:4 as more of a mistranslation than an ambiguous rendering, and it would be hard to argue against that assertion, given the facts." (The King James Only Controversy, James R. White, Copyright 1995, pg. 233)

It is unfortunately most abundantly clear that James White has taken heed to the most serious flaw of the contemporary textual critic. This sickly flaw is manifested in the realm of trading opinion for fact by process of dogmatism. As you can see, the "scholar" (in this case James White) states his opinion with such dogmatic chivalry, that the unsuspecting reader assumes he is speaking God's truth when he concludes his sentence with such words as "... *given the facts.*" I agree wholeheartedly with Dean Burgon when he states that these textual deviants presume that a matter is "Must in Fact" when it is none other than "May in Fiction!"

Arthur Coxe states again:

"As to the marginal readings, the Society have taken several liberties, which are so petty that one fancies they have all been introduced to excuse a bold marginal comment on Acts xii.4, by which the word "Easter" is neutralized. It is a just comment, and I only object to it as coming from those who are pledged to give no comment. If they had decorated I Cor. v.8, "therefore let us keep the feast," with the note---"i.e. Easter," it would have been equally just, BUT STILL UNPARDONABLE:" (Coxe, *ibid*, pg. 48)

Concerning Acts 12:4 again, Mr. Coxe states in a letter to the Rev. Dr. Turner of the General Theological Seminary:

"But the most petty instance of this anti-Church feeling is found in the margin of Acts xii.4, where they have boldly inserted a "note and comment," to get rid of the word Easter. They insert, "Gr. The Passover," equivalent to saying this word means passover, and should have been so rendered. Now I agree as to the fact, that they Jewish Passover is intended in this place; BUT WHAT RIGHT HAVE THEY TO INSERT SUCH A COMMENT? Had you, my dear Doctor, proposed to return the compliment, would they have allowed it? For example, (I Cor. v.7.) "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast." Would they permit you to insert, "i.e. Easter?" No one can deny that the feast here intended is THE CHRISTIAN PASSOVER; though I am sure that you and every Churchman would be above the stratagem of foisting the fact into the Society's Bible." (Coxe, Letter to Dr. Turner, pg. 4)

I have often taught other Bible believers the tremendous truth that when a "scholar" corrects the King James Bible, you can find another "scholar" who will contradict that particular "scholar" and uphold the A.V. 1611 reading. Such is the case with James White and Arthur Cleveland Coxe.

For exhibit three, we shall examine a couple of quotes from Dr. A.T. Robertson's Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, and compare his statements with those of Philip Mauro, Dean Burgon, and Thomas Birks.

Dr. Robertson taught the following regarding the Greek text of Westcott and Hort: *"It is today the text that is used by scholars all over the world. These two Cambridge scholars have produced a text that is not final, but that is infinitely superior to all others that preceded it since the first printed Greek New Testament in 1514."* (Robertson, Intro. to NT, pg. 36)

Again Robertson informs us:

"The aim of this present volume is to put the modern student in possession of their principles of textual criticism so that he can apply them himself to each problem in detail and so be able to make his own text of the New Testament." (Robertson, *ibid*, pg. 38)

Dismissing the Syrian/Byzantine text on his own opinion, Robertson says:

"These scholars did not claim that they had produced the original text, but that it was the OLDEST and the BEST text known to us now in the present state of research. The purely Syrian text has been set aside. The Textus Receptus can never be established to critical favor unless revolutionary discoveries are made. The attacks of Burgon and Miller were vigorous, but they have failed to stand against the facts. Independent investigators have come practically to the same conclusion about the text as that reached by Westcott and Hort." (Robertson, *ibid*, pg. 221)

However, to counter such repulsive, dogmatic assertions, we will first bring forth the testimony of Thomas Birks, Knightbridge Professor- Cambridge 1878. He comments indirectly on Robertson above who said he wished to place Westcott's and Hort's textual principles into the hands of his students so they could make their own text of the New Testament. Birks states:

"The method of criticism, then, which is founded on the distribution of MSS. into groups and families, from the close affinity of their readings, seems to me doubly fallacious and unsound. It fails, in the first place, because of the almost entire want of direct historical evidence, by which we would determine the actual process of derivation, and lines of descent, in the hundreds of cursive manuscripts, or even in the very few uncials which still survive. And it fails, in the second place, because, if the materials were a hundred times more abundant, it wholly mistakes the true relation between the witnesses, on which the force of collective evidence must depend. For this

is not lateral, but vertical. Each witness or manuscript must have its weight determined by the series of copyings through which it has passed, and not by its agreement or disagreement with other copies of its own age, of which the steps of transmission many have been, and often must have been, wholly different from its own." (Essay on the Right Estimation of Manuscript Evidence in the Text of the New Testament, Thomas Rawson Birks, pg. 21)

Philips Mauro certainly doesn't think the text produced by Westcott and Hort is "infinitely superior" to that of any other. As a matter of fact, Mr. Mauro informs us:

"We conclude therefore, from what has been under consideration up to this point in our inquiry, that the R.V. should BE REJECTED, not only because of the many unsupported departures from the A.V. it contains, but because the Greek Text whereon it is based was constructed upon a PRINCIPLE SO UNSOUND THAT THE RESULTING TEXT COULD NOT BE OTHER THAN "HOPELESSLY" CORRUPT." (Mauro, Which Version?, pg. 68)

John William Burgon, Dean of Chichester reiterates:

"The theory of the respected authors proves to be the shallowest imaginable. It is briefly this: -- Fastening on the two oldest codices extant (B and Aleph, both of the IVth century), they invent the following hypothesis: --'That the ancestries of those two manuscripts diverged from a point nearer the autographs, and never came into contact subsequently.' [NO REASON IS PRODUCED FOR THIS OPINION.]" (Burgon, The Revision Revised, pg. 26, note 1)

Mauro rebuts Hort's comments quoted by Burgon on the point nearer the autographs:

"We fully admit that the principle of following the most ancient manuscripts is, on its face, reasonable and safe; for it is indisputable that (other things being equal) the copies nearest to the original autographs are most likely to be freest from errors. If therefore it were a question whether or not we should follow, in the fashioning of a Greek Text, the earliest as against later manuscripts, there would be no "question" at all; for all would agree. But, as the case actually stands, it is impossible for us to follow the earliest manuscripts, for the simple reason that they NO LONGER EXIST. Not a single copy of the many thousands that were made, circulated, and read in the first three centuries is known to exist to-day." (Mauro, *ibid*, pg. 53-54)

In reference to the statements by Philips Mauro, lest I be accused of giving inaccurate information (for Bible correctors are notorious for attempting to discredit the A.V. 1611 on the grounds of errors made by its proponents), I would like to point out that since the time of Mauro's publication in the 1920's, early 2nd-3rd century papyrus fragments have been found which contain portions of New Testament Greek. (We will examine these in subsequent articles, and review the scholastic "horror" that many of these early readings vindicate King James readings otherwise labeled as "late additions" to the text). However, Mauro's point

is still valid because the basis of assuming "older is better" IS STILL based upon Vaticanus and Sinaiticus which are undoubtedly 300 years AFTER the release of the "original" autographs.

Here is a place where Dean Burgon gives his "opinion" in pure, unadulterated, "Ruckmanite" fashion:

"The English (as well as the Greek) of the newly "Revised Version" is hopelessly at fault. It is to me simply unintelligible how a company of Scholars can have spent ten years in elaborating such a very unsatisfactory production. Their uncouth phraseology and their jerky sentences, their pedantic obscurity and their unidiomatic English, contrast painfully with "the happy turns of expression, the music of the cadences, the felicities of the rhythm" of our Authorized Version. The transition from one to the other, as the Bishop of Lincoln remarks, is like exchanging a well-built carriage for a vehicle without springs, in which you can get jolted to death on a newly mended and rarely traversed road. But the "Revised Version" is inaccurate as well; exhibits defective scholarship, I mean, in countless places." (Burgon, Revision Revised, Dedication, pg. vi)

Referencing the famous Johannine Comma (I John 5:7), Doug Kutilek makes the following statement about the passage in typical, Alexandrian fashion:

"Ancient writers: no Greek-speaking Christian writer before the year 1215 A.D. shows any knowledge of the disputed words. Not once are these words quoted in the great controversy with the Arians (over the Deity of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity) in the 3rd and 4th centuries; they certainly would have been quoted if they had existed in any Greek manuscript of that period." ("A Simple Outline Regarding I John 5:7")

Naturally, when making such bold comments, these watered down, lifeless charlatans will not provide you with the complete bulk of evidence to the contrary. Therefore, standing up immediately to silence the loquacious absurdities of Mr. Kutilek we have Mr. Frederick Nolan in 1815 that stated:

"The early heretics did not subscribe to those parts of the canon in which they occur; and they did not meet the difficulties of those disputes which were maintained with the later. In order to answer the purposes of those controversies, Christ, in two of the contested passages, should have been identified with "God," who "was manifested in the flesh," and "purchased the Church with his own blood." and instead of "the Father, Word, and Spirit," the remaining passage would have BEEN DIRECT CONCESSIONS TO THE GHOSTICKS AND SABELLIANS, WHO, IN DENYING THE PERSONAL DIFFERENCE OF THE FATHER AND SON, WERE EQUALLY OBNOXIOUS TO THOSE AVOWED ADVERSARIES, THE CATHOLICKS AND THE ARIANS. Nor did the orthodox require these verses for the support of their cause; they had other passages which would accomplish all that they could effect; and without their aid, they maintained and established their tenets." (An Inquiry Into The

Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament, Rev. Frederick Nolan, 1815, pg. 278-279)

Thus far Mr. Nolan has given you two reasons why I John 5:7 is seemingly scanty in reference to quotations from the church fathers (babies as Luther called them):

1) The passage in I John 5:7 is among those like I Timothy 3:16 and Acts 20:28 that have all been tampered with in the manuscript tradition, all three having to do with the deity of Christ as "God."

2) That the major reason for NOT QUOTING I John 5:7 was based on its wording, chiefly, purporting Jesus Christ as the "WORD" instead of the "SON." Hence, with the Sabellian heresy being debated that Jesus Christ is the Father with no distinction, I John 5:7 possibly would further propagate that notion. Therefore it wasn't quoted.

However, Mr. Nolan's argumentation doesn't end there. He continues with the following:

"With respect to I John v.7, the case is materially different. If this verse be received, it must be admitted on the single testimony of the Western church; as far at least as respects the external evidence. And though it may seem unwarrantable to set aside the authority of the Greek Church, and pay exclusive respect to the Latin, where a question arises on the authenticity of a passage which properly belongs to the text of the former; yet when the doctrine inculcated in that passage is taken into account, there may be good reason for giving even a preference to the Western church over that of the Eastern. THE FORMER WAS UNCORRUPTED BY THE HERESY OF THE ARIANS, WHO REJECTED THE DOCTRINE OF THE PASSAGE IN QUESTION; THE LATTER WAS WHOLLY RESIGNED TO THAT HERESY FOR AT LEAST FORTY YEARS, WHILE THE WESTERN CHURCH RETAINED ITS PURITY."
(Nolan, *ibid*, pg. 293-294)

Here, Mr. Nolan informs us that in order to receive I John v.7 on external grounds it must be due to the exclusive testimony of the Western (Latin) church. He designates the proposition that we SHOULD receive the passage based on Latin because the Latin Church did not resign to the Arian (similar to Jehovah's Witnesses) heresy for a period of like 40 years, as did the Greek Church.

In my last article, I discussed how asinine [Gary Hudson](#) was in his supposed vindication of the critical Greek texts for excluding I John 5:7 on grammatical grounds. Mr. Hudson made a comment that finds its lodging in the sphere of stupidity by the following:

"As far as we have been able to discover, this argument was first suggested by Robert L. Dabney in 1871. Aware of the fact that the manuscript (external) evidence for the verse is extremely scant, Dabney introduced a new argument in its favor based upon

what he believed to be an important internal consideration:" ("I John 5:7 Grammatical Argument Refuted," Gary Hudson)

I mention this quote from Mr. Hudson to show you how dogmatic a Bible corrector will be in their assertions as facts, but have no clue that they are just manifesting their "abysmal ignorance." Mr. Nolan employed usage of this "grammatical argument" in 1815, 56 years prior to Hudson penning it on Robert Dabney. Nolan discusses it on pages 259-261, 294, and 304 of his work. Notwithstanding, Gregory Nazianzus in "Oration XXXII: Fifth Theological Oration: On the Holy Spirit, c.XIX, though not defending the Comma, acknowledges that such a grammatical difficulty existed with his dissenting comments against those who insisted upon this syntactical solecism.

Kutilek above says, " *no Greek-speaking Christian writer before the year 1215 A.D. shows any knowledge of the disputed words.*"

However, on the contrary to the self-proclaimed scholastic intellectual, Mr. Kutilek is refuted by Ben David in his work, "Three Letters Addressed to The Editor of The Quarterly Review, In Which is Demonstrated The Genuineness of The Three Heavenly Witnesses- I John v.7"

Mr. David is HONEST enough to inform us, just to take a few:

"If we turn to the Greek fathers, we shall find them equally well acquainted with the verse, and equally reluctant to quote it. I will notice a few of those who have been brought forward as vouchers for its genuineness:

"Basil paraphrases the text, but is afraid to quote it: "Oi pisteuontes eis Theon, kai Logon, kai Pneuma, mian ousan theoteta. WHO BELIEVE IN GOD, AND THE WORD, AND THE SPIRIT, BEING ONE GODHEAD " (Ben David, pg. 57).

Continuing with Ben David:

"Theodorus, the master of Chrysostom and a contemporary of the emperor Julian, as we learn from Suidas, wrote "A treatise on one God in the Trinity, from the Epistle of John the Evangelist" Eisten Epistolen Ioannou tou Euaggelistou peri tou eis Theos en Triadi. This is a remarkable testimony, as it implies the existence and notoriety of the verse about the middle of the fourth century."

"Cyril, in his Thesaurus, attempts to prove that the Holy Spirit is God. With this view he extracts the 6th and 8th verse, and omits the 7th: yet he inserts an argument which demonstrates that this verse lay before him, though he was too much afraid directly to use it. Cyril's words are these: Eirekos gar oti to pneuma esti tou Theou to marturoun mikron ti proelthon, epipherei, a marturia tou Theou meizon esti. Pos oun esti poiema to ton olon Patri suntheologoumenon kai tes agias triados sumplerotikon. For having said that it is the Spirit of God that witnesses, a little forward he adds, the witness of

God is greater: How then is he a creature WHO IS SAID TO BE GOD WITH THE UNIVERSAL FATHER, AND COMPLETES THE NUMBER OF THE HOLY TRIAD. The words in capitals form the substance of the seventh verse which Cyril wished to quote, as being direct to his purpose; yet through fear he declined to produce it in express terms. This was in the fifth century. Time, however, removed the grounds of this apprehension; and in the course of seven centuries, Euthymius Zigabenus published a work called The Panoply of Faith (Panoplia Dogmatike); in which he quotes the words of Cyril, premising the disputed text as it stands in our Greek Copies."

"Travis, in support of the verse, produces a passage from a Dialogue as between Athanasian and an Arian, where it is quoted in part, with an express reference to John as its author. The passage is to this effect: 'Is not that lively and saving baptism, whereby we receive remission of sins, administered in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. And St. John says, And these three are one.'" (Ben David, ibid, pg. 58-59)

One of the most recent compilations of garbage to be postulated by the Alexandrian cult is a book dedicated to destroying a Bible believer's faith in the Authorized Version. The name of the book is "The Unbound Scriptures" by Rick Norris, a good for nothing, professing Fundamental Baptist, apostate from North Carolina. In it Norris states the following:

"If the KJV is to be regarded as a perfect translation, in every verse it should have the most accurate rendering of the Scriptures in the original languages." Norris then goes on to list several passages in the Old Testament which he thinks could be improved upon. However, again, contradicting Mr. Norris we have the following ancient scribe:

"The highest eulogiums have been made on the translation of James the first, both by our own writers, and by foreigners. And indeed if accuracy, fidelity, and the strictest attention to the letter of the text, be supposed to constitute the qualities of an excellent Version, THIS OF ALL VERSIONS, MUST, IN GENERAL, BE ACCOUNTED THE MOST EXCELLENT. Every sentence, every word, every syllable, every letter and point, seems to have been weighed with the nicest exactitude, and expressed either in the text, or margin, with the greatest precision. Pagninus himself is hardly more literal; and was well remarked by Robertson, above a hundred years ago, THAT IT MAY SERVE FOR A LEXICON OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE, AS WELL AS FOR A TRANSLATION." (An Authentic Account of Our Authorized Translation, Henry John Todd-Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty, and Archdeacon of Cleveland, 1834, pg. 54-55)

We could never think of leaving out a comment from Arthur Coxe on this subject: *"He who would rub off those graceful marks of age which adorn our version, vulgarizes and debases that venerable dignity with which the first ideas of religion*

came to the youthful mind and heart from the old and hoary Bible." (Coxe, *ibid*, pg. 8-9)

Burgon concurs:

"An unlearned reader's confidence in his guide vanishes; and he finds that he has had not a few deflections from the Authorized Version thrust upon him, of which he reasonably questions alike the taste and the necessity." (Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pg. 193)

In the year 2000, another Baptist from North Carolina, Robert Joyner, released an embarrassing work (I say embarrassing because some of the lies told by the author were so silly I blushed when reading them) against the King James Bible entitled, **"King James Only? A Guide to Bible Translations."** Naturally, the title itself reeks of Satanic scholarship ("Yea, hath God said...?- Gen. 3:1), with the following quote emphasizing just how egocentric these scholastic egotists can be:

"The KJV people ask, 'Why do the modern versions leave verses and words out?' I think they have the question reversed. It should be, 'Why does the KJV insert so many words and verses?'" (Joyner, pg. 62)

In the future I plan on doing a full book review of this "work" and posting on my website. However, for the present inquiry I would like to make a couple of points:

1) Joyner doesn't even address the question. He simply repeats this question given to him by A.V. Only advocates and then switches the question to a position he has already assumed! I suppose it would be safe for me to assume from Joyner's flash dance that points of omission or addition to the text of the New Testament is relative to the inquirer?

2) Joyner is completely oblivious to the FACT that omissions are the first line of Bible corruption as outlined by the Holy Scriptures. If you will notice the "outline of textual criticism" in the third chapter of Genesis, when the serpent succeeds in guiding Eve to doubt the integrity of God's word, the first thing she does is OMIT a word! She omitted the word "FREELY" in verse 2. It was after that manifestation of corrupted scholarship that she added, "neither shall ye touch it" in verse 3. Howbeit the A.V. persecutors never discuss the biblical aspects on manuscript corruption. The next time the devil shows up referencing the scriptures he OMITTS a portion of it in Matthew 4:6.

3) Philip Mauro is lightening fast to correct Mr. Joyner:

"The commonest of all mistakes in copying manuscripts, or in repeating a matter, are mistakes of OMISSION, or lapses of memory, or the result of inattention." (Mauro, *Which Version?*, pg. 60-61)

Another amateur, Bible corrector, Brian Tegart, makes the following comments regarding the translation of "Ἰησοῦς" as "Jesus" instead of "Joshua" in Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8:

"Looking at the context of these two verses, it is easily seen that they are referring to when Joshua was leading the Israelites into the promised land. So why does the KJV have "Jesus" in these two verses while the other translations have "Joshua"?

A look at the underlying Greek in these verses shows that "Iesous" is the name under discussion here. Everywhere else in the NT, it is translated correctly as "Jesus", because that's who it is referring to. However, in these two verses (Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8), the name is the same, but referring to Joshua of the Old Testament, not Jesus of the New." (["Acts 7:45 & Hebrews 4:8 Jesus, Joshua: What's The Difference Anyway?"](#) Brian Tegart)

Last year I wrote an article on these two verses, vindicating the translation found in the A.V. 1611 against textual despots like Tegart. It is entitled, "[Dirty Dirk Wood In A Tainted Meat Locker](#)." Notwithstanding, the comments of Arthur Coxe will be a blessing once again:

"It is of some consequence to make the common reader feel the Greek in his New Testament: at least, if any Christian pastor is persuaded of this, the Bible Society has no right to Judaize his New Testament, and so decide against him. I cheerfully concede that in the Greek form of Joshua, which is the familiar name of our Blessed LORD, there is a difficulty to the ordinary apprehension. Yet in one instance, it is explained in the margin by the translators themselves; and I have often found the instance of use, in explaining to a Bible-class the truth that our LORD condescended to bear the humble human name of Joshua, and that Joshua was a signal type of his LORD, in this, as in other particulars. The Graecised proper names of the new Testament are, in all other cases, sufficiently plain to be understood by any one intelligently reading the Scriptures, especially with the references; and, for one, I protest against the Hebraized look, which the novelty gives to one's Testament. I prefer to see Sion, and not Zion, in the New Testament, because the latter form has a territorial and geographical association. Thus, in that glorious text, "Ye are come unto Mount Sion," the form Zion seems to remove it from identity with "the heavenly Jerusalem." The fact is, God seems to have provided the Greek, as new bottles for new wine, and one feels the propriety of its idioms, where a new and celestial inheritance comes into view. I am not sorry to meet Osee, and Noe and Sara and Juda, in the new testament; for the bare dropping of superfluities seems a symbol of their baptism into the freedom of the New covenant, and of the "newness of spirit" which has succeeded the oldness of the letter. IF A COMPETENT AUTHORITY SHOULD PLACE THE ORIGINAL HEBREW NAMES IN THE MARGIN, I DOUBT NOT, ALL WOULD BE SATISFIED; BUT THE TEXT, THE TEXT, LET US HAVE IT AS OUR FATHERS LET IT!" (Coxe, *ibid*, pg. 37-38)

At this point a couple of astonishing facts should embrace the reader with fervor. One, the commentary of the modern A.V. critics is biased, secondary, and at times ridiculous. Secondly, the state of scholarship in contemporary times has deteriorated and become the epitome of disgust in light of the ancients. Finally, that whenever you see some individual propagating his opinion (usually one that he learned from someone else...Originality is an attribute destitute of reality in this day and age) as an established FACT, there is always another individual that has a contrary opinion and will be able to correct that form of dogmatism. So where does this leave us in regards to what is right, and what distinguishes truth from error, etc? It certainly couldn't reside in our own bosom, for that would leave us as self-centered authorities as those we criticize. In fact, it must reside in "Thus saith the Lord." The W-O-R-D-S of almighty God, namely, the words that he has spoken and has published. And as such I mean not "the message of God," or "the multitudinous array of manuscripts," or some "eclectic texts" prepared by irreverent persons. I mean the Bible, as in the text that God has seen fit to leave us in these last times- The A.V. 1611! And to do this my brethren, THE TEXT MUST BE LEFT IN TACT!

Finally, I'd like to end this segment with some final comments from our dead forefathers that now "sleep in Jesus."

Arthur Coxe: *"The best and the most that can be done, even in England, is to ensure the strict preservation of the text and its accessories, and they are according to the present standards."* (Coxe, *ibid*, pg. 9)

James Lister: *"Let us beware then of putting the suggestions of modern critics on higher ground than the modest but solid claims of our ancestors."* (Lister, *Excellence of the Authorized Version*, pg. 14)

William Brantly: *"The proposed abandonment of the words baptize and baptism, and the substitution of the kindred terms, immerse and immersion, will doubtless attract to itself the favourable suffrage of a few. Its plausibility will beguile and its novelty will charm them. But the more reflecting, perceiving that nothing is to be gained by the alterations, while much will be hazarded; caught by no specious reasoning, and won over by no puerile argument, will withhold from the translation their sanction and their patronage, and still retain at the domestic altar, in the study and in the pulpit, the good old English Version, endeared to them by a thousand tender and hallowed associations. Such we think, will be the disorganizing tendency of the question agitated either at the present, or at ANY FUTURE TIME. Brother will be arrayed against brother, church against church, and association against association, and the Book, THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN TO US AS A HEAVEN WROUGHT LIGAMENT, BINDING EACH TO THE OTHER, AND ALL TO IT, WILL THUS BECOME THE ORGAN OF STRIFE, DISCORD AND DISSENSION. FROM SUCH A CATASTROPHE, MAY THE GOD OF THE BIBLE PRESERVE US!* (Objections to A Baptist Version of the New Testament, William T. Brantly, pg. 65-66, 1837)

A Critique of Goethe's Faustian Rendition of Ο Λογος in John 1:1

By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson

The perpetual enterprise respecting the subject matter of translating the sacred texts of Scripture into a recipient vernacular continues to be a relentless debate of principles, ulterior motives, fiscal prosperity, and intellectual temptation. The indefatigable pursuits of linguistic pundits, combined with the inept and whimsical opinions of philological novices have rendered the reliability of the words of the New Testament a hopelessly subjective, and in some cases, singular perspective. The manifest fruition of this phenomenon is viably palpable through the plethora of existing sectarian and non-sectarian Bible translations, which have been thrust upon the free market in a variety of tongues throughout the inhabitable world. However, no publication in the world touches the frilled orations or the sanctimonious transcriptions of the professing Biblical scholar. While offering his expertise regarding the specifics of Hellenistic Greek lexicography, he boldly declares that the translation of words not in collusion with his scholarly opinion to be nothing short of egregious errors. These pronounced errors, in turn, are subsequently "corrected" under the guise of meaningful objectivity.

When enthusiasm grants an inquiring student the wondrous honor of traveling wholeheartedly into the realm of World Literature, the learner must find himself at an overwhelming loss when he discovers that one of the characters in the read before him is engaged at an alteration of the text of the New Testament. Moreover, at the hands of his tutelage, this selfsame student must find it overtly exasperating to walk in on this naked exposition of travesty at the behest of the following salient words from *Faust*, "*hich is nowhere more magnificent than in our New Testament. I would for once like to determine-because I am sincerely perplexed-how the sacred original text could be translated into my beloved German*" (702). The context in the preceding statement is the dilemma ingrained within the pages of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's *Faust*, namely, that Faust, during his night of "Study" (701), seeks to alter the translation of the Gospel of John 1:1 from, "*In the beginning was the Word.*" to an interpretation which would give the members of the German tongue the relegation of *εν αρχη ην ο λογος* as "Mind," "Force," and "Act" respectively (702). Therefore the pertinent task before us is to examine the claims of Faust in reference to the translation of John 1:1 and determine that he is grossly in error by an examination of the context of his position, along with expert testimony from linguistic sources, and a comparison of other foreign language translations that equitably render the words in question as "Word" and nothing else.

First, in order to deliver an adequate appraisal of Faust's assertion that the three words previously mentioned are possible renditions for the Greek word Λογος in John 1:1, it is necessary to provide his comments at length:

It says: 'In the beginning was the Word.' Already I am stopped. It seems absurd. The Word does not deserve the highest prize, I must translate it otherwise If I am well inspired and not blind. It says: In the beginning was the Mind. Ponder that first line,

wait and see, Lest you should write too hastily. Is mind the all-creating source? It ought to say: In the beginning there was Force. Yet something warns me as I grasp the pen, That my translation must be changed again. The spirit helps me. Now it is exact. I write: In the beginning was the Act. (702)

In his book *Goethe's Faust*, Harold Jantz offers the idea that a great many students are regularly condemning Faust's translation practice here as an evident token of subjectivity (as I have bolstered in my thesis), but in actuality Faust is cleverly exercising his skill as a classical philologist (Jantz 113-114). If you will notice Faust's words above he asks if the word "Mind" justifiably conveys the idea of "*the all-creating source*." Hence, given Mephistopheles's comments later that Faust thinks the word so beggarly as to be only craving "reality," (705) thus implying that his alteration of "Word" to the final "Act" in a progression of debatable ideas is proof positive that Faust's intention in a fresh translation of the "sacred text" was to encompass the realization of the LogoV in demonstrable deeds. Jantz conjectures, "*It is to be taken in its larger context as a simple, natural description of the magical process, beginning with the 'word,' which is valid because it is a symbol for the 'meaning' lying behind it (remember Figulus' description of the book of nature). The comprehension of this 'meaning' give the magnus the 'power' over the forces of nature, this 'potentiality' in its turn coming to realization in the 'act' (deed). All this was for the Renaissance philosopher parallel in its minor human way to God's creation of the world.*" (Jantz 115)

But, both Faust's purpose and Jantz's justification of Faust's motive fall deplorably short of the evangelist's purpose in the first chapter of John's Gospel. First, the context of this first chapter of John's Gospel is to establish the Λογος's preeminence, not to verbosely illustrate God's "creative power." The preeminence of the Λογος is clearly seen in his co-essence as being God (John 1:1), his co-existence with God (John 1:2); his ability to create the world (John 1:3); his power to personally and individually sustain life and existence (John 1:4); his purpose in illuminating mankind (John 1:9); and his sole position as being the only means by which fallen mankind could spiritually be born of God and properly be called his sons (John 1:11-13). Secondly, the fact that John 1:14 inculcates this all-powerful God with the feebleness of mankind is not indicative of an "all-creative source," but of a pragmatic expression of God (who is a Spirit- John 4:24) to the human race. Because "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." (the Word here being a translation of Λογος too), he is passionately linked to the verse in Hebrews 1:3 which calls the Son of God,

ος ων απαυγασμα της δοξης και χαρακτηρ της υποστασεως αυτου or "*who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person.*" This tremendous truth is also manifest in the fact that the other three times Λογος is used in holy writ (to total seven), it has absolutely no concern with all- creative acts, but with a physical, actual manifestation of God to the world through his Son (1 John 1:1; 5:7; Rev. 19:13). When the author used the word Λογος his only purpose is to relate an unseen, unheard Almighty to his creation (John 1:18; 5:37). Thirdly, the idea that Faust's translations are a progressive development from "word" to "act" really

betrays Faust's own words on the subject. Faust told us expressly that the rendition of Λογος as "Word" "*seems absurd*" (702). Hence, with his own words stating that "word" is absurd in conjunction with his exhortation to not translate λογος as "force" to hastily thereby bringing out the final "act," it is certain that he wasn't progressing, but simply looking for a word to suit his purpose. Fourthly, one keen author points out the fact that although Faust rejected "Word" for λογος at one point in the story, he later came to terms with it's astounding truths when she stated:

Now, therefore, the thematics of word returns to the play in new form. At the beginning of Part I Faust rejected words and 'word-mongering' as inadequate forms of knowledge; he could not allow the logos to be a word, so he translated it as 'deed.' But now at the end of Part II, after the words of the spirits have brought the new day in Pleasant Landscape and after Faust has created Arcadia with his own words, the word has been restored to a position of respect. Above all, Faust wants to guard himself from saying a 'magic word' to drive Care away, and after she has blinded him, he says, 'The night seems to press in deeper and deeper, /But inside me shines bright light;/ What I conceived I'll hasten to complete;/The master's word it alone has weight.' In a typical dialectical move Faust has to reject the word in order to possess it fully. (Brown 94)

Furthermore, to boldly claim as Faust has done that the rendition of Λογος as "Word" henceforth "*seems absurd*" is really to downplay and ignore one of the greatest composite translation efforts in the history of the world. By a simple inspection of English and foreign language Bible translations it becomes embarrassingly apparent that the invariable usage of Λογος is translated by the English equivalent, "Word." A fellow German, Dr. Martin Luther, having initially translated his German Bible from the 2nd edition Greek text of Erasmus in 1522, by means of his 1545 revision of the same delineates John 1:1 as, "*Im Anfang war das Wort, und das Wort war bei Gott, und Gott war das Wort.*" Similarly, the 1960 Reina-Valera Spanish Bible states, "*En principio era el Verbo, y el Verbo era con Dios, y el Verbo era Dios.*" The French version translates, "*Au commencement etait la Parole, et al Parole etaite avei Dieu, et la Parole etait Dieu.*" Of course, it goes without saying that Italian Diodati version gives us "Parola" for "Word," as the Latin Vulgate from the fourth century delegates the word, "Verbum" to represent λογος. These translations, without a doubt, all mean, "Word." Hence, it is plausible to assert that these scholastic sources finding origin in eclectic sources were just as qualified if not more so in some cases to render the verdict of the Faustian absurdity as nugatory.

Notwithstanding, briefly considering lexical sources it is should be taken into account that Λογος denotes, "*the independent personified expression of God, the Logos. Our lit. shows traces of a way of thinking that was widespread in contemporary syncretism, as well as in Jewish wisdom lit. and Philo, the most prominent feature of which is the concept of the Logos, the independent, personified 'Word' (of God): GJs 11:2 (word of the angel to Mary) συνλημνη εκ Λογου αυτου (sc. του παντων Δεσποτου). J 1:1abc, 14 (cp. Just., A I, 23, 2; Mel., P. 9, 61 and oft. By all apology., exc.. Ar.). It is the distinctive teaching of the Fourth Gospel that this*

divine 'Word' took on human form in a historical person, that is, in Jesus" (Danker 601). Also, the usurpation of the term λογος to mean "Mind" also reeks of Neoplatonism, which when combined with the ideological features of the "Word" relegates a downgrade on the deity of Jesus Christ. One philosophical commentator notes:

Origen, who is the closest (he was probably a pupil of Plotinus's own master Ammonius Saccas), has a theology strikingly like that of Plotinus; the Father corresponds to the transcendent One; the Logos-Son, whom Origen makes much inferior to the Father, is the One-in-Many, the Divine Mind; the Spirit is inferior again, though not very like Plotinus's universal Soul. The New Testament's statements about the Holy Spirit made it difficult for even the most Platonically-minded theologian to assimilate him as completely to the Platonic World-Soul as the Son was assimilated to the Divine Mind. Later, Arianism shows signs of the influences of fourth-century Neoplatonism. (Armstrong and Markus 21; indirectly, Stead 150)

The transparency of Faust's subjective motive in altering the proper translation of John 1:1 as, "*In the beginning was the Word*" is illustrated in his utter failure to notice the primary context of John chapter 1 as the preeminent place due the Word through his manifestation to the world as the physical representation of God, while being equal in essence and existence with him. Despite Mr. Jantz's attempts to justify Faust's translation endeavor's by pointing a form of lexical hierarchy, he is opaquely oblivious to the fact that Faust himself was not attempting to transition from "the Word" to "the Act," but simply exploring word usages to fit his scheme. Translating λογος as anything but "the Word" betrays the host of translations, both English and otherwise, which invariably translate the so-said word as an equivalent of "the Word." One of the most respected synthetic lexicons in existence renders the idea of a Christian λογος as "the Word," tracing its usage from a Jewish background through Philo of Alexandria (although Armstrong and Markus [19] assure us that it isn't necessary to assume that John was reading Philo), through to Church Fathers beyond the apostle John. Finally, Armstrong and Markus keenly observe that a downgrade on the deity of Christ is a direct descendent of Neoplatonic thought by equating the λογος with the "Divine Mind" through advocates such as Adamantius Origen. All-in-all, the most that one can do, not only in the case of Faust now behind us, but in all scenarios referencing the falsifying effects of distorting Scripture, is to leave the sacred words of text in tact exactly as God in his marvelous providence delivered them.

Works Cited

Armstrong, A.H. and R.A. Markus. Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy. New York: Sheed and Ward. 1960.

Brown, Jane K. Faust Theater of the World. New York: Twayne Publishers. 1992.

Danker, Frederick William. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press. 1957, 2000.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang Von. "Faust." The Norton Anthology of World Literature. Ed. Lawall, Sarah. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. Vol. E. 702-705.

Jantz, Harold. Goethe's Faust As A Renaissance Man: Parallels and Prototypes. New York: Gordian Press. 1974.

Kittel, Gerhard. Theological Dictionary of The New Testament, 10 vol. Trans. Bromiley, Geoffrey W. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing. 1967.

Mason, Eudo C. Goethe's Faust: It's Genesis and Purport. Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press. 1967.

Stead, Christopher. Philosophy In Christian Antiquity. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 1994.

Matthew 23:14
An Expansion of Piety or an Example of Paucity in the Modern Versions?
By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson

The following material was drafted to answer the questions of an individual seeking information on the reasoning for the omission of Matthew 23:14 from the modern Bible versions, which follow one of the corrupt critical texts (such as Nestle-Aland 27 or the United Bible Society 4th edition, etc.) in their subsequent English translation. Unfortunately, I deleted his original composition to me requesting the information, but you should be able to glean the gist of his questions from the context of my response. The information request was sent to me a few months ago through the contact section on the A.V. 1611 Answers website, and has been resting in my files ever since. Hence, I thought it might be edifying for all of you to read and contemplate upon its contents instead of remaining a dormant computer file. Finally, for further studies concerning the causes of corruption in various Greek manuscripts and texts, the reader is encouraged to consult, *"The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels,"* by Dean John William Burgon. Specifically, he discusses Matthew 23:14 on pages 38-39 in this book, providing handsome details as to why this passage is not a zealous accretion to the traditional text, but rather an accidental omission caused by a careless scribe.

Dear Brother in Christ,

You did not leave your name on the standard reply email, so I'll just have to refer to you as a Brother in Christ. However, I thank you for your kind email, and will be happy to relay to you my findings concerning the passage in question.

The passage, Matthew 23:14 reads as follows in the A.V. 1611:

" Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation."

Of course, as you correctly noted in your email, the passage is missing in the modern English versions, which follow Nestle-Aland or some other similar critical text. However, it is bracketed in the NASB and the NASB update. The verse in question is limited to apparatus in the Nestle-Aland 27th edition.

Scrivener's collation of the Greek readings which underlie the A.V. 1611 reads as follows in the passage:

Ουαι υμιν, γραμματεις και Φαρισαιοι, υποκριται, οτι κατεσθιετε τας οικιας των χηρων, και προφασει μακρα προσευχομενοι; δια τουτο ληψεσθε περισσοτερον κριμα.

The first thing that I would like to do is show you how a modern, destructive critic of the A.V. 1611 (in this example, James White), handles the omission. After admitting that this verse is found in the majority of existing Greek manuscripts, and that is subsequently not found in the text of modern critical editions (see White, "The King James Only Controversy," pg. 154-155 with his endnote on pg. 189), he makes the following statement in order to justify the omission from modern Greek texts and the resultant English versions:

"In some instances it is fairly obvious that a verse has been either repeated or imported from another place in the text. In both Mark 9:44 and 46 the phrase 'where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched' has been inserted in later manuscripts in both places, repeating the very same phrase that is found in verse 48. The manuscripts that do not contain the phrase, while the minority, make up a wide range of witnesses against these verses. There is no reason for these verses to have been accidentally omitted, and obviously they were not purposefully omitted because all the manuscripts contain the very same words at verse 48. " (James White, The King James Only Controversy, pg. 155)

Accordingly, on pg. 155 of his book, Mr. White asserts that *"other passages fall into the same category of inserted text from other places in the Gospel accounts include...Matthew 23:14 (from Mark 12:40 and Luke 20:47)..."* Now, if you will notice carefully, Mr. White states that there is no reason for these verses to have been accidentally omitted or purposely omitted. Granted, I would be inclined to agree with Mr. White that these verses in Mark 9 or Matthew 23:14 were not PURPOSEFULLY omitted. However, I would adamantly disagree with him for his nonsensical hypothesis that these passages were not ACCIDENTALLY omitted.

James White is either manifestly ignorant of the fact, or PURPOSEFULLY neglected to inform his reading audience (in this case you and me), of a phenomenon all too common and familiar to a scribe copying Greek manuscripts. This accidental cause of corruption is called, "Homoeoteleuton," which is a Greek name that denotes a similarity or likeness of ending. When a copyist had before him a manuscript with a particular passage that contained the same words on different lines, or what appeared to be the same word, upon reverting back to his original from which he was copying, his eye would wander from the correct line he was copying to another place on the page (usually a little lower down) that had the word of the same appearance. Consequently, all that was in between the two similar words was omitted, and on occasion, duplicated. Such is the case in Matthew 23:14.

In Matthew 23:14, as you can see above, the passage begins with:

Ουαι υμιν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι

However, Matthew 23:13 begins with:

Ουαι δε υμιν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι

Along the same lines, Matthew 23:15 has:

Ουαι υμιν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι

Hence, some stupid scribe, at a very early age, because of the recurring Ουαι υμιν (or, "Woe unto you") easily omitted the phrase as his eye wandered from the appearance of the phrase in verse 13, deleting ACCIDENTALLY the material found in verse 14, picking it up again in verse 15.

The verse is found in the majority of the cursive Greek manuscripts, 14 uncial manuscripts (which include MSS. Ω, Σ, and Φ), the Syriac Peshitta, the Harkleian Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabian, and some mss. of the Latin Vulgate. The passage is attested by Origen in Latin, Chrysostom, Opus, John Damascene, Theophylact, Hilary, and Jerome.

The continuous concord of corrupt witnesses (especially in Matthew's Gospel), which omit the passage are a B D L Z and the Θ uncial. Along with these are the Armenian version, five or more cursives (nothing compared to the ones that contain the passage), and the Lewis edition of the Syriac. This corruption passed on to some of the Bohairic mss., as well as the Sahidic, Origen, and some of the Vulgate mss. inconsistently. This error was also repeated in the Old Latin versions.

It is certain that this corruption took place early and passed into Egypt because of the corrupt Alexandrian witnesses that perpetuate the error. However, to bolster the idea that this passage was added intentionally by a "well meaning scribe," and bears no marks of accidental omission, is certainly a profound demonstration of ignorance concerning scribal habits. Anyone even remotely familiar with scribal practices knows that a scribe is more prone to omit than to add. However, modern textual critics still insist that the converse is true. They abide by the shifting sands of Scholarship, while I hold to the words of God as found in the A.V. 1611.

To answer your questions:

1) The reading from verse 13 that you say is found in verse 14 in some Greek Orthodox texts is probably just due to differences in the placing of the verses. For example, in Samuel Tregelles' book, *"An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament,"* he lists the variant reading we just discussed above as verse 13 instead of verse 14. This simply has to do with how the verses are placed. I don't

know of a variant from verse 14 that contains the words you mentioned from verse 13.

2) Matthew 23:14, as found in the King James Bible is attested by a plethora of church fathers, the majority of uncial and cursive Greek manuscripts, and a number of early versions.

3) As I have stated above, the reading arose as an accidental corruption due to a similarity of endings on the Greek words in the passages.

I hope this answers your questions. May the Lord Jesus Christ bless your endeavors for him.

**Sincerely in Jesus Christ,
Jeffrey D. Nachimson**

**Butler's Bumbling Bunk Concerning Final Absolute Authority
Compilation & Commentary by Jeffrey D. Nachimson**

The following exchange of correspondence began when one of the many thousands of members of the "Yea, hath God said?" Society (see chapter 3 of the book, "Manuscript Evidence," by Dr. Peter S. Ruckman) sent me a brief email (the first one below) thanking me for recognizing him as an Alexandrian apostate. His name is Fred Butler. Mr. Butler is a fairly new member of the Society, having lost his faith in the King James Bible (as he was formerly an A.V. Only advocate) because his adherence to such professions of faith was adamantly dependent upon the reliability of scholarship. Essentially, Fred Butler exchanged A.V. 1611 scholarship for Alexandrian, Bible-correcting, "Christian" scholarship. However, I will discuss this at length at the end of the correspondence.

Furthermore, I discovered quite previously, that a former Bible-believer thinks that he is due certain rights to a listening audience because he has suddenly been "enlightened" and is now qualified to tell all of Bible-believing Christendom the deceptive error of their ways, and to provide them with a scholastic scapegoat out of this supposed cultic heresy. However, all that has managed to come to pass in the castaway (I Cor. 9:27) lives of men like Fred Butler, Rick Norris, and Gary Hudson, is that they exchanged the A.V. 1611 for preference and "scholarship," not because they have unearthed some unknown phenomena, but because they found an excuse to accept the falsehood and textual treachery that they once repudiated. Individuals such as Fred Butler epitomize the passage that says, "Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen." (Rom. 1:25)

Of course, the proof positive for the above analysis is that the material promulgated by these individuals is no more and no less the same disparaging nonsense perpetuated by "men of old" who never did believe the A.V. 1611. All of the rigmarole about "errors," "better translations," "only the originals are inspired," "translations are works of men and cannot be inspired," etc., has still not improved or diminished whatsoever. The only thing that a person of Fred Butler's status is capable of doing is finding new ways to masquerade the timeless flaws of those who are more interested in the service of men than in the stewardship of God.

Therefore, in order to make or break Mr. Butler speedily, I presented him with what, if not, should be the standard reply to all Alexandrian apostates. When you review this correspondence, you will see Mr. Butler's words inundated with classic catch phrases and clichés such as "the Bible," "God's Word," etc. Hence, I thought it expedient to provide Mr. Butler with an ultimatum to tell me where I can find this "God's Word" so I can inspect it and study it tangibly. And, just so there was no obfuscation involved, I provided him with a concrete example of exactly what I meant by a "palpable" text. Naturally, when you read his reply, you will immediately observe the sly changing of words, and the embarrassing back peddling employed to attempt to save face while evidently cloaking his true position: Fred

Butler's idea of "God's Word" is a mythological fairytale buried in the unascertainable confines of the first century. Notwithstanding, I also asked Mr. Butler to provide me with the names of the man/men who first showed him that there were/are what they consider "errors" in the King James Bible. Without stating matter-of-factly who showed him "errors" he did provide the names of two individuals who influenced him in a "minor" way toward his "genuine reform to the truth." So, here is Fred Butler, Alexandrian clone number 666,666,666 showing us how it is done in 2005 in regards to evading clear-cut questions while venturing to be doctrinaire and authoritative.

Subj: **Thanks for the plug!**

Date: 5/5/2005 11:48:10 AM Central Standard Time

From: fred@gtj.org

To: Jeffrey Nachimson

Sent from the Internet (Details)

Hey Jeff,

I want to thank you for adding my site to your apostasy list. I find it a great honor to be named in the Alexandrian hall of fame. Do you think you could mention me to Bro. Ruckman? I would be nice to have him name me in one of his monthly rants published in his Bible Bulletin.

Thanks much,

In Christ,

Fred

www.fredsibletalk.com

Subj: **Re: Thanks for the plug!**

Date: 5/6/2005

To: fred@gtj.org

Dear Fred,

Thank you for your recent email. I learned a valuable lesson many moons ago about being held accountable for what you exhibit publicly. When you are the editor or at least a contributor to a website that openly attacks the King's English (even if it is a blatant demonstration of *reductio ad absurdum* by imputing the textual variant in Luke 3:36 onto the A.V. 1611), you must be prepared to be rebuked, criticized,

refuted, and ostracized for so participating in such an imitating feat (as your tactics are essentially a mundane recapitulation of your Bible Correcting forefathers). Nevertheless, in response to your "thank you," you are most certainly welcome.

Sincerely in Jesus Christ,
Jeffrey D. Nachimson

"For we are not as many, which CORRUPT the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ." 2 Corinthians 2:17

Subj: **RE: Thanks for the plug!**
Date: 5/6/2005 3:22:59 PM Central Standard Time
From: fred@gtj.org
To: Jeffrey Nachimson
Sent from the Internet (Details)

Amen Brother,

You capture exactly why I speak against KJV onlyism with your words: KJV only proponents openly attack God's Word and the King's English and they must be prepared to be criticized, rebuked, refuted and separated from. They are a blight upon Christ's Church and must be exposed openly for all to see.

In His Grip,

Fred Butler

www.fredsibletalk.com

PS. Does this mean you will mention me to bro. Ruckman for inclusion in one of his rants for his Bible Bulletin?

many thanks

Subj: **Re: Thanks for the plug!**
Date: 5/6/2005
To: fred@gtj.org

Dear Mr. Butler,

Thank you again for your reply. It is interesting, yet not surprising in the least, that you employ usage of the Alexandrian cliché, "God's word" knowing fully well that

you are unable to produce such a thing with your profession. Therefore, to answer your question, when you are prepared to deliver in no uncertain terms EXACTLY what you mean by "God's word," thereby defining the W-O-R-D-S you are referring to specifically, and thus naming the text and location where I can find this "God's word" that you speak of so casually, then I will be happy to forward the name of Fred Butler (also known as Diotrephes - III John 9-10) to Dr. Ruckman along with a copy of your emails.

Secondly, along with the required information above, you will list when and where you first learned that the King's English contained "errors," how you came to discover them, and who first taught you to exchange the plain words of the A.V. text for the obfuscating tenets of modern scholarship. WHEN and IF you can honestly (Romans 12:17; 2 Corinthians 8:21) provide the above information, I will sincerely deliver your name/material to Dr. Ruckman personally.

However, if you insist on evading the issue, and continue to play the part of the typical scholastic clone (parroting those before you), then our correspondence will cease here. Hence, you have some writing to do. I will eagerly await your honest, firm and sincere answers. Until then...

Sincerely in Jesus Christ,
Jeffrey D. Nachimson

P.S. Just so there is no misunderstanding betwixt us, Friend, let me illustrate my point by answering the propositions above using the converse:

The words of the living God can be found in the text of the Authorized King James Bible without distinction of various editions, revisions or copies (whichever term you "prefer" to employ). Specifically, I defend every word in the text that is before me, which can be palpably and tangibly demonstrated as available for evidence (unlike this "God's word" so generically abused by the Alexandrian Cult). This text is holy, infallible, given by inspiration, and without proven error of any sort.

Secondly, I first heard about the infallibility of the King James Bible preached from the pulpit of the Christian school that I attended (at first as an unsaved teenager), then subsequent to my receiving Jesus Christ in September of 1993, the Lord opened my eyes to the subtlety of modern English Bible versions and the inerrancy of the A.V. 1611 through some material published by Jack Chick (I had never even heard of Peter Ruckman). The first people to influence me in this regard were my first pastor (Russell Tuck) and my high school principal (Robert Nicholson).

Now, if your answers are not somewhat plain like those above; short and to the point, then we have nothing further to discuss. You see, after 50 years in the ministry, Dr. Ruckman has seen every "sleight of men" (Ephesians 4:14) utilized by the Bible Corrector. If you really want to catch his attention, then tell us how you first learned to mess with the King James Bible and "correct" it. Personally, I don't

think that you have the guts or the grace to answer truthfully and forthrightly. You now have ONE reply to make your case...JN

Subj: RE: Thanks for the plug!

Date: 5/9/2005 11:02:39 AM Central Standard Time

From: fred@gtty.org

To: Jeffrey Nachimson

Sent from the Internet (Details)

El Jeffy,

Wow! I never thought I would have to qualify to have Bro. Ruckman hurl curses and insults at me in one of his monthly published rants. I figured any apostates who wrote against KJV onlyism could risk a cruel slash of his pen. When did he raise the bar with such high standards? I will have to tell the other cultic boys at our monthly Alexandrian meeting that Bro. Ruckman has taken it up a notch as for who he libels in his papers. Thanks for that info!

I reckon I have the intestinal fortitude to answer your questions:

Specifically, the W-O-R-D-S of God are found in any reputable translation of the copies of the copies et. al. of the original inspired documents God's people where moved by the Holy Spirit to write. You could locate a copy on my desk, or at Wal-Mart if you are so inclined to visit. I further believe God is more powerful than heretics, so he never allowed any to get away with intentionally corrupt His WORDS so as to permanently introduce heresy to lead His redeemed Church astray as KJVOs speculate in their literature. Heretics spread false doctrine by misinterpreting God's word, not by changing it as KJVers insist. I believe Westcott and Hort were fine Christian men, as far as Anglican Christians go, contrary to the lies KJVers utter against them by twisting their written material. They were just as "godly" as Anglicans as the Baptist killing, royal rear-end kissing, baby sprinkling Anglican KJV translators were during their day.

I first became a KJVer after my conversion when I was introduced to the heresy by a friend named Rich Christiano and his buddy Jeff Bartel (now missionary in Albania). Pastor Gary Flynt of OK (at the time) solidified my beliefs with his poorly researched book on the subject of Bible versions. Like an undiscerning dope, I imbibe every word and believed it all for ten years.

God Almighty was pleased to lead me out of onlyism by illuminating my mind to the truth. One of the key "instruments" he used to slice that cancer out from my soul was Gail Riplinger and her deplorable book, New Age Versions. When I began to re-check Ms. Riplinger's claims against the footnoted sources and what her detractors actually stated, God revealed to me how low KJV only "scholarship" will

stoop to revise historic fact, selectively edit, and in some case make up out of thin air, an apologetic belief that only promotes a lie.

My full confession as a KJVer for 10 years can be located here:

<http://www.fredsibletalk.com/fb019.html>

If you are not inclined to read it, some of the heretical "apostate" points you could pass along to Bro.. Ruckman is

Master Seminary

John MacArthur

James White

Calvinism

Though these were minor players God used in my genuine personal Reform to the truth, I am sure they are "Red Flags" in your mind and should qualify as a mention in one of Bro. Ruckman's rants against me. Maybe he can paint me as a character in one of his illustrations, also.

Yours in Jesus

Fred Butler

www.fredsibletalk.com

Nachimson: The first thing that should be noticed is my original proposition to Mr. Butler:

"Therefore, to answer your question, when you are prepared to deliver in no uncertain terms EXACTLY what you mean by "God's word," thereby defining the W-O-R-D-S you are referring to specifically, and thus naming the text and location where I can find this "God's word" that you speak of so casually, then I will be happy to forward."

Notwithstanding, I was even kind enough to give Mr. Butler an example of this condition, when I illustrated:

"The words of the living God can be found in the text of the Authorized King James Bible without distinction of various editions, revisions or copies (whichever term you "prefer" to employ). Specifically, I defend every word in the text that is before me, which can be palpably and tangibly demonstrated as available for evidence (unlike this "God's word" so generically abused by the Alexandrian Cult). This text is holy, infallible, given by inspiration, and without proven error of any sort."

Notice the details of the proposition and the example:

- "Exactly" what you means by "God's Word," which is supposed to "define" the "W-O-R-D-S."
- "Name" the "text" (notice the singular) of this "God's Word."
- Where is the "location" of this "God's Word?"

My own illustration demonstrates these points:

- The words of the living God can be " palpably and tangibly demonstrated as available for evidence."
- The Authorized King James Bible
- Here on my desk available for evidentiary presentation.

You see; I already knew Mr. Butler's position before he even wrote to me. How? His position is the same position of every Bible-correcting would be intellectual on the planet in any decade, from any denominational affiliation. I proved this point to the tune of several pages in my article, " An Inquiry into the Interpretation of Translational Inspiration." In that article I demonstrated that an Alexandrian believes in the infallibility of a bunch of lost papers that are no longer tangibly available for evidence. In short, what they are capable of producing for examination doesn't coincide with their profession. I quoted Wilbur Pickering who provided the information that at our current state we do not have the precise wording of the "original text." Hence, any profession in the inerrancy of the "original text" is nothing more that verbose moonshine.

Question: How does Mr. Butler handle the proposition?

- " Specifically, the W-O-R-D-S of God are found in any reputable translation of the copies of the copies et. al. of the original inspired documents God's people where moved by the Holy Spirit to write."

Nachimson: Now, wait just a minute, sir. The proposition was that you tell me "EXACTLY" what you mean by "God's Word." Secondly, the proposition included, ".thus naming the text." Please note the singular usage of "the text." What we have here is nothing more than the ramblings of a confused man (I Cor. 14:33), who is NOW KNOWN by the multitude of words (Ecclesiastes 5:3) that have proceeded out of his fool mouth. Mr. Butler has failed to demonstrate what "God's Word" is. He says "any reputable translation" (which COULD BE any one of 200 English translations, or maybe even another foreign language translation; after all, he doesn't say). Nevertheless, what does "any reputable translation" have to do with FINAL AUTHORITY? It doesn't! "Any reputable translation" relegates the

devilish principle of multiple authorities, just as in Genesis 3. I humbly appeal to the reader, who then becomes the FINAL AUTHORITY in the midst of "any reputable translation"? Why, Fred Butler, of course. We shouldn't expect anything less.

- Butler never answers this question. He couldn't and didn't name the text.
- "You could locate a copy on my desk, or at Wal-Mart if you are so inclined to visit."

Nachimson: Now, wait just a minute again, sir. You are saying that I can locate "a copy" of "any reputable translation," which according to your own words are "the copies of the copies et. al. of the original inspired documents God's people were moved by the Holy Spirit to write." So, to simply matters, I can find a copy of many copies of reputable translations, which were taken from many copies of more copies of "the original inspired documents" (documents huh? What happened to "God's Word"?). Well isn't that something? During this entire shindig I've been looking for "THE" text. It looks like Mr. Butler failed to keep up with his end of the bargain.

Again, notice the illusion to II Peter 1:21. "God's people were moved by the Holy Spirit to write." This is another typical Alexandrian shenanigan. Later you will observe that Mr. Butler says that he ditched the King James Bible because of poor Bible study habits from other A.V. only proponents. However, notice, as a plethora of Bible-correctors do, is forget the W-O-R-D-S of II Peter 1:21, pretend that the verse is discussing writing, then posit the verse as a proof text for only the "original manuscripts" ARE (but, they really mean "were") inspired. But, really, who has the poor reading habits, even if some have exercised poor study habits? "For 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." In this passage, original inspiration had absolutely nothing to do with writing; it had to do with SPEAKING.

I hope the reader is able to come to the conclusion as to why these individuals cannot be taken seriously for even a moment. If for nothing else, they cannot back up what they, even after agreeing to do so. When Fred Butler got rid of his King James Bible, at that time he became unable to show anybody inquiring what "God's Word" is, where the Scriptures are, and what the name of the text is.

However, all of this is mere child's play compared to the actual frivolous nature of Mr. Butler's "reputable" psychosis. On his website, Mr. Butler has an article, <http://www.fredsibletalk.com/fb023.html> in which he places the blame on the King's English for the inclusion of name "Cainan" in the Lord's genealogy in Luke 3:36. He uses this verse as a crutch to cast doubt on the veracity of the A.V. 1611. However, it should be noted, and much to the chagrin of his new found love for "scholarship," that the name "Cainan" in Luke 3:36 is also found in the multitude of "any reputable translation" on his desk and at Wal-Mart. The name is also included in the Nestle-Aland 27 th edition critical text following the spelling of the

name as found in Aleph and B (however, the difference is in the last letter where the Receptus has it as a n and the critical texts as a m). While appealing to its exclusion from P75, Mr. Butler didn't bother to tell his reading audience that the critical sign in Nestle's shows that the verse in question is *vid*, which means that is a questionable reading in that passage in the manuscript. Therefore, leaving the verse in Codex Cantabrigensis (or Bezae; D), it should be taken into consideration that there is more manuscript evidence for I John 5:7 than for this reading that Mr. Butler says is incorrect in the A.V. 1611 (but in reality is an "error" in all of the modern, "reputable" English versions since they read as the A.V.)

Next, Mr. Butler was kind enough to include some further information in his correspondence that I didn't ask him to provide. Nevertheless, I will examine it here. He stated:

"God is more powerful than heretics, so he never allowed any to get away with intentionally corrupt His WORDS so as to permanently introduce heresy to lead His redeemed Church astray as KJVOs speculate in their literature. Heretics spread false doctrine by misinterpreting God's word, not by changing it as KJVers insist."

Nachimson: According to Dean Burgon's book, "The Causes of Corruption of the Traditional Text," chapters 13 and 14 are dedicated to exposing the "causes of corruption chiefly intentional; corruption by heretics; corruption by the orthodox," which include passages such as John 1:18 and John 3:13. The false readings in these two passages, which have made their way into the modern English versions, still infect the church of God today.

Secondly, Mr. Butler evidently hasn't studied his Bible very aptly if he is going to be insistent that heretics spread false doctrine by misinterpretation and not by "changing" the word of God. Actually, the outline given us in Genesis 3, and put to practice by the devil in Matthew 4, illustrates that several factors are involved in false doctrine, not just one:

- "Yea, hath God said?"- Doubt the veracity of the words
- "We may eat of the trees of the garden"- Omission of the word "freely"
- "But of the fruit of the tree which is the midst of the garden"- Misinterpretation/Ignorance of the context; Eve had the wrong tree here.
- "Neither shall ye touch"- Addition
- "Lest ye die"- Substitution/ Paraphrase
- "Ye shall not surely die"- Misapplication/transposition

All of these factors took place with the changing of the words of God in Genesis 3. Heresy is not the result of one factor; it is combination of many deceptive facets.

The next proposition that I gave to Mr. Butler read as thus:

"Secondly, along with the required information above, you will list when and where you first learned that the King's English contained "errors," how you came to discover them, and who first taught you to exchange the plain words of the A.V. text for the obfuscating tenets of modern scholarship."

As with the proposition about, I presented him with a verifiable example concerning my point of reference:

"God Almighty was pleased to lead me out of onlyism by illuminating my mind to the truth. One of the key "instruments" he used to slice that cancer out from my soul was Gail Riplinger and her deplorable book, New Age Versions. When I began to re-check Ms. Riplinger's claims against the footnoted sources and what her detractors actually stated, God revealed to me how low KJV only "scholarship" will stoop to revise historic fact, selectively edit, and in some case make up out of thin air, an apologetic belief that only promotes a lie.

My full confession as a KJVer for 10 years can be located here:

<http://www.fredsibletalk.com/fb019.html>

If you are not inclined to read it, some of the heretical "apostate" points you could pass along to Bro.. Ruckman is

Master Seminary

John MacArthur

James White

Calvinism

Though these were minor players God used in my genuine personal Reform to the truth, I am sure they are "Red Flags" in your mind and should qualify as a mention in one of Bro. Ruckman's rants against me. Maybe he can paint me as a character in one of his illustrations, also.

Nachimson: Now, hold on just a minute, buddy. Nowhere in this despicable diatribe does Fred Butler attempt to tell me who taught him that there were supposed "errors" in the King James Bible. I didn't ask the man about "minor players" in his "genuine personal Reform to the truth." So, it appears that Mr. Butler failed on both counts. This is exactly why I never wasted my time forwarding this information to Peter Ruckman, and this is exactly why I never wasted five minutes responding to

Fred Butler again. He is a liar, a charlatan, and completely incapable of answering a series of simple questions about his professing to have "God's Word." However, it should be noted the two main features that fed Mr. Butler into the depths of Scholarship Onlyism. God never lead this man out of any "onlyism." Mr. Butler simply traded one "onlyism" for another. He traded Final, Absolute Authority for his own preference and opinion. The two main features are as follows:

- **His dependence on King James Scholarship faltered in his own opinion.**
- **The heretical, deceptive doctrine of Calvinism. Please note above how Mr. Butler subtly capitalized the word "Reform," as that is what the T-U-L-I-P adherents call their theological proclivity.**

If you will notice above, he mentions John MacArthur and James White as "minor players" in his quest for truth. Both of these individuals are five point Calvinists, and neither of these individuals hold to any Final, Absolute, written authority above their own intellect. Hence, their influence rolls infelicitously off of Mr. Butler's pen:

" There is not one pristine line of Greek manuscripts that represent the providentially preserved Word of God, nor is there a line of good Bible versions that God divinely directed to end with the purified King James Version. It is true that God calls us to have faith, but our faith is grounded upon objective truth. We are not to have faith in contrived and subjective speculations, which is what KJV onlyism is ultimately founded upon." (Butler, <http://www.fredsibletalk.com/fb019.html>)

So, what is there? Copies of copies? The original mss. that do not exist? "Any reputable translation" that you prefer? Isn't it a farce at best to proliferate the idea that you purport objective truth, but every aspect of modern scholarship is based on the subjective opposite? Who that has studied the issue of Final Authority hasn't discovered that the enemies of the King's English have:

- **Not followed their rules of Greek grammar and syntax consistently when it comes to the Greek article, verb tenses and moods, aspects of the participle, rendering adjectives adverbially, etc.**
- **Lied about King James being a homosexual without examining the evidence OBJECTIVELY**
- **Employed the usage of dynamic equivalency while complaining about the A.V. 1611 doing the same thing.**
- **Refused to adhere to the principle of uniform translation while persecuting the King's English for not always translating uniformly.**

- Constantly rejected older readings found in the papyri (such as P46 in Ephesians 5:9), when those readings vindicate the A.V. 1611.
- Purposefully employed another method of translation in passages that can be translated multiple ways just to cast doubt on the King James text (Acts 4:27; I Timothy 6:10; Acts 5:30)
- Said that there are innumerable amounts of archaic words in the King James Bible when some of those very words are listed concurrently in such publications as "100 words that every high school graduate ought to know."

In short, Fred Butler considers what he and his friend prefer as "objective truth," but in reality all that one can find in his writings are the marks of relativity (multiple translations, refusal to answer questions definitively, etc.)

In closing, I would like to elaborate and expound on a point that I made earlier. The difference between an individual like myself and an individual like Fred Butler is that my belief in the King James Bible has nothing to do with any other King James Only advocates. The reason that I stress this point is that one of the primary points that Mr. Butler presents as evidence for his departure from the A.V. 1611 to who knows what other-ism is because of the supposed misguided efforts of Gail Riplinger.

Now understand that Peter Ruckman was my teacher for three years while I attended his school; I have studied his material since about one year after my conversion to Jesus Christ; I have all of his commentaries, all of his books on the King James Bible, and have heard him lecture 3-4 nights a week (not including church services) for three years. But, I'm here to say even with all of that, I have found errors in his books on the King James Bible that don't move me one inch from my position. The point here is that that Book (the A.V. 1611) is infallible, not the translators of it, not the men and women who believe in it, etc. The only infallible thing on this earth is that Book. Peter Ruckman, Gail Riplinger, Sam Gipp, etc., have their errors, and are subject to further error. However, they can never go wrong placing their faith in the words of the King James Bible instead of the ever-changing face of modern "Christian" scholarship. For a full confirmation of this point, please see my upcoming article, "May In Fiction" where I examine and refute an article by James May. There he back peddles tremendously and admits that a verse that he said was in "error" in the King James Bible, was only an "error" in his imagination.

2 Timothy 3:16 - Which Bible Constitutes the Scriptures?

By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson

In the fall of 2002, during my first semester at the Pensacola Bible Institute, I sent approximately 90 emails out to various religious organizations, Bible Colleges, pastors, theological seminaries, churches, etc. in order to ascertain a consensus as to what constitutes the Scriptures in the English tongues based on a literal interpretation of II Timothy 3:16. If, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.," then where can we find these Scriptures? As the keen observer will testify, the vast majorities of the commentators do not answer the question but delve off into red-herring answers to keep the Bible-Believer off of their scent. However, while inspecting the contents of the emails and statements, keep in the mind the following:

- Not one of the individuals pinpoint any written FINAL AUTHORITY that can be tangibly examined anywhere on the face of this earth.
- All of the individuals represented, recommend MULTIPLE AUTHORITIES, and leave the decision up to the individual. Thus, YOU become the ultimate authority in such matters.
- Most appeal to the authority of the so-called "Original Manuscripts" that have absolutely no practical value to a Christian anywhere since they do not exist.
- Some actually go as far as to tell you that the contents of the "original writings are located throughout the plethora of over 5,000 extant manuscripts available for inspection. However, NOT ONE of the writers represented do not tell you the precise text that is supposedly, "original."
- Practically all of the represented commentators appeal to Greek and Hebrew Scholarship rather than the plain words of the English Bible. Hence, we call this "Scholarship Onlyism"
- To these types of people, the word "Scripture" is not a direct reference to the W-O-R-D-S of God, but a general reference to an entity that doesn't exist. For example, you will see an appeal to the idea that the doctrines are preserved or "the truth of Scripture" is preserved even though the words differ, etc. However, the emphasis placed by our Lord Jesus Christ is upon the W-O-R-D-S of God (see John 14:23; 15:7; 12:48; 8:47, etc.)
- The greatest type of deception is by a man that says he "holds in his hands the WORD OF GOD," capitalizing the "w" to make it look like he is reverencing the book. Nevertheless, this kind of deceiver still will not tell you where you can get the Scriptures, or which Bible constitutes the Scriptures. Hence, the capitalization is for effect to make you think he believes the Bible, while he endorses nothing of the sort.

*** REMEMBER: THE ONLY THINGS A BIBLE CORRECTOR BELIEVES IN ARE, (1) HIS OWN EDUCATION, AND (2) HIS APPEAL TO "BIBLICAL" SCHOLARSHIP.**

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

In the absence of Dr. Wheeler, I have been asked to respond to your question, "which Bible constitutes the Scriptures?" All of the Bibles that we have today are translations of the original texts which were originally written in Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic. Whenever translations are made from one language to another, the translator has problems. First there are words in the original languages from which there are no equivalents in English. Proper English sentences have verbs. It is possible to have verb-less sentences in Hebrew. Therefore, when a translation is made, a verb must be added. A translator can provide a translation that attempts to be very literal. A literal translation, however, can be misinterpreted by an English speaking reader who does not understand that some expressions are idiomatic in Hebrew and Greek or words are used differently. For example, in Biblical Hebrew, "heart" means "mind" because the ancient Hebrews thought of the heart as the center of intellectual activity and the kidneys as the center of emotions. If someone translates, "I love you with all of my kidneys," an English speaker would not understand. (I made up that sentence. It is not in the Bible.) No translation is flawless. Translations work hard at translating in such a way as to capture the meaning as well as the words of Scripture. Ironically, more recent translations of the Bible are more accurate than older ones because today we have more ancient manuscripts from finds in archaeological sites and ancient libraries. Scholars base their translations on the oldest and best manuscripts in existence today.

We do not know exactly to which Scripture 2 Tim. 3 is referring. Likely, the author of the epistle had what we call the Old Testament in mind because that would be the Scripture that would have been available at that time. The New Testament was still in process.

I would advise you to get a good translation or even more than one translation to read and study. Each one provides insight.

I recommend:

- *The New Revised Standard Version*
- *The New American Bible*
- *The New International Version*
- *The TANAKH (a Jewish translation of the Old Testament only)*
- *The New Jerusalem Bible*

- *The New English Bible*

All of these attempt to faithfully translate the Old and New Testaments.

The Bible that constitutes the Scriptures is the one that speaks to your heart.

Wilma Bailey

Associate Professor of Hebrew and Aramaic Scripture

Christian Theological Seminary

1000 West 42 nd Street

Indianapolis, IN 46208

FULLER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

My experience has been that the only way to get at the Bible is to learn the original languages. Take correspondence courses from universities in Greek and then Hebrew. Do not go to classes. Get tapes for how the languages are pronounced. I use diglots for the OT and NT. Do not use interlinears. After 50 years I still use them to keep up my Greek and Hebrew.

All translations have to be expositions of what the translators think the original text means. Those who really value God's verbally-inspired, inerrant word will be frustrated until they can get back to the Hebrew and the Greek.

If one had a love letter from someone writing in another language, one would want to learn that language to get the real "feel" of the words the loved one used. The tragedy is that so few people care what the Bible is saying in the originals. The translators do the best they can, but it cannot be as good as the originals.

BIBLICAL LIFE COLLEGE & SEMINARY

From the point of an educator, I would say that the scripture in its original language was inspired of God. The King James Version comes pretty close. In my personal studies, I use the King James Version and then supplement it with the Amplified Bible or a good linear bible that is keynoted to Strong's.

Dr. Michael K. Lake

Biblical Life College & Seminary

P.O. Box 588

Marshfield, MO 65706-0588

Phone: 417-859-0881 Fax: 417-859-0883

Email: drlake@biblical-life.com

Website: [http: www.biblical-life.com](http://www.biblical-life.com)

HOUSTON GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

I would answer your question simply that "Scriptures" today would be any Bible which maintains a basic faithfulness to the Greek and Hebrew originals (using the term "originals" very loosely to mean those early manuscripts accepted as canonical). This would include translations ranging from the King James historically to modern translations such as New International Versions and New Living Translation. The actual difference in wording does not change the truth of the Scripture God has given to us.

Dr. Chuck Pitts

Houston Graduate School of Theology

1311 Holman

Houston, TX 77004

713-942-9506

capitts@hgst.edu

SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Most of the translations available are fine, depending on your purpose. If you are doing serious study from an English translation New American Standard or English Standard Version are good. To get the general message of the Biblical text and idiomatic translation like the New Living Translation is excellent. The New International Version is a good all purpose translation.

All of these have been produced by thoroughly evangelical scholars with a high view of Scripture and a deep passion for God.

I hope this helps.

May God be with you.

Daniel. I. Block

KNOX THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Dear Sir, you ask, "Brethren, if I may ask, which Bible [translation] today constitutes the scriptures?" We must be careful to distinguish between the Scriptures and the translations of them. The Scriptures are constituted by all the 66 books of the Old Testament in Hebrew and Aramaic and the New Testament in Greek, excluding the Apocrypha. These Scriptures must be translated into the common language of every nation, because all the people of God do not understand the original languages in which the Scriptures were originally written and received. Consequently, the only translation that is sufficient for the purposes stated in 2 Timothy 3 is one that is based on and aims to be faithful to the original languages. One other factor to consider is which approach the translation takes to the work of translation. The two major approaches today are "word for word" and "thought for thought." For your purposes as one new to the study of the Bible, a "word for word" translation is less likely to express the translators' own interpretations of the original text. There are a number of translations (KJV, NKJV, ASV, NASV, etc.) that fit the criteria mentioned here. Check the introductions to the translations to see if they meet these criteria. In a phrase, a word for word translation of the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.

R. Fowler White, Ph.D

Knox Theological Seminary

5554 N. Fed. Hwy.

Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308

Phone: 954-771-0376; Fax: 954-351-3318

Email: fwhite@knoxseminary.org

THE MASTERS SEMINARY

You can confidently use either the New American Standard Bible (NASB) or the English Standard Version (ESV).

Richard Mayhue (Vice-President)

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION

It would help to know if you belong to a denomination and if so which one. You have asked me and you must know that I am a Roman Catholic theologian thus my perspective comes out of this tradition. You also must know that the bible was written in various languages, the two most important ones being Hebrew and Greek. Because most of us do not speak this language, they must be translated. I don't know if you speak another language besides English but if you did you would know how two different people can translate the same word two different ways. Thus, the many translations of the Bible. Roman Catholics also point out that the Bible was written by a community which we call the Church. In that sense, interpretation of the Bible belongs rightfully to a community rather than the individual. For that reason, one needs to study how this community, the Church, has interpreted the Scriptures throughout the centuries. There is, however, another way to read the Scriptures. One can read the Scriptures in a spiritual way. God often speaks to us through the Scriptures. It has been a centuries old practice in the Roman Catholic tradition to read the Scriptures to sense God's presence with us. I hope this helps. If you have a bachelor's degree, you might consider the Graduate Theological Union a place to study. There are many denominations within the GTU and if you are not Roman Catholic perhaps one of the others might be helpful. God bless you and guide you on your journey.

Professor Garcia Rivera

NEW ORLEANS BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

I would really like to talk to you at length about the Scripture. If you could call me sometime, I would be happy to talk to you about it.

The short answer is that all of the translations can be regarded as Scripture. In my understanding, the miracle of God is that he not only gave us a true and accurate word in the original languages, he has also preserved his word through all of the translations. I feel confident that we can hear God speak in all of the translations.

Blessings

J. Duke

EAST BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Since the Bible was written in Greek and Hebrew, and since there is more than once way to translate things from one language to another, there are many valid translations. But because translations are not in themselves what God inspired (in contrast to the Bible as originally written), it's good to compare translations to try to get the most accurate understanding of the original. (To learn Greek and Hebrew is even better, but I know that is not a practical solution for everybody who wants to read the Bible.) Usually you can use more word-for-word translations (like the NASB) to help keep the more meaning-for-meaning translations (like the NIV) honest; the former are closer to the original syntax (but miss figures of speech, etc.), the latter are easier to understand and try to render ancient figures in more understandable English. Keep in mind that even if our translations were perfect (and it were linguistically possible for any one translation to exactly communicate the nuances of one language into another, which it is not), we wouldn't understand perfectly because we're not perfect. =) As Paul says in 1 Cor 13, we know in part and prophesy in part, and that will remain the case until Jesus returns and we know even as we are known.

Your brother and fellow worker,

Craig Keener

GEORGE W. TRUETT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The original scriptures were written in Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic. If we had them they would be the authentic scriptures. Unfortunately none of them exist today. All other Bibles are attempts to translate God's word into today's language. None is perfect but they are all absolute reliable. Probably the New American Standard version is the nearest to correct. Hope that helps.

Paul W. Powell (Dean of Graduate Studies)

BAPTIST BIBLE SEMINARY (PENNSYLVANIA)

God has gloriously inspired and faithfully preserved His infallible Word. We have a multitude of manuscripts of the Old Testament in Hebrew and New Testament in Greek. Based on these manuscripts we can compare them and come to conclusions about the original text of scripture. Of the translations recommend by conservative Bible scholars today here are some and a perspective on their strengths.

- **King James Version**- A conservative, fairly literal translation in classic English that has been greatly used of God in Church History.

- **New King James Version-** based on the same set of Greek and Hebrew Texts as the KJV- more contemporary language while maintaining the dignity of the KJV in the NKJV.
- **New American Standard Version-** a favorite of serious Bible Students because of its literal translation. It sometimes does not flow as fluidly in English but is very helpful in getting to a close understanding of the Greek and Hebrew.
- **New International Version-** a more easily read English Version but not as literal as the KJV; NKJV or NASV. The newer version called the TNIV is very controversial because of its Gender Neutral dealing with the translation of the Greek and Hebrew. I am not comfortable at all with the TNIV.

I hope this is helpful to you.

In Christ,

Jim Jeffrey (President)

ST. VLADIMIR'S ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

I personally think that the best English translation of the Bible is the old RSV. One must go to the original however, and for the OT one must always consider the LXX translation. The Bible is not "fallen from heaven," and there is no text that is considered the right or correct one. All have differences from the others. You might consider pursuing the issue further with biblical scholars. I would recommend Dr. John Barnet at St. Vladimir's Seminary. His email is jbarnet@svots.edu.

May God guide your way.

Father Thomas Hopko

DR. ROBERT L. HYMERS JR.

I perceive that you are a Ruckmanite. I suggest that you go to the menu, on the left side of our webpage, and go down to the button which says, "Book on Ruckmanism." My entire book on this subject is reproduced there.

Yours in Jesus,

Dr. R.L. Hymers Jr.

PIEDMONT BAPTIST COLLEGE

Thank you for your note. I was not sure if you were looking for an undergrad or graduate program. We have both here. You can go to the college web site for admissions and other information.

www.pbc.edu

The college and grad school policy is that we are to use the KJV as our text and use in chapel etc. I have no problem telling my students that what I hold in my hand is the Word of God.

Dr. Clay L. Nuttall, Dean of Graduate Division

Piedmont Baptist College

716 Franklin St.

Winston Salem, NC 27101

Office 336-725-8344 Ext. 2209

Cell 336-655-3780

cnut@pbc.edu

J.L. HAYES

My personal recommendation of a translation of the Bible would depend upon several factors. However, for the sake of simplicity, I will give you the following advice. If you are new to the Bible and Christian thought, I would recommend a very readable translation that I have found to be extremely reliable, the New Living Translation. On the other hand, as you progress and need a more precise translation, there are a few from which to choose: 1) the King James, though the language may cause you some difficulty to begin with; but if you stick with it, you will adapt; 2) the New King James, very accurate, the language has been updated to make it more readable, and 3) the New American Standard, like the KJV and NKJ is very accurate in its translation of the Greek. From beginning to end any of these versions would be extremely helpful to you as you progress in your Bible study.

In His Service,

J.L. Hayes (Ephesians 2:8-9)

CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The issue need not be so perplexing as some try to make it. I agree with most other fundamentalists, along with the translators of the beloved King James Version, that ANY non-sectarian translation of the bible that accurately reflects (as much as is humanly possible) the wording of the original, inspired and inerrant autographs is the authoritative Word of God to that language group.

Sincerely,

Roy Beacham

MAY IN FICTION: *Being a Forthright Vindication of the Text of Matthew 14:9 in the Authorized Version of the Holy Bible Against the Intolerable Remarks to the Contrary Offered by Mr. James May*
By: Jeffrey D. Nachimson

James May is an individual, who under the auspices of Douglas Kutilek (Mr. Kutilek is the editor of the anti-A.V. 1611 website¹ on which Mr. May posts articles) has joined the ranks of contemporary, Bible-correcting apostates, who purport scholarship as their final authority, while incessantly sitting in judgment on the Authorized Version of the Holy Bible. Specifically, Mr. May drafts articles on the website noted above, although mostly in defense of Dr. Westcott, he has indeed engineered two treatises which seek to dispose of the believer's faith in a single, absolute, written, tangible authority that God has given him in the universal language of the end time. The first article² was considered in part by me³ when I provided Greek syntactical documentation vindicating the A.V. 1611 of an "error" which Mr. May decided was prevalent in the King James Bible based on his own subjective ideas of translation particularity. I was able to exonerate the A.V. text against the elementary accusations of Mr. May, and demonstrate with utter ease, that the Greek accusative plural *ορκους* is reasonably translated as an English singular possessive in the King James Bible (oath's) instead of a plural (oaths) as found in some of the modern versions (NIV, NASB, NKJV, etc., although it is translated as a singular in the New Living Translation, and Kenneth Wuest's own expanded translation in his, "The Gospel of Mark According to the Greek New Testament for the English Reader."), which see.

The second draft proffered by Mr. May I discovered serendipitously while doing a routine inspection of the contents of Kutilek's site⁴. From time to time I examine the contents of the Alexandrian apostate websites to keep up with their discontented antics against the King's English. Evidently, someone had delivered my article to Mr. May, to which he decided to respond on the anti-King James website. This article, which was intended by Mr. May to be a clever rebuttal, actually dissipated into calamitous rubbish. However, knowing fully well that denunciation is not argument, neither reiteration proof⁵, I shall endeavor to prove that Mr. May was much better off by leaving his comments on my original article within the confines of his own imagination, than attempting such infantile excursions into delusions of grandeur.

First, I must confess that although not in the least bit surprised, I am greatly perplexed by Mr. May's apparent self-contradiction in dictating what he means by "Greek text." For example in the first paragraph of his rebuttal composition, he states expressly:

Earlier this year I wrote and posted to the Internet a paper entitled, "The Great Inconsistency of King James Onlyism." In the paper, I devoted three pages, out of a total of 28, to a brief discussion of five verses where the King James Version is not an accurate translation of any Greek text. One of the examples that I gave is found in

Matthew 14:9. In this verse, the Greek word translated as "oath's" is plural. While the 1611 KJV lacks the apostrophe that would indicate number, current editions have placed the apostrophe such that the word is singular in English.

If the reader will please call his attention to the portion in bold (which I placed in bold print for emphasis), he will immediately observe that Mr. May states that the A.V. 1611 reading was not an accurate translation of ANY GREEK TEXT. Yet, at the conclusion of his examination, the following peculiar words are discovered:

Nachimson imagines that those of us who believe in the inerrancy of Scripture and yet reject his view of the KJV are on some desperate mission to find error in the version of 1611. In reality, our belief in the inerrancy of the Greek text as given by the Holy Spirit compels us to reject a manmade English translation that contradicts both itself in its various editions and the Greek text. We would be delighted if the KJV provided us with a perfect translation of God's word. We must, however, live in the world as it is, not as we might like it to be.

Again, Mr. May's words have been placed in bold print for emphasis. As the keen observer will notice with a brief perusal of the two quotes from Mr. May, at one point he states "any Greek text," and by the end of his diatribe resorts to the usual, "the Greek text." To this sort of manifest hypocrisy, I have devoted an entire article⁶ to the truthful proposition that this proclamation of faith "*in the inerrancy of the Greek text as given by the Holy Spirit*" (see above), is nothing more than a mythological concoction, fabricated to fool gullible and unsuspecting readers into believing that these individuals believe the Bible, when they can produce nothing of the kind. In my article just mentioned, I give the quotations from a variety of sources that show, beyond any reasonable doubt, that these self-deluded and self-indulged persons, while professing a PRESENT TENSE belief in the inerrancy and infallibility of "the Bible," go right along and prove themselves but feeble liars when they cannot produce the precise text that they ardently declare that they believe. Such, naturally, is the exact case with Mr. James May. For the life of him, even after reading this treatise, will not make any public statement regarding "the Greek text" that he believes is inerrant "*as given by the Holy Spirit.*" He will resort to anti-intellectual subterfuge regurgitating the age-old lie that this text can be found in the plethora of existing Greek manuscripts (this is the tuck-tail and run tactic employed by Dr. Roy Beecham of Central Baptist Seminary in Minnesota). When Mr. May says that he believes in an inerrant Greek text, he is lying through his teeth. What this man believes is that the "original manuscripts" WERE once inspired and inerrant, but are now lost, and the most we have access to is an "accurate text." However, basing concern on the words extolled by Mr. May, I would like to know where this "*inerrancy of the Greek text as given by the Holy Spirit*" is tangibly located at this very moment where I can ascertain it and read it? What I would like to know is not a textual jigsaw puzzle of over 5,000 mss., but "THE GREEK TEXT" (note the singular) that the A.V. supposedly "contradicts." (See May's comments above). Therefore, it is abundantly clear and utterly manifest that "*those of us* (those of May's persuasion) *who believe in the inerrancy of Scripture,*" are compelled to

"reject a manmade English translation" because the "Scripture" that they profess to "believe in" is a nonexistent fairytale that scurried off in the 1st century. The definitive proof for this is that these individuals, and especially Mr. May, who in reality only believe in their own opinions, cannot produce this "TEXT" that they say is "inerrant."

One of James May's first articles posted on Kutilek's website (which formerly was edited by Gary Hudson, who has subsequently removed all of his anti-A.V. 1611 material from that website for whatever reason), was a critique of Gail Riplinger's work, "New Age Bible Versions."⁷ However, it should be observed, despite the liberal use of ellipsis by Ms. Riplinger, the following statement made by her in that book, is both timeless, and a definitive demonstration exhibiting the frivolous stupidity of men like James May who are foolish enough to employ usage of contradictory rhetoric such as, "The Greek Text," when he could not produce such a thing in any court of law in the United States. Discussing the phraseology, "the original Greek," Ms. Riplinger devised an ingenious reply:

*So, which Greek? Aleph1, Aleph2, Aleph3, B1, B2, B3, C, L, W, Textus Receptus, Westcott and Hort, Scrivener's, Alfred, Griesbach, Elzevir, Erasmus, Tischendorf, Lachman, Souter, von Soden, Hodge-Farstad, Nestle's-Aland, (If so which edition between 1 and 26?) UBS-Aland, Black, Metzger, Wikgren (Which edition between 1 and 4?) or the Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators.*⁸

Naturally, other texts such as Tregelles, Nestle-Aland 27th edition, Bengel, Wetstein, Scholz, Bentley, and Mill could be added to this list, but the point is made: **WHEN JAMES MAY OR SOME OTHER THEOLOGICAL DILETTANTE LIKE HIM MAKES A FATUOUS STATEMENT SUCH AS "THE INERRANCY OF THE GREEK TEXT" THEY ARE NOT PREPARED TO TELL YOU WHICH GREEK TEXT THEY ARE REFERRING TO!**⁹

Another repugnancy located in the writings of Mr. James May is this assertion, this mere fabrication, that the various editions of the King James Bible are somehow a contradiction. Mr. May states at the end of his treatise:

In reality, our belief in the inerrancy of the Greek text as given by the Holy Spirit compels us to reject a manmade English translation that contradicts both itself in its various editions and the Greek text. We would be delighted if the KJV provided us with a perfect translation of God's word. We must, however, live in the world as it is, not as we might like it to be

Several pertinent facts should be duly proliferated at this juncture:

1) Because of such bold animadversions as seen above with May's last sentence, it is this precise reason as to why I entitled this review, "May in Fiction." To such fanciful, extravagant, stretches of the mind, Dean Burgon once answered in

conjunction with F.J.A. Hort stating that "the Syrian Text" MUST be the result of a recension:

But why 'must' it? Instead of 'must in fact,' we are disposed to read 'MAY -in fiction.'
10

Nevertheless, it is all too evident that someone is in contradiction; that is granted. However, why must it be assumed presumptuously that the various editions of the King James Bible are in contradiction, when in fact, it is James May and those of his superficial caliber that insist in the inerrancy of "THE" Greek text when many of these extant Greek texts contradict literally on every page? Commenting on the integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or the Received Text of the New Testament, Frederick Nolan postulated that the number of variant readings in his day (1815), was somewhere around 150,000.11

2) What Mr. May fails to realize is that no edition of the King James Bible constitutes a multiple or contradictory authority by which a Christian is to judge all matters of faith and practice. None of the alleged typographical errors, including interchanges of singular and plurals, transposition of gender, updating in spelling, omission of words due to the carelessness of the printer, etc., unless resurfaced by those with an agenda to cast doubt on the veracity of the A.V. 1611 as we have it in our current possession, are present to put a Christian in the position where he has to sit in judgment on what the text actually says. No Bible Correcting apostate, such as James May, will contend with the fact that the Bible that A.V. 1611 believers read, preach, teach from, and defend, is the book that is currently in their possession, which can be held, inspected, and given for evidence (unlike "the inerrancy of the Greek Text" of course). This, of course runs completely in contradistinction to the host of multiple, conflicting authorities that have been plunged into Christendom (NASB, NKJV, NIV, NLT, RSV, NRSV, etc.).

3) The standardization of the English Bible and its conformity to the edition of 1611 was confirmed by the Rev. Henry Mason, Chairman of a Committee of the General Convention on the Standard Bible of the Anglo-American Church in 1851:

Dear Sir,---I am happy to have it in my power to answer your letter of inquiry concerning the text of the Bible.

During the years 1834, 1835, and 1836, the delegates of the Oxford and the Syndics of the Cambridge press had a long and elaborate correspondence on the state of the text of the Bible as then printed, and until then there had been much inaccuracy. A correct text, according to the edition of 1611, was then adopted, both in the Oxford and Cambridge Bibles. The Secretary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has furnished me with the following statement from Mr. Combe, the superintendent of the Oxford press:---

'The text of all the Oxford editions of the Bible is now the same, and is in conformity with the edition of 1611, which is, and has been for many years, adopted for the

standard text. The medium quarto book is stereotyped, which protects it from casual errors; and having been in long use without the detection of any error, I have reason to think that it may be considered as perfect as a book can be, and may therefore be fairly received as the Standard Book of the Society.'

It is a most gratifying thought, that our English Bible should be circulated over your vast continent, and that our native language should be employed as the vehicle of Eternal Truth to an increasing multitude of readers; and we may justly pray, that the purity which is secured to the text, may be extended also to the doctrines gathered from the text and propounded to the hearers of the Word.

It gives me much pleasure to have had this opportunity of communicating with an American brother, and I remain, Rev. Sir, your faithful servant, Rev. Henry M. Mason¹²

4) Indeed, no variation in readings between A.V. editions, due to the carelessness of printers, have presented any "contradictions" in the text, unlike with modern English Bible versions (for example, the monstrous, and habitual lie taught in Mark 1:2 in all new Bible versions following Nestle's text), their representative Greek texts, and other Greek texts aforementioned.

5) Mr. May hasn't a clue, nor has considered that there are variations within the very textual readings that underlie the A.V. 1611 due to the inspiration of God. Who, but a Biblical ignoramus didn't know that the reference to Habakkuk 2:4 in Romans 1:17 is not word for word? And who didn't know that the quotations of the Evangelists in Matthew 4:4 and Luke 4:4 are variations as well? If that be so, then what is this particularity and peculiarity concerning supposed "contradictions" in various A.V. 1611 editions that present no contradiction at all?

6) However, all of this is mere child's play in comparison to the true motive of some Bible-denying heretic like James May (or his friends), which is a confession that proceeds out of his own mouth. Every once in a while, a person will come across pieces of correspondence that involves "Scholarship Only" advocates. After instructing his readers to consider "*with the thought in mind that one irrefutable error is sufficient to completely disprove the position held by most King James Only defenders.*"¹³, he tells an inquirer in a recent email:

*Let me suggest that as an offensive position, it is easier to show the uncertainty in the KJV than it is to show errors. There are errors that can be clearly shown, but unless you are proficient in Greek, pinning those errors down may be a slippery task. The KJV translators were diligent scholars, and they made few blunders. Uncertainty in the KJV can be shown by demonstrating the variations in printings of the KJV, especially from 1611 until today.*¹⁴

So, following directly, the "yea, hath God said.?" formula established by the Devil in Genesis 3:1, James May subtly informs his reader that perpetuating

"uncertainty" is more profitable and a task more easily attained, than merely pointing out errors. However, this clearly contradicts his thesis that *"one irrefutable error is sufficient to completely disprove the position held by most King James Only defenders."* This aforementioned email was sent in inquiry of May's "scholarly" opinion of the ten most prevalent errors in the King James Bible. Nevertheless, although Mr. May was bold enough to confess that *"pinning those errors"* was not a menial task, he wasn't however, straightforward enough to admit that the reason that proving error in the King James Bible is a *"slippery task"* is because Bible-Believers turn right around and use the Bible-Corrector's own sources to correct him.

Before engaging in a complete refutation of Mr. May's rebuttal article to my original material, I think it is timely and sufficient to herein demonstrate the real issue behind "Christian scholarship." In James May's original article, "The Inconsistency of King James Onlyism," he was very expeditiously inclined to postulate the following regarding Matthew 14:9:

Earlier in this paper there is a quotation from David Sorenson in which he states his belief that although the first edition of the King James Bible contained errors of punctuation and printing, over the years these errors have been corrected so that the KJV now contains no errors whatsoever. This assertion can be easily disproved

Accordingly, Mr. May goes on to present his argument for the "error" in the King James Bible, which is the translation of the Greek plural accusative ορκους as an English, singular possessive (oath's) in Matthew 14:9 and Mark 6:26. I would like to call the reader's attention to the fact that he said that, *"this assertion can be easily disproved."* However, it is interesting enough after reading my refutation of his easily disprovable thesis, that he states the following at the conclusion of his "rebuttal":

Although Nachimson advocates a grammatical principle to vindicate the King James translation of Matthew 14:9, the consistent application of the principle to other similar passages in the New Testament provides a powerful argument against the perfection of the KJV

Here, James May relinquishes his textual faux pas in accusing the King's English of being in error, when it was he himself who was in error. Notwithstanding, if the above were not enough, his words in the anonymous email aforementioned should remove all doubt:

I am also attaching a paper which I wrote (The Great Inconsistency of King James Onlyism) in which I discuss a few errors in the KJV. Please note my own error in regard to Matthew 14:9, which I discuss in another paper which I have attached, 'Matthew 14:9 Revisited'

The trifling words of James May should tell the Bible Believer four things. First, that the boorish and sordid ramblings of James May against the text of the A.V. 1611 should be stripped immediately from his original article, or a retraction placed therein. Secondly, that because the original question posed and answered by me was whether or not Matthew 14:9 was an error in the King James Bible, upon discovery that it is indeed not by the very rules of Greek syntax that he claims to go by, there should not have been any further discussion initiated by Mr. May. Thirdly, that the King James Bible should always be given the benefit of the doubt when it comes to being questioned by those professing to be able to point out errors in it. Fourthly and most importantly, the REAL ISSUE concerning modern "Christian Scholarship" in reference to correcting the King James Bible: **THE ONLY TRUE ERRORS TO BE DISCOVERED ARE THOSE FOUND IN CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP AND SCHOLARS, NOT IN THE KING JAMES BIBLE!** Should there be any doubt in the reader's mind to this observation, by the end of this treatise Mr. May will be proven to have been in error time and time again, while the text of the Holy Bible corrects him each time, and is proven to be in perfect harmony each time?

Nevertheless, the inquiry surfaces, that, if James May has admitted defeat and acquiesced to the reality of his factual feebleness, then why would he even contemplate the continuation of his distasteful treatise? The answer is deplorably obvious: Since Mr. May is his own final authority when it comes to the text of the Holy Bible, then upon the realization that he has been shown to be in error instead of the A.V. 1611, he will simply concentrate his vituperation techniques upon other passages in the King's English. In short, if one passage can't be proven to be in error, then just mosey onto the next.

In order to deter his reading audience from considering the facts of the case presented by me, James May designs his own emotional Trojan horse. He does as many A.V. 1611 Only's and Alexandrian Apostates alike do, and that is take all derogatory, acerbic and crude statements made by an author, compile them into one or two sentences in chain succession, which inevitably intensifies the desired effect that the culprit is a "crude and childish name-caller." Hence, in the back of the mind is this consideration of a rigorous and austere individual who does nothing more than parade himself in verbal calamity and malice. Mr. May states in his opening paragraph:

Besides arguing his point, Nachimson unfortunately also finds it necessary to hurl a variety of insulting names at those who, including myself, do not share his view of the King James Bible. He uses such terms as "Alexandrian clones," "textual wolves," "scholastic scum," "self-conceited individuals," "reprobated suckers," "stupid Alexandrian Cultists," "Alexandrian Cult nincompoops," and "translational schizophrenics." While I will offer some comments upon Nachimson's disputing of my position, he will have to wallow all by himself in his crude and childish name-calling^{[15](#)}

When such infantile excursions have been thrust upon me in times past, I proliferate the practice of compiling all of the "suspicious" commentary levied by our Lord and his apostles and prophets, place them into one or two sentences (out of their contexts), and prove both the shallowness and ridiculous spectacle of moronic behavior promoted by men of James May's temerity. You see, a topical faith in the King's English doesn't give a child of God character. Bob Jones Sr. (not the two jerks that clog up his line of descent: i.e., Bob Jones Jr. and Bob Jones III) used to say, "You can borrow brains, but you can't borrow character."¹⁶ All Alexandrian Cultists are parroted clones that attempt to utilize the brains of other Alexandrian Cultists, none of them having the character of an organized criminal. Although abounding in treachery, immorality, and illegal activity, the Mafioso comes straight at you, head on. A scholarship adulator such as Mr. May, like any good politician, is characterized by a deceitful motive slyly offset by an accommodating profession (Romans 16:17-18). Dr. Bob also stated previously, "Your character is what God knows you to be; your reputation is what men think you are."¹⁷ Hence, God knows that a man messes with the King James Bible in order to appear scholarly, intellectual; to avoid criticism from peers, maintain income, and preserve his REPUTATION. If men of James May's caliber had any character whatsoever, they would be much more cautious before being fixated with the idea that there are definitive mistakes in the King's English, when in the end, they are ALWAYS completely and unquestionably wrong! Concerning my "name-calling above," I take the words of the Apostle Paul when he concluded his comments upon the Cretians, and apply them to Mr. May (he said that they were always LIARS, EVIL BEASTS, and SLOW BELLIES), namely, that, "This witness is true" (Titus 1:13).

Next, Mr. May delves into an aged argument that has been regurgitated so many times that a cow would turn and walk away from its contents, specifically, the argument of the infallibility of the King James Bible being an example of circular reasoning.¹⁸ Here are May's introductory comments to his first direct quote of my article:

By presenting the issue under discussion as a legal case, Nachimson disguises the fact that he has built his conclusion into his premise:

Hence, we hold to the proposition that the A.V. 1611 text is innocent until proven guilty. That is, until some scholastic scum like R.L. Hymers can show us definitely that there is an "ERROR" in the A.V. text, then he can keep his "leasing" mouth shut and cease from filling the air with anymore anti-Biblical prevarications! (Nachimson, p. 2).

The reader may find it illuminating to note that Dr. Hymers is a member of the very pro-KJV Dean Burgon Society, only uses the King James Bible, and rejects all modern translations. More to the issue, we are not dealing with a criminal case, and the KJV will not be found either "innocent" or "guilty." Because this is not a criminal case and because our conclusion will not be one of innocence or guilt, there is no presumption of "innocence" for the KJV. We presuppose that the KJV is an accurate, but not perfect, translation of an accurately transmitted text. The burden of proof rests with

Nachimson to prove the extraordinary idea that the King James Version is an absolutely perfect translation in its most minute details.[19](#)

Now, concerning this literary melancholy about circular reasoning (or building "*his conclusion into his premise*"), I have somewhat to say unto thee:

1) Nothing in the natural born days of existence known to man is more repulsive, clandestine, ill-mannered, contradictory, or a more epitomized rendition of "*petitio principii*" than to state that *he* (James May) believes "*in the inerrancy of Scripture*," without being able to tangibly produce any "Scripture" of any kind to bolster his assertion. Nevertheless, if you will read the material that I have extracted from Mr. May above, you will clearly see that this is just the case.

2) The Alexandrian apostate in general has failed for decades to realize that IN PROFESSION (hence, word only - see I Thessalonians 1:5), what he SAYS he believes is in close proximity to an individual who holds to the A.V. 1611. Both groups claim that "the Bible" is (note the present tense) inerrant, infallible, and the final authority of all matters of faith and practice. The trouble then, in which I have mentioned both now and again, is the palpability of the claim. For example, if you investigate Douglas Kutilek's [website](#), you will find two peculiar things about that organization. One, they PROFESS "*this website is dedicated to the defense of the Bible as originally written, against the flood of falsehood propagated by King James Onlyism.*" Hence, you would expect to find on this website, "the Bible as originally written," but such is adamantly not the case. Secondly, instead of finding material to prove this dedicatory assertion, what one discovers are two verses FROM A KING JAMES BIBLE (II Timothy 3:16 and I Thessalonians 5:21) to "prove" the dedicatory assertion. Now, I appeal to the reader, what could be more dissimulating, more fruitless, or more mentally unbalanced as that? I also humbly ask the inquiring reader, if I am guilty of "building" my "conclusion into my premise" as Mr. May accuses me of, what is to be said of Mr. May who has both a premise and a conclusion that are only existent in his mind and in the books of those who taught him?

3) Mr. May and I both have presupposed some details in this textual masquerade. I, as is quoted above, have presupposed that the King James Bible is error free until someone can prove that there is a definitive error in it. Mr. May on the other hand states, "*we presuppose that the KJV is an accurate, but not perfect, translation of an accurately transmitted text.*" Nevertheless, I am curious to discover why Mr. May has permitted himself to take such extravagant liberties that he has not afforded to me? At this point I would venture to say that Mr. May has provided serious damage to the credibility of his profession since he admitted that an error that was admittedly a clear mistake in the King's English, turned out to be an error on his part.

4) Mr. May states that the burden of proof is on me when he pontificates, "*the burden of proof rests with Nachimson to prove the extraordinary idea that the King James Version is an absolutely perfect translation in its most minute details.*"

Therefore, here are the sound Biblical principles which have led me to this conviction that the A.V. 1611 contains the words that God Almighty in his providence has given to me by inspiration as he has professed to do in the book collectively called, "the Bible."

a) As the Thessalonians did with the apostle Paul, the words that were presented to them were to be accepted as the word of men or the word of God (see I Thess. 2:13). There was no gray area or middle ground. When the A.V. 1611 was presented to me after I received Jesus Christ, I received it not as the word of men, but as it is in TRUTH, but as the word of God, which effectually works in me that also believes. Now, I believe that TRUTH IS TO BE DISTINGUISHED FROM ERROR (I John 4:6). Hence, if I receive this book as truth, then it is in contradistinction from error, and contains no error. Jesus Christ said to the Father, "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth" (John 17:17).

b) In Acts 21:40, the apostle Paul starts preaching to the Jews "in the Hebrew tongue," and proceeds with his message into chapter 22. However, as Mr. May, or any other apostate will tell you, Luke originally wrote the book of Acts in the Greek tongue. Therefore, by the fact that Paul preached in Hebrew, but his words were recorded in "the original manuscripts" in Greek, and because I know that all Alexandrian apostates claim that the "originals" ARE inspired, that the possibility of an inspired translation exists. Accordingly, when professing scholars tell me, *"there are no perfect translations. God does not inspire particular translations,"*²⁰ I know that all of those who profess such nonsensical foolishness are completely ignorant of the principles laid down for judging such matters in the word of God.

c) The very Scriptures that are said to be "given by inspiration" in II Timothy 3:16 are the very same Scriptures that young Timothy had in his possession (II Timothy 3:15). Notwithstanding, the Bereans had these Scriptures (Acts 17:11), as did our Lord Jesus Christ (John 5:39), likewise the prophet Daniel (Daniel 10:21), the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8:32), and our beloved brethren, Peter and Paul (II Peter 3:15-16; Galatians 3:8; I Timothy 5:18, etc.). At no time in the confines of holy writ did any of these gentlemen promulgate the meager and malicious rhetoric proliferated by modern apostates today (i.e. *"a better rendering would be," "this is an unfortunate rendition of the Greek verb tense," "the article is lacking in this particular verse, so the definite article should be omitted when translated," "this translation is clearly in error," "the majority of scholars and textual critics agree that this passage is a gloss added by an overzealous scribe," "the addition of this text is what we call an expansion of piety,"* ad infinitum ad nauseum). The Scriptures that these Biblical persons had in their possession were accepted and promoted as holy, genuine, completely authentic, and at no time were any hints of ERROR provided to cast doubt upon the veracity of the text that they were utilizing (including translations, which, by the way, were not word-for-word exactly [Luke 4:18-19]).

Consequently, does it stand to reason that my position on the A.V. 1611 is simply a demonstration of building my conclusion into my premise? Or, is it the result of

faith (Acts 28:24) based upon principles established and practiced by our Lord and his very servants themselves? The King James Only position in short, is the logical conclusion of taking Biblical principles and putting them into demonstrable existence. The most that one can do with Mr. May's position, is profess Biblical inerrancy, while only having "an accurate, but not perfect" text with which to provide any examples of this selfsame Biblical inerrancy. The decision of the reader is left to himself, but as for me, I will rest in the sure words of the King's English before I rely on the shaky foundation of "Christian" scholarship.

Continuing, I find it most intriguing that this textually rambunctious character, James May, while commenting upon certain portions of what he quotes from my article above, fails to both notice or offer an answer (mild or otherwise) to the foundational premise of my statement. I stated expressly and to the point, that if Mr. May could not definitively prove an ERROR in the A.V. 1611, then he should do the world a tremendous service and keep his oracular member sealed. However, instead of studying "to be quiet" (I Thessalonians 4:11), he continues to bore the reader with more and more examples of red herring deficiencies:

1) Mr. May says that "*the reader may find it illuminating to note that Dr. Hymers is a member of the very pro-KJV Dean Burgon Society, only uses the King James Bible, and rejects all modern translations.*" Yet, the reader may find it even more illuminating or reciprocally disenfranchised intellectually to note that even though the above details are true about Dr. Hymers, that that has absolutely nothing to do with the statement I made about R.L. Hymers, Jr. I stated plainly and specifically, that until some "scholastic scum" like R.L. Hymers can show us definitively that there is an "ERROR" in the text of the A.V. 1611, then he ought to keep quiet. Now, I appeal to any ounce of sanity retained in the reader after being subjected to Mr. May's spiritual and intellectual hypocrisy, as to what this has to do with Hymers using a King James Bible instead of modern versions, or being a member of the "Dean Burgon" society? At this point, for absolute proof that James May is completely irrelevant in his comparison of Hymer's use of the A.V. 1611 to my statements about him, the reader is encouraged to review the statements in the following sermon published by Hymers.^{[21](#)} Furthermore, and even more productive, is definitive proof that while "using" the King's English, Hymers as James May, is not in the least bit shy to point out what he considers potential "errors" in the King James Bible. Hymers states:

The next step in Ruckmanism follows logically the idea that the KJV is superior to the Greek and Hebrew. The next step in this: the KJV contains advanced revelation. Notice how Ruckman comes to this conclusion in defending the translation of "churches" for "temples" in Acts 19: 37. The Greek word "hieron" is poorly translated as "churches" in the KJV. The word should be translated "temples" to be correct.^{[22](#)} But this obviously weak translation does not change Ruckman's view that the KJV is inerrant.^{[23](#)}

Accordingly, all Mr. May has managed to do for the reader with his subterfuge concerning Dr. Hymers is inculcate the reader with further blundering stupidity of which he himself so obviously abounds. As one can clearly see, no matter what R.L. Hymers Jr. thinks about modern Bible versions or no matter what society he is a member of, his position on the A.V. 1611 is no less or greater than that of James May, Doug Kutilek, John R. Rice, or the American Atheist, Frank Zindler.²⁴ They are all individuals who think that the subjective position of what they have gleaned from "Biblical" scholarship, qualifies them to sit in judgment on the Holy Bible. In this sense, all saved, conservative, soul-winning, church attending, tithing, preaching Bible-correctors are ALL practical atheists because when it comes to ABSOLUTE, FINAL AUTHORITY, they are all on the same frequency, namely, that the true, absolute text of the Holy Bible that WAS inspired can only be presented in a "reliable" format that isn't inerrant and infallible like it once was.

2) James May also states, *"More to the issue, we are not dealing with a criminal case, and the KJV will not be found either 'innocent' or 'guilty.' Because this is not a criminal case and because our conclusion will not be one of innocence or guilt, there is no presumption of 'innocence' for the KJV."* So, because there is no "presumption of innocence," James May will simply pass through the text of the King James Bible ever so nonchalantly, picking and pinning away for errors at every conceivable turn. Please, note that although this is certainly not a criminal proceeding as Mr. May has pointed out, it is an accusatory case of which a portion of text in the A.V. 1611 has been accused of being in error. Therefore, the wasteful verbosity surrounding the constitution of a criminal proceeding is nothing more than a play on semantics since the error must be true or not true, or in short, innocent or guilty. Nevertheless, perhaps Robert Gromacki would have a slight disagreement with Mr. May as to whether or not the A.V. 1611 is "on trial" since he entitled his 1990 book, *Translations of Trial: Is Your Bible the Word of God.*²⁵ However, all of this is child's play because in the mouth of two or three witnesses is every word to be established (Matthew 18:16; I Timothy 5:19; Deuteronomy 17:6; 19:15) when it comes to matters of accusations. Certainly, Mr. May has not established error in the A.V. 1611 in this manner, although I exonerated the A.V. text with the testimony of two Greek grammarians, none of which hold to my position on A.V. 1611 infallibility. Conceding to this point is Mr. May himself, who stated, *"from two recognized grammarians (he also quotes Daniel B. Wallace), he has demonstrated that it is quite possible-perhaps likely-that we should translate the plural Greek 'orkous' as the singular 'oath's' in Matthew 14:9."* And, if all this were not completely satisfactory to convince you, if it be objected that matters of accusations were relevant only to people in the passages cited above, who could deny that Paul's application of the above passages on two or three witnesses were directly applied to the epistles (not people) that he had written to the Corinthians (see II Corinthians 13:1-2)? As I have stated many times before, the benefit of the doubt will always be given to the King's English before it is given to the class of defunct "Christian" scholarship which cannot even agree with itself.

The substance (and, of course, this is applying the term very loosely) of Mr. May's article is divided by subject into a variety of categorical subsidiaries, which I suspect are for the convenience of the reader. These are listed in bold print as "Translators or printers?"; "More frogs for Pharaoh"; "Oaths and crows"; "Wallace & Turner"; and "Conclusion." However, as despicable as may soon be evident, in the case of the critiquing ability of James May, convenience certainly does not recapitulate cajolery.

Under the heading, "Translators or printers," Mr. May challenges my original assertion in which I stated:

In the passage before us, the alleged ERROR in the A.V. 1611 text is that the A.V. translators were completely blind and oblivious to the basic rules of Greek syntax; that even though each member of the group of translators had read through and inspected this verse a minimum of 14 times, somehow this "oversight" passed by 47 men. The ERROR presented here by this translational schizophrenic, James May, is that the King James Bible translated a Greek plural accusative as an English singular![26](#)

In response to my initial description of his alleged discovery of this atrocious error in the King James Bible, Mr. May both deleteriously and deceptively responds:

I could use the same blustery language that Mr. Nachimson employs and say that he "lied" in this statement, but I will not. What he charges me with is, however, completely untrue. In my paper I said nothing about the work done on this verse by the translators of 1611. As is very clear on page 20, I used Matthew 14:9 as an answer to an assertion made by David Sorenson that "although the first edition of the King James Bible contained errors of punctuation and printing, over the years these errors have been corrected so that the KJV now contains no errors whatsoever." The point I made, which should be evident to any careful reader, is that later editors made mistakes when they added punctuation marks. In other words, I carefully chose my wording so as not to indicate whether the lack of punctuation was a result of the work done by the translators or of the work done by the typesetters and printers. I chose this wording because I do not know. Notice my exact words, "The KJV 1611 failed to insert the necessary apostrophe for the possessive of its translation."[27](#)

Reflecting upon this segment of Mr. May's article, here he pretends (as heretics so often do) and proceeds to suggest that I have somehow superciliously misrepresented his statements. As you can see in retrospection, Mr. May quotes my original article portraying me as ONLY referring to his position as to belie the fact that he never intended to assert that the King James translators introduced the debatable punctuation error, but that it was initiated by "later editors" subsequently. Now, to this type of loquacious omnibus, which to me is nothing more than a defeated foe taking up words on a page to attempt to establish a diversionary ploy. This is perhaps plausible enough to say that Mr. May's methodology here deters the reader from viewing the express qualification that I give for these statements in the very next paragraph of my original article. There, I germanely stressed:

May takes a 1611 reprint edition of the A.V. text and states that no apostrophe was located on the word in the verse in question. This much is true. However, his first ERROR is that he assumes that this problem was corrected by a later "editor" who inserted the apostrophe "in the wrong place." [28](#)

Of course, Mr. Nachimson didn't even come close to lying in the first place. Mr. May was covertly omitting and concealing statements in order to make Nachimson say something that he didn't say by only partially quoting him. Now, the truth of the matter is that James May assumes that the apostrophe was added by a later editor, while Mr. Nachimson takes for granted that the text was right to begin with, namely, that the editors correctly placed the apostrophe in order to make the word "oaths" a genitive singular (oath's), of which I presume that the A.V. translators intended. These tautological reprobates think that they are so high and sanctimonious that they can bolster assertions without having to extend the same courtesies to their opponents. Why is it that we are expected to bow to the untenable hypothesis that a translation cannot be inerrant because only the supposed original manuscripts are inerrant, when these selfsame originals or the precise wording of its text cannot be given with any absolute certainty by these superimposing, querulous, "not quite onlyists"?

The reader should always keep in mind that James May is another repugnant individual who has rightly earned the title, "apostle of uncertainty" (this clever attachment has been used elsewhere, but is wholly applicable here). As I mentioned previously citing the anonymous email, because Mr. May knows that proving ERROR in the A.V. 1611 *"is a slippery task"* resorts to what he considers proving "uncertainties" in the King's English. Hence, in the beginning of his next paragraph under the heading, "Translators or Printers," Mr. May relegates the following:

The simple fact is that no one can document precisely what the KJV translators actually recorded in this passage or anywhere else in the Bible. KJVers are constantly telling us that we cannot appeal to the original Greek manuscripts because they no longer exist. Well, the original documents that the translators sent to the printers for the A.V. 1611 no longer exist either, and the printers did a dandy job of introducing many errors into the text, which errors to this day have not been fully corrected. The "perfect Bible" that Nachimson claims to hold in his hands is a phantom that does not exist. We repeat our position that we have a Bible preserved by God such that it is sufficiently accurate for all matters of faith and practice. Allowing the KJV to be its own judge, there never has been a perfect edition. I made this point quite clear in my paper under the heading "Various Editions of the KJV." Anyone desiring a much more extensive treatment should secure F.H.A Scrivener, The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611), available as a photocopy from the Dean Burgon Society. [29](#)

1) Immediately, you can see that his despicable tactics are manifest from the initiation of his textually sinister plan. He points out the fact that no one can document PRECISELY what the A.V. translators recorded here. Now, watch how subtly and devilishly Mr. May moves in for the ultimate deception. On top of stating

that no one can know for certain what the King James translators said precisely in the text under consideration, he then includes the rest of the A.V. text from Genesis to Revelation. He pontificates, "*or anywhere else in the Bible.*" Hence, Mr. May continues by making a correlation between the various editions of the A.V. 1611 to the "original manuscript" dilemma so often discussed by A.V. proponents against A.V. detractors. May's plan here is to show you indirectly that there is no conceivably possible way on the face of this earth, for anyone, King James Only or otherwise, to have a book called the Bible, that IS (present tense) holy, infallible, and without error. Watch what he says again, if you didn't catch it the first time:

KJVers are constantly telling us that we cannot appeal to the original Greek manuscripts because they no longer exist. Well, the original documents that the translators sent to the printers for the A.V. 1611 no longer exist either, and the printers did a dandy job of introducing many errors into the text, which errors to this day have been fully corrected. The "perfect Bible" that Nachimson claims to hold in his hand is a phantom that does not exist. WE REPEAT OUR POSITION THAT WE HAVE A BIBLE PRESERVED BY GOD SUCH THAT IT IS SUFFICIENTLY ACCURATE FOR ALL MATTERS OF FAITH AND PRACTICE.

2) As you can plainly and disgustingly see, James May has just audaciously disenfranchised Christendom of a Bible that is holy and without error. Now, mind you, this is after he insisted that, "*our belief in the inerrancy of the Greek text.,*" is what he believes. If James May didn't have enough intestinal fortitude to use the "blustery language," and call me a liar, I'll do it to him without thinking twice about it. Any man, James May or otherwise, who professes to "believe in the inerrancy of the Greek text," and then turn right around and tell you that because you evidently do not have the "original documents" of a book or collection thereof, that what you have is only "accurate" and "preserved," is nothing more than an unbiblical, anti-Scriptural, Satanically inspired, good for nothing, spiritually defunct, hypocritical, mordacious, lying, serpentine antagonist! James May is a liar and so are the men who taught him what he proliferates, and so are the imbecilic Hebrew/Greek despots who allow him to write in their publications and on their websites. Do you understand now why this issue is so important? If James May is telling the truth, then the Scriptures that Jesus Christ told the Pharisees to search in John 5:39 were imperfect and only "reliable," and "the word of truth" that Paul told Timothy to study and rightly divide in II Timothy 2:15 was only as much "the word of truth" as it was accurate. However, since he didn't have the "original documents" he was left to guess what truth was in the text that he had before him based on his own knowledge, opinion, and preference. Mr. May says, "*we repeat our position that we have a Bible preserved by God.*" What does he mean "a Bible"? This comical rendition is so infantile and so profoundly ridiculous, that this man literally has contradicted himself again. What, may I ask, happened to "the inerrancy of the Greek text"? You see, these theological babies word their doctrinal proclivities so generalized that they remain maneuverable enough to sequester themselves from ridicule long enough to repeat the same tireless mantra incessantly. However, if you have learned anything from the words promulgated by James May, learn these

things. One, he doesn't have a perfect Bible. Two, because he doesn't have a perfect Bible, you can't have one either. Three, if there was a perfect Bible, it was lost with the destruction of the original manuscripts. Four, in order to discover what is "accurate" you have to rely on scholastics like James May and Doug Kutilek to inform you what is permissible and correct and what is to be discarded. Five, in order to accommodate the unsuspecting Christian into thinking he is a Bible-believer, a liar like James May will connive his way into professing to believe in an inerrant Bible, but will never attempt to produce such an entity. Six, remember that these ravaging wolves are always doting about and constantly reiterating, that in their estimation, the A.V. Only position cannot be proven Biblically. However, I would certainly like to know how in the world, " *a preserved Bible* " that is evidently " *sufficient for all matters of faith and practice*," is Biblical and can be proven with the words of God? Verses such as II Timothy 3:16 and II Peter 1:20-21 intimate no such tripe as " *we have an accurate Bible that is sufficient for all matters of faith and practice*." That kind of a profession is nothing more than blasphemous gaff.

3) Above, Mr. May says, " *Allowing the KJV to be its own judge, there never has been a perfect edition.* " A mundane statement such as this horridly reeks of a deplorable misunderstanding of two things. One, the application of the words, "A.V. 1611" by Bible-believers. And, two, what a Bible-believer means by "perfect." First of all, God has never used inspiration to supersede the human means of bringing that same inspiration to pass. What this means is, is that God never forcibly coerced one of his servants into flawless penmanship, or absolute pristine grammar as well. New Testament Greek is replete with grammatical nuances such as anacoluthon and zeugma. In reference to the former, Robertson states, " *there are numerous examples, some simple like the suspended nominative ο νικων ποιησω αυτον (Rev. 3:12), some more complicated like γραψαντες (Acts 15:23) which does not agree with either αποστολοις or εκλεξαμενους in verse 22.* " [30](#) Concerning the latter, Robertson and Davis delineate, " *Zeugma puts together words that do not properly belong together as in 1 Cor. 3:2 γαλα υμας εποτισα, ου Βρωμα I gave you milk to drink, not solid food. So also Lu. 1:64 ανεωχθη το στομα αυτου παραχρημα και η γλωσσα αυτου his mouth was opened and his tongue.* " [31](#)

What does all of this amount to? Well, it shows that although God intends by inspiration to impart the words that he wants men to have, he doesn't override their natural tendencies to accomplish that task. Hence, God is not going to physically prevent a scribe or a printer from making mistakes in spelling or punctuation, but that doesn't detract from his purpose to give men his precise words. When the "wicked Bible" rendered Exodus 20:14, "thou shalt commit adultery," resultant of the printer failing to print the word "not," what did that do to the words of God? Absolutely nothing. They were already established as, "thou shalt not commit adultery." Have all of the textual variations and grammatical blunders, and scribal errors in over 5,300 manuscripts prevented God from giving us the words that he wants us to have? Absolutely not. God didn't eradicate human blunders to the point of transmission flawlessness in each and every instance, but he did provide man with the exact wording of his Book that he wanted pinned down. It is this

representation with which we claim to have in the A.V. 1611 text. Hence, when you look at John 1:18 in English, you can know with absolute certainty that "the only begotten Son" represents the words that God wants you to have, and you can safely reject, "the only begotten God," or "the only unique God," and so on. The fundamental difference between the King James believer here, and the Alexandrian egotist on the other side of the equation, is that the words and readings which are considered the words of God are already pinned down in the precise, exact text of the A.V. 1611. The Bible-corrector, while professing to have the words of God, reverts back to a generalized answer when pinpointed in this area. In short, they profess to possess something that they don't actually have to illustrate their profession; they are liars.

Notwithstanding, when a Bible-believer employs usage of the expression, "A.V. 1611" he is not specifying the particular 1611 edition of the King James Bible, necessarily. The Alexandrian apostate would like to deceive his reading audience into making this the case, but it is simply a reference to the year in which the King James Bible was published. Therefore, it is an irrelevant, prosaic argument to point out that the particular edition of the A.V. 1611, which we commonly use is a 1769 edition. The words that God gave us in 1611 were given by inspiration no matter what kind of printing blemishes were introduced. However, all of this trivial and trifling nonsense just further demonstrates that Mr. May and others like him are completely powerless in getting rid of the book, which I hold in my hands; the one he calls "a phantom." [32](#) On the contrary it isn't a phantom because I am able to mail him a copy of it, just like I'm able to mail one to Doug Kutilek, or any other second rate jerk who thinks that he is able to exalt himself above the throne and providence of God. The only thing that he could send to me in a similar fashion are the Greek texts of Nestle-Aland, the United Bible Society, the TR that underlies the A.V. 1611, etc., with his opinion being the deciding factor as to who gets to decipher the differences in the words. You see, when it comes to the "preservation" (as this is a much abused term in textual circles as well) of the words of God located throughout the overwhelming and exhausting quantity of Greek manuscripts, ancient versions, papyri, lectionaries, patristic quotations, etc., the Bible-believer would agree with the Alexandrian that the significant number of variant readings in these thousands of documents are rather insignificant when it comes to the overall ability of the Lord to perpetuate his words. The issue, then, is the consistent application and finality of this dilemma. The Bible-believer intrepidly declares that the words located throughout the plethora of variant readings in the manuscript tradition, by the providence of God, based on the principles of having the scriptures in one's possession precisely, are infallibly manifest in the text of the Authorized Version. Therefore, the correct Greek text is the one that was fashioned to underlie the King James Bible, no matter which eclectic sources were utilized to bring this task to pass.

On the contrary, however, is this desultory, fanciful dictum speculated by the scholarship only advocates, namely, that despite the fact that God inspired his words without a trace of error in the "original autographs," concurrently inerrancy

is only "preserved" ACCURATELY in the biblical material extant.³³ This pretentious, irreligious falderral can be seen definitively and beyond any doubt whatsoever in the short work by John Faris. Mr. Faris (to preserve the Old English), quoth he:

*But whether one chooses to read the King James Version or the Revised Version, it is the word of God he takes in his hand-the word preserved so wonderfully through the ages-the word of which God says: "It shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please."*³⁴

Essentially, representing the vast majority of Bible-correcting scholarship, Mr. Faris confesses that no matter which version of the Bible a Christian may choose to read, he can rest assured that either Bible is "the word of God." Hence, my question to you, dear Christian, is seeing that this is the essence of what Biblical scholarship has to offer through its most audacious pundits, does this line up with the rebuke offered by our Lord Jesus Christ to Satan, specifically, that man shall not live by bread alone, "but by every word of God"?³⁵ If there is a sharp contrast between two variant readings, such as the one found in I Timothy 3:16, how can both be called, "the word of God" just because someone asserts without any sort of Biblical foundation that we only have to be concerned with the over all "preservation" of God's "revelation"?³⁶ Concisely, the modern scholastic view on Biblical inerrancy is nothing more than desecrating dogmatism exposed to the winds of an unsubstantiated void. It is the unrivaled capstone of, "take your pick only-ism."

In the final paragraph of Mr. May's first heading, "Translators or Printers," he states the following:

Although Nachimson is totally wrong in his accusation that I maligned the KJV translators when I discussed Matthew 14:9, I will gladly comment upon their supposed inerrancy. In my paper, on page 15, I observe that the KJV 1611 contained a marginal note at Luke 17:36 which stated, "This 36 verse is wanting in most of the Greek copies." Obviously the translators were not sure if the verse should be included in the New Testament. They did not believe themselves to be inerrant. It is my firm conclusion that they knew more about their work than Mr. Nachimson does. I could expand this issue to great length, but one example has proven the point. I will also note that "47 men reading each passage 14 times" did not prevent the translators from calling the Holy Spirit an "it" in four passages: John 1:32; Romans 8:16; 8:26 and I Peter 1:11. These passages border on blasphemy. I discuss this at greater length on pages 21 and 22 of my paper.

The objection to Luke 17:36 comes back to Mr. May's "uncertainty" principle. As I quoted above, he believes that the way to deal with King James Onlyism is to produce the minimum amount of belief in the Authorized text by inculcating the reader with a maximum amount of uncertainty. This is accomplished, or at least sought thereto, not by a presentation of factual evidence and absolute truths, but by a single factual statement interpreted in light of a vast propensity of guesswork. In

the example before us, yes it is true that there is a marginal note from the 1611 edition of the A.V. that says that Luke 17:36 is wanting in most of the Greek copies, but that is a farfetched cry from proving that the A.V. translators weren't sure about including the passage. What is to be said about the other verses in the King James Bible (which are minimal, however), that are "wanting in most of the Greek copies" (I John 5:7; Luke 2:22, etc.) extant? So, no, "one example has" absolutely not "proven the point." An unsupported claim backed by a mound of tomfoolery is nothing more than an unlearned fool attempting to deceive his reader by taking up words on a page. Either prove that the A.V. translators had doubts about the verse, or forbear speaking on the subject.

Moreover, Mr. May moves on to his frequent, histrionic show of bigotry in reference to the King James reading in Romans 8:16, 26; John 1:32; I Peter 1:11. Mr. May asserts that by "calling the Holy Spirit an it," the A.V. 1611 "*borders on blasphemy*." However, since this "error" has been dealt with elsewhere at length,^{[37](#)} I shall only offer a couple of thoughts on the subject here. Discussing the personal pronoun *auto*, Greek grammarian Robert Funk offers his translation of the Greek phrase, *auto to pneuma* in Romans 8:16 as, "*the Spirit itself*." ^{[38](#)} Notwithstanding, in John 6:33, we see how the A.V. 1611 corrects the Greek (*ο καταβαινων εκ του ουρανου* - he which cometh down from heaven) abused by Alexandrian puppeteers like James May and his cohorts of vanity. The Bible says, "*For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.*" Modern versions, such as the NASB and the RSV say, ". *that which comes down from heaven*," or something to the like. The NLT alters "he" to "the one," but surprisingly, the NIV and the NKJV stay on target with the A.V. 1611 this time. My question is that, although the King James Bible refers to Jesus Christ as "that which" (I Cor. 13:10; I John 1:1) elsewhere, considering the differentiation in English readings in this particular passage, would Mr. May be dauntless enough to call the modern versions, bordering on blasphemy, or would he remain insidious still, and only baptize the A.V. 1611 into such excursions? As Mr. May stated in the anonymous email referenced earlier in this treatise, proving error in the King James Bible is a "slippery" feat. Accordingly, I think it is safe to presume that Mr. May has now "slipped" on the floor of absolute truth found in the words of the A.V. 1611.

Lampooning my original material on the absence of apostrophes from the 1611 edition of the King James Bible, Mr. May lofts a bit of a diversionary mechanism, designed to deter the inquiring student of the Bible away from two concrete and definitive evidences, which I provided to support the position that the word "oath's" (Matthew 14:9; Mark 6:26) in "current editions" of the A.V. 1611 were most certainly indicative of the 1611 exemplar. Under the title of, "More Frogs for Pharaoh," Mr. May dictates as follows:

In chapter eight of the book of Exodus, the Bible tells us that God demonstrated his power and vindicated his servants Moses and Aaron by sending a plague of frogs upon the land of Egypt. The response of Pharaoh's magicians is rather curious. Instead of

removing the frogs which God had sent, they demonstrated their power by producing more frogs. Hardly what Pharaoh needed. Mr. Nachimson appears to have his own frog business. He defends the lack of the apostrophe at Matthew 14:9 in the 1611 edition by producing other examples of missing apostrophes and asserting that this mark of punctuation was not used by the 1611 KJV! His every example adds to the list of deficiencies contained in the King James Bible of 1611 as compared to the current KJV and to modern Bibles. Perhaps Nachimson is suggesting that the hands of the KJV translators were tied and that they had no way of indicating whether the word "oath" should be singular or plural. I have not the slightest idea when apostrophes were introduced into the English language, nor have I the least inclination to pursue such an arcane question, but one thing is clear: If apostrophes were unavailable in 1611, the translators could have easily specified whether the text was singular or plural. All they needed to do was either translate "because of the oath" or "because of the oaths." This is clearly a deficiency in the King James translation, and all of the huffing and puffing in the world will not make it otherwise. Nachimson can keep his frogs;--- we have enough already.

1) I find Mr. May's futile attempts at interpreting my motive in appealing to the lack of apostrophe issue, and his subsequent revisionist ploy of creating an analogy to bypass my STATED reasoning for purporting this idea to be completely, as Dean Burgon once stated, ". an unscrupulous use of the process of Reiteration, accompanied by a boundless exercise of the Imaginative faculty."³⁹ What purpose, may I ask, does his amphibian ethics serve in light of my purpose, which he so conveniently omitted? In my original article, I declared, " The point is, apostrophe marks of punctuation weren't used in the 1611 editions. Therefore it is circular reasoning for Mr. May to assume that because the word for "oath's" is plural in Greek that it is automatically a "mistake" by a future A.V. "editor" to add the singular possessive instead of the plural." Because the use of the apostrophe as a mark of possession was not prevalent until after 1725,⁴⁰ James May has no ground whatsoever upon which to erect his shifty theories or his superfluous inventions.

2) However, even though his treatise is manifest with utter stupidity, shameful omissions of intricate details, jerrybuilt stabs at sarcasm, and as will be seen in my subsequent points, a debilitating absurdity in basic English comprehension, James May here is going to expose to all of Christendom, just how anti-intellectual, and injudicious his research and claims to erudite intimation are. In another ghastly trial at demonstrating "uncertainty" in the A.V. 1611, James May, without any sort of viable fact at all exclaims, "*Perhaps Nachimson is suggesting that the hands of the KJV translators were tied and that they had no way of indicating whether the word "oath" should be singular or plural.*" Despite his deceptive rhetoric, James May's trouble is that he has the utmost regard for the activity in his mind, but very little esteem for plentiful inquiry. For example, it most certainly is speculative at best to question whether or not the A.V. translators' hands were "tied." However, what is not hearsay, and what can be documented through a meaningful investigation of historical facts, is that BEFORE the universal acceptance of the apostrophe as a means of denoting possessive punctuation, the singular possessiveness of a word

was, in many instances, delineated by means of the genitive singular ending, -es. Two graduate students of American University in Washington D.C., in partial fulfillment of the Master of Arts degree in "Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages," (TESOL), submitted the following findings in regards to the apostrophe in their research paper:

In 1559, the apostrophe appeared in England in William Cunningham's The Cosmographical Glasse (Parkes, 1993, p. 55). Sixteenth century English printers developed the mark to indicate omissions, but this convention is not as simple as it might sound. Initially, the apostrophe was intended to demonstrate the elision of a vowel, meaning the vowel sound had been omitted, assimilated, or slurred in pronunciation, as in th' inevitable end, but the apostrophe was also used to indicate a missing letter when the vowel no longer existed in the spoken form, as in can't (Parkes, 1993, p.55). Not surprisingly, there was much confusion concerning its usage until the middle of the 19th century, when printers and grammarians attempted to devise rules to govern the usage of apostrophes (Crystal, 1995, p. 203). Despite their efforts, however, much confusion remains today.

The use of the apostrophe to denote possession has its origins in Old English, which frequently attached the genitive singular ending -es to nouns. Hook (1999), points out that 60% of all nouns in Old English formed their genitive cases in this manner (p. 44); it is therefore not surprising that the current genitive ending -s has survived in Modern English. The apostrophe could be viewed as a way in which to mark the deleted vowel -e of the -es possessive ending, "derived from the Old English strong masculine genitive singular inflection" (Blockley, 2001, p. 35). Adrian Room (1989, p. 21) provides support for this view, citing the Old English word for stone, stān, whose genitive form was stānes. [41](#)

The above information is very important for you to grasp for two indubitable reasons. One, James May just stated in the paragraph above concerning apostrophes, "I have not the slightest idea when apostrophes were introduced into the English language, nor have I the least inclination to pursue such an arcane question, but one thing is clear: If apostrophes were unavailable in 1611, the translators could have easily specified whether the text was singular or plural." Well, if Mr. May had taken a little time to seek out the issue he would have observed that the answer to his self-induced dilemma was right in front of him, namely, that in the 17th century and up through the first quarter of the 18th century, the singular possessive and the plural of a word were often spelled similarly. For example, take the case before us to serve as a palpable illustration. In the Hendrickson reprint of a 1611 edition of an A.V., Matthew 5:33 states in part, ".shalt perform vnto the Lord thine othes. " This verse is decisively a plural rendition of the words "oaths" (spelled "othes" there). Likewise, turning to Matthew 14:9, that verse says in part, ".neuertheless for the othes sake. " Without the apostrophe, which was introduced as a mark of possession later, the singular possessive and the plural were spelled the same way. Another passage, which bears a resemblance to the "othes" phenomenon is found in I Thessalonians 5:13: ".for their workes sake." This is the English rendition of the

Greek, δια το εργον αυτων, which is a prepositional phrase containing an arthrous singular substantive followed by a plural pronoun. However, notice that the 1611 spelling looks the same as a plural would (see Ephesians 2:9 where "workes/works" is plural). Acts 26:7 states, περι ης ελπιδος, which is rendered, ".for which hopes sake." in the 1611 editions, while it is currently punctuated as, ".for which hope's sake." Again, as you can plainly see, these English singular possessives and plurals were spelled the same at that point in history. Hence, if the A.V. translators intended on rendering δια δε τους ορκους as a singular possessive, it would have looked in 1611, exactly how it appears in the 1611 reprints. Nevertheless, although these examples were used to show that certain singular possessives and their plural counterparts were spelled the same, I'm aware that the objection might be raised that all you would have to do is "go to the Greek" to discover if it is really singular or plural. Of course, I'm going to demonstrate how utterly depraved of rationale Mr. May's treatise is in this forthcoming point by showing a variety of plurals translated as singulars in the A.V. 1611 and other modern versions. Suffice it for now, though, that in Galatians 1:13, the Greek, εν τω Ιουδαισμω is a singular prepositional phrase translated by the A.V. 1611 as a plural. The Hendrickson reprint gives, ".in the Jewes religion." while current texts relegate, ".in the Jews' religion." Therefore, going to the Greek wouldn't have helped the scholarship groveling Bible-corrector in this instance, nonetheless.

3) The foregoing examples here are solidified manifestations as to how Mr. May deliberately omitted portions of my original article in his refutation indolence, which would otherwise make his journey to maintaining his position a formidable experience. First, is a Greek nominative singular followed by a genitive plural in Matthew 3:2. This verse in Greek, reads in part, η βασιλεια των ουρανων. The words are rendered as, "the kingdom of heaven." "Heaven" in the passage is singular in English, even though it is clearly plural in Greek. This singular/plural contrivance is also found in the NKJV, NIV, NASB, RSV, NLT, etc. Hence, in my original proposition in defense of the A.V. 1611 relative to Matthew 14:9, I posed the following questions completely ignored by James May: " Do we now have an error in subsequently 99% of the English versions extant in this passage? Did all of them miss the Greek plural and make a mistake by translating it as an English singular?" Does Mr. May attempt at even addressing these concrete and pristinely relevant examples, or does he fill the page with more frivolous, nonsensical remarks? Mr. May, hopelessly devoid of any comic relief available, relates to us, " This is clearly a deficiency in the King James translation, and all of the huffing and puffing in the world will not make it otherwise. Nachimson can keep his frogs;--- we have enough already." Only by his evident servility to the blind adulation of mounting assertions with no underlying substance, can a quixotic fraud like James May invent such licentious claptrap. James May possesses the right to call it whatever he would like, however, this does not prove "error" in the King James Bible. Proving "error" in the A.V. 1611 is the underlying foundation determining infallibility. I addressed this supposition in my former treatise, which see.[42](#)

4) Although, in my primary essay I provided a similar example to the one above in Matthew 28:1 with the word "Sabbath" (This is another plausible instance in which a Greek genitive plural is translated as an English singular), to which no answer was provided, and no acknowledgement of its relevance was recognized. As Dean Burgon so smoothly replied to Bishop Ellicott, "*You flout me: you scold me: you lecture me. But I do not find that you ever answer me.*"⁴³ Speaking of the learned Burgon, how could Mr. May, in all of his self-tout, fail to elicit the wealth of material provided by the Dean on this very subject?⁴⁴

5) In Matthew 19:12 we witness an identical syntactical construction to the one which is the focus of our current debate; Matthew 14:9. Both Mr. May and myself have previously noted that the Greek phrase in Matthew 14:9 was δια τους ορκους. Accordingly, the parallel grammatical rendition in Matthew 19:12 reads, δια την βασιλειαν των ουρανων ("for the kingdom of heaven's sake"). Consequently, "heaven's" is a genitive plural in Greek, but is translated as either an English singular (NCV, NIV, RSV, NRSV, NASB, NLT, etc.), or as an English singular possessive (NKJV) in the modern versions. What has been even more invidious is the extravagant omission of commentary and rebuttal on this impregnable admission by Mr. May, even after I quoted this precise proposition at length from Dr. Ruckman's material.⁴⁵ It is certain that when it comes to an adequate knowledge of Greek syntax, James May is clearly a shade-tree grammarian.

6) The minutest perusal of Wigram's work⁴⁶ would have revealed to Mr. May or any other sophomoric critic of the King James text that δια τους εκλεκτους is rendered, "for the elect's sake" (A.V. 1611; NKJV), or "for the sake of the elect" (NIV, NASB, RSV, etc.) in Mark 13:20. ekelktouV is an accusative plural translated as an English singular in the above versions. The same phenomenon is found to be so with επι τους ασθενουντας ("unto the sick") in Acts 19:12.

7) Frankly, I am at a loss for words as to how someone, who professes to have even the most trivial education in New Testament Greek (as does James May), could make his way through the text of the fourteenth chapter of Matthew's Gospel without having noticed the comprisal of singular-plural interchanges in the very near vicinity of the words in question? Beginning with verse 2, απο των νεκρων is rendered "from the dead;" in verse 5, τον οχλον is rendered as a singular, "the multitude" (as they are both singular here in Greek and English), but please keep in mind momentarily that the plural form in Greek will still be translated as an English singular; in verse 6, Γενεσιοις, the dative form of γενεσια, is a categorical plural used to denote a collective singular in English: birthday; in verse 13, the Greek plural, οι οχλοι is provided by the King's English as, "the people;" in verse 14, τους αρρωστους αυτων is given in the English translation as a collective singular, "their sick;" if you will recall a moment ago, I brought to your attention the fact that in verse 5, the Greek singular ton oclon was also translated into English as a singular, "the multitude." Well, now we so have it, that in verse 15, the Greek πλυραλ τους οχλους is translated as an English singular, "the multitude" (notice

that this is the same English translation for both the singular and the plural Greek). Again, in verse 19 we have two more examples of the words, "the multitude." At the start of the verse, the accusative plural, τοὺς ὄχλους is "the multitude" as well as is the dative plural τοῖς ὄχλοις ("to the multitude") at the conclusion of the verse. Now, just to demonstrate how loose this singular-plural interchange can be, the A.V. translators render τοὺς ὄχλους finally, as "the multitudes" in verses 22 and 23. Back to our point, in verse 28, the plural τὰ ὕδατα is simply, "the water." The same phenomenon is prevalent in verse 29 too. Therefore, when Mr. May was so disposed to project, *"contrary to Mr. Nachimson's accusation, I have been reading the Greek New Testament longer than he has been alive,"* given his shameful performance thus far in even noting the very basal points of which I have demonstrated regarding Greek and English plurals and singulars, to such vitriolic speech, I reply with a shaking of the head, and an admonition to let the evidence speak for itself. James May knows nothing whereof he affirms.

The apparent magnification of Mr. May's failed scholarship, mundane intellect, and impoverished study habits has inspired him to devise one of the most contemptuous and insolent schemes in a surreal attempt to leave his article (forced upon the reading public) with any sort of personal dignity in tact. In the following paragraphs we are going to examine Mr. May's inconsistent, inaccurate, and indolent practice of taking the word "suggest," thrusting the ideas inferred from it into inconceivable, make-believe scenarios. If sound analysis be Mr. May's forte, he certainly doesn't know his trade. In the ensuing paragraphs, even the most dissenting reader is encouraged to notice Mr. May's excessive implications in reference to Turner's singular/plural renderings, his insidious and wavering appeal to the NIV and NASB, his inability to properly interpret Scripture, and his want of knowledge in executing decent hermeneutical principles. Most of all, however, I want the reader to take notice of the fact that James May simply doesn't believe any Bible extant, although his profession to the contrary is established by nothing more than words (see Ecclesiastes 5:3).

One pertinent point that I make in my original treatise involving Matthew 14:9 is the fact that IN THE CONTEXT of the passage, only one "oath" is expressly spoken of in verse 7. Following the English syntax through to conclusion, I asserted that the A.V. 1611 reading of "oath's" was simply in line with the "oath" discussed two verses prior. Hence, I declared that there is nothing in the context to warrant a plural possessive punctuation, and such a postulation to the contrary is only the result of a ridiculous conclusion perpetuated by someone who spends their time in Greek texts, which they evidently don't know how to read. Mr. May, in response, instead of answering the objection, delves into the far reaching aspects of his imaginative faculties, and comes up with the following accusation: *"According to this novel teaching, the Scripture narratives never leave out any details. If the Bible does not say that something happened, it did not happen."*

Even after reading Mr. May's objection, I still would like to maintain my original viewpoint that his conjecture, namely, that "oaths" is the correct reading simply

because of a Greek accusative plural, is a "ridiculous conclusion." First, allow me to defend myself here, and say that Mr. May's statement above is nothing short of a palpable lie. "Mr. Nachimson" never made any sort of direct intimation that if narratives "*leave out any details*," then "*it did not happen*." Secondly, I am however, willing to consider where Mr. May thinks that I have evidently overlooked some details provided somewhere else. As such, Mr. May, in his feeble rebuttal, goes on to make the following analogy (or should I say, anomaly?):

At any rate, Nachimson wants us to believe that if Matthew mentions one oath, but no others, there cannot have been any others. It appears that Nachimson has not spent much time comparing the four Gospels with one another. A good harmony of the Gospels might be an excellent addition to his library. I have taken Mr. Nachimson's words and applied them to another incident in Matthew's gospel:

May's second ERROR is a manifest failure to read simple English. The A.V. 1611 told you in no uncertain terms in Matthew 26:74 in the context, that the crow was indeed SINGULAR! Note:

"And immediately the cock crew." (Matthew 26:74)

There isn't one word in the context about more than one crow being made, thereby warranting a claim of multiple crows. The only way someone could come to such a ridiculous conclusion is by spending their time in Greek texts that they evidently don't know how to read, (p. 13).

Actually "someone" might have come to such a ridiculous conclusion by reading Mark 14:30 and 14:72. In the book of Matthew there is no hint whatsoever that in connection with Peter's denial the cock would or did crow more than once. Mark, however, tells us of two crowings, "And the second time the cock crew." There are actually many examples in the Gospels where one Gospel omits interesting information that is contained in another, which proves beyond all controversy that the Gospel narratives often leave out details that we might expect them to include. Mr. Nachimson is correct that there is a "ridiculous conclusion," but it is his conclusion, not mine.

In response, allow me to say that anyone who can construct such irrelevant, nonsensical, and just utterly tenuous concoctions, will tell us next that he has access to the material containing the "*many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one.*" (John 21:25) Allow me to say that Mr. May has now wasted two more paragraphs on a page that has as much relevance to it as does Gabriel's supposed 600 wings as dictated by the Hadith in the Islamic literature. Who could believe such a mess? Either someone who was so ingratiated with themselves, that they became completely oblivious to reality, or else someone who was so hasty in their response, that they aren't one, which "*studieth to answer*" (Proverbs 15:28). The details surrounding the oath made by Herod in Matthew chapter 14 are only repeated in Mark chapter 6. Both chapters relegate the same details regarding the "oath." In Matthew 14:7, it is stated specifically as a singular, "oath," and in Mark 6:23 it is worded, "*Whatsoever thou shalt ask of me, I will give it thee, unto the half of my kingdom.*" It is fine and well that Mr. May objects on the condition that generally speaking there are other gospel accounts, which may

facilitate more information. However, in the specific case before us, both accounts provide the same details. Therefore, Mr. May's correlation is flawed, asinine, and just plain egregious. I mean, excuse me, but really, what kind of flagrant usurper can sit in front of his computer and type, "*it appears that Nachimson has not spent much time comparing the four Gospels with one another. A good harmony of the Gospels might be an excellent addition to his library.*" Well, what can I say? I already own A.T. Robertson's *A Harmony of the Gospels*, and I have failed to discover on any page of it (especially on page 71), where the two accounts of Herod's oath in Matthew 14 and Mark 6 relinquish any further information on the singular oath than what I have given already. Since I have already fulfilled Mr. May's suggestion by already possessing Robertson's harmony, may I suggest that this individual purchase tutelage for himself, and learn how to read? A good mastery of the English language (not to mention Greek to boot) might be an excellent addition to his cognitive repertoire. Does Mr. May really mean for us to believe the extravagant notion that if one Gospel narrative contains information not contained in another, and that by such if two Gospels contain the same information in their narratives with no other information provided elsewhere, that we are to deduce out of thin air the possibility that there are other details that exist by which we are to interpret that which is presently before our eyes? If that is the case, then we might be in for a long day, and be susceptible to believe anything.

Leaving now the section entitled, "*Oaths and Crows*," Mr. May is now going to attempt to prove that my appeal to the grammars of Daniel Wallace and Nigel Turner is inconsistent because not all of their suggestions line up with the translation in the A.V. 1611. However, although it is true in a general sense that Greek grammars and grammarians don't always line up with the A.V. in every detail, two things are painfully obvious. One, that despite the diversionary tactics to the contrary by James May, there is almost always a grammar, grammarian, or lexicon somewhere which vindicates a particular reading in the A.V. 1611. Pointing out such facts is not intended to be a reliance on scholarship or to imply that the sources adhere to my position on Biblical authority, but they are used to demonstrate that when potential errors are extracted from the A.V. text, there is always another authority, which vindicates it (either directly or indirectly). Two, in some of the cases, which we are about to examine, Mr. May basically, either interpreted Turner's statements without taking them at face value, or just plainly interpolated stretched ideas into his remarks.

Under the section heading, "*Wallace & Turner*," the following remarks were made by Mr. May, initiating by quoting me:

Nonetheless, because James May isn't a faithful student of the Bible (II Tim. 2:15) or a decent student of Greek syntax, he failed to notice the most egregious error of all in his tirade against the most magniloquent book in history; that this phenomenon of a Greek plural being rendered with an English singular is a viable rule with a reasonable syntactical point to it:

"A difficult pl. which may be explained in this way is Mt. 2:23 prophets: the reference is to one prophet only. Zerwick calls it pluralis categoriae (4a) and he further suggests it as an explanation of Mt 27:44 (after Jerome, Aug., Ambrose): both robbers are said to reproach Jesus whereas it was only one, and we

need not call in another tradition to help us out. OTHER DIFFICULTIES ARE THUS SOLVED: MT 14:9 MK 6:26 horkous oath..." (Moulton/Turner, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. III-Syntax, pg. 26)

I am rather certain that Mr. Nachimson is oblivious to what he has accomplished with these two paragraphs. From two recognized grammarians (he also quotes Daniel B. Wallace), he has demonstrated that it is quite possible--perhaps likely--that we should translate the plural Greek "orkous" as the singular "oath's" in Matthew 14:9. What Nachimson fails to notice, or at least bring to our attention, is that as Drs. Turner and Wallace apply this grammatical observation to a variety of passages in the New Testament, they cite numerous verses where the KJV itself fails to translate properly. In the very paragraph quoted by Nachimson, Nigel Turner suggests the deficiency of the KJV in Matthew 2:23 and 27:44:

Matt 2:23. And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene. (KJV)

Turner's analysis suggests that "by the prophets" as found in the KJV, would be better translated "by the prophet." So if we indeed grant the point that Turner is making, then the King James translators were wrong, which according to Nachimson's thinking would mean that they were not "faithful students of the Bible (II Tim. 2:15" nor "decent students of Greek syntax." Consistency deals a fatal blow to Nachimson's argument.

Matt 27:44. The thieves also, which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth. (KJV)

Since Luke 23:39-41 makes it clear that only one of the thieves "cast the same in his teeth," the Greek plural "thieves" in Matthew 27:44 should have been rendered by the King James translators as a singular, at least according to Turner/Zerwick. Once again, this "rule" indicates error in the KJV. Remember, according to Nachimson, this is a "viable rule." He will, no doubt, soon be telling us that the rule can only be applied to certain passages, namely the ones where it validates the KJV. It is not difficult to understand why I entitled my paper, "The Great Inconsistency of King James Onlyism." It is also worth noting that the Greek text here says nothing about anyone's teeth. Modern readers should not be restricted to such obscure phrases in their Bibles, and it is no surprise that Christians are flocking to updated translations.

The first lie told by Mr. May in this sectional atrocity, is the intricate detail, which I mentioned earlier, namely, the bold liberties taken by Mr. May with the word, "suggest." Notice that he subtly states, "Nigel Turner suggests the deficiency of the KJV in Matthew 2:23 and 27:44." After quoting Matthew 2:23, Mr. May informs us that, "Turner's analysis suggests that 'by the prophets' as found in the KJV, would be better translated 'by the prophet.'" Mr. May's analysis here is nothing short of a bald error. Nowhere does Turner "suggest" that the translation "by the prophets" is an error in the KJV, and nowhere does he "suggest" that the passage would be better rendered, "by the prophet." What Mr. May has done (which is his own manifest token of stupidity), is contrive the idea that because Turner gave the translation of

Matthew 14:9 as, "oath," thus listing it as a plural of category, that that meant that any passage listed as a categorical plural automatically qualified as Turner wishing to make it a singular. It would have worked wonders for James May to stop "suggesting" and start "quoting." You see, when Turner gives the translation of the categorical plural, he provides the English word in italics, just as he did with *oath* in Matthew 14:9/Mark 6:26. Hence, he states regarding Matthew 2:23, "*a difficult pl. which may be explained in this way is Mt 2:23 prophets: the reference is to one prophet only.*"⁴⁷ Of course, the passage being a reference to one prophet only is a hypothesis at best. Nevertheless, Turner gives the translation as "*prophets*" just as he gave Matthew 14:9 as "oath," but explained that he thinks that it is a reference to one prophet only. The truth of the matter is that for ALL English translations the method used is either, positing the explanation for a categorical plural in the English translation as a collective singular, or it is translated it as a plural (as Turner STATES here for Matthew 2:23) and the responsibility of relegating such exegetical nuances is left to the expositor. Hence, Mr. May, trying desperately to stay afloat, concludes his paragraph, "*So if we indeed grant the point that Turner is making, then the King James translators were wrong, which according to Nachimson's thinking would mean that they were not 'faithful students of the Bible (II Tim. 2:15 nor decent students of Greek syntax').*" As the reader can plainly see, Mr. May is so engulfed with trying to be garrulously clever, that he completely overlooked Turner's point, misrepresented him in turn, then ultimately misinterpreted the whole application from Turner's grammar. Nigel Turner was stating that although Matthew 2:23 says "prophets" it is a reference to one prophet only. No "suggestion" or otherwise was given, the truth of which is substantiated by the italicized word, "*prophets.*"

Concerning Matthew 27:44, we find a very similar phenomenon as above. May tells us that since Luke 23:39-41 "makes it clear" that there was only one thief hurling invectives towards our Lord that, "*.the Greek plural 'thieves' in Matthew 27:44 should have been rendered by the King James translators as a singular, at least according to Turner/Zerwick.*" Again, neither Turner nor anyone else takes such a fanciful hallucination. Turner states in reference to Zerwick, "*Zerwick calls it pluralis categoriae (4a) and he further suggests it as an explanation of Mt 27:44 (after Jerome, Aug., Ambrose): both robbers are said to reproach Jesus whereas it was only one, and we need not call in another tradition to help us out.*"⁴⁸ The same phenomenon as above is applicable here. How in the world does Mr. May take an explanation and turn it into a translation suggestion? Even if he were right, which he clearly isn't, how does an accepted suggestion in one place, call for a plea in all cases? Mr. May is the one who said that the A.V. 1611 was in error for using an English singular for a Greek plural. As piteous as it is (for him at least) that Mr. May was painfully in error on this grammatical principle (and totally ignorant of it as well), such vengeful recalcitrance isn't warranted at the expense of the plain facts, or extracting ideas that just aren't there. Notwithstanding, neither the NIV, NASB (which, Mr. May tries to use against the A.V. later), nor the NKJV, RSV, or the NLT agree with Mr. May's analysis or "suggestion." Secondly, Robertson solves the riddle as thus, "*in Mt. 27:44 oi lhstai is not to be taken as plural for the singular.*"

*Probably both reproached Jesus at first and afterwards one grew sorry and turned on the other, as Lu. 23:39 has it."*⁴⁹ In either scenario, the translation stays exactly the same as it does in the A.V. 1611.

Furthermore, of me, James May writes, *"He will, no doubt, soon be telling us that the rule can only be applied to certain passages, namely the ones where it validates the KJV. It is not difficult to understand why I entitled my paper, 'The Great Inconsistent of King James Onlyism.'* It is also worth noting that the Greek text here says nothing about anyone's teeth.⁵⁰ Modern readers should not be restricted to such obscure phrases in their Bibles, and it is no surprise that Christians are flocking to updated translations." Really, to be quite honest, what I would like from Mr. May or any other self-proclaimed corrector of the A.V. text, is that they apply the same standards to the King James Bible that they allow for themselves, and the modern versions that, *"Christians are flocking to."* If you are going to call it inconsistent to apply the categorical plural principle now and again, here and there, then please, by all means, apply such translation bondage onto the NASB, NIV, NKJV, etc. as well. We've been presented with two passages of Scripture, none of which Mr. May has used a modern version to justify in his supposed "suggestions" taken from Turner (which turned out to be no suggestion at all, but rather a misguided effort by Mr. May). I call your attention to this fact because in just a few moments you will see that in a couple of passages he attempts to bolster his assertion with the NIV and the NASB, then just the NIV without the NASB, knowing fully well that we he uses neither, they both line up with the A.V. 1611, and when he utilizes one of them, the other supports the King James text. After performing such textually licentious acts, he has the effrontery to call me "inconsistent"? Excuse me, while I go and repent!

As surely as the Scriptures declare, *"A fool uttereth all his mind: but a wise man keepeth it in till afterwards"* (Prov. 29:11), James May assures us, *"of course in every instance where the rule indicates error in the KJV, Nachimson and the rest of the KJV Only crowd will argue against it. In, so doing, they demonstrate that no amount of evidence will persuade them from their false position. Any appeal to Greek grammar on their part is simply a ploy."* And, of course, I've confessed this "ploy" before in my writings. It is simply to demonstrate that to place your faith in the reliability of scholarship instead of the words of the King's English puts you in a precarious position each time. It allows for phlegmatic study habits, omission of intricate details, and in the case of James May, permits one to become the inventor of some of the most audacious editorials and revisions seen in quite some time. I'll argue against "every instance" because "every instance" is ridiculously unfair, pedantically assertive bolstered by a paucity of attributes, and in most cases are just clearly and hopelessly non-existent. I cannot entertain evidence for very long that is filled with gaping holes, recondite theories, and utter explanatory circumlocution.

Reverting back to page 25 of the Moulton/Turner grammar, James May is set to express:

Matt 2:20. Saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and go into the land of Israel: for they are dead which sought the young child's life. (KJV)

God had Joseph and Mary take Christ into Egypt, the land of preservation, until the death of Herod. After his death, an angel informed Joseph that "they are dead which sought the young child's life," (Matthew 2:20). In the context, the one person who was seeking the child's life was Herod. To reuse some of Mr. Nachimson's words, "there isn't one word in the context about more than one person seeking Christ's life, thereby warranting the plural 'they.' The only way someone could come to such a ridiculous conclusion is by spending their time in Greek texts that they evidently don't know how to read." According to the analysis of Turner, the translation here should be "he is dead who sought the young child's life." Mr. Nachimson's rule would again find error in the KJV.

And what, may I humbly ask, is "Turner's analysis"? Did his analysis really "suggest" that "the translation here should be 'he is dead who sought the young child's life,'" or was Turner simply explaining another what he calls the "allusive plural"? Did James May perhaps lie to us once more by taking liberties which aren't anywhere in the section of the book in question? Turner simply stated, "*The allusive pl. is sometimes used when a class or variety rather than number is stressed. This is so in post-class. Greek and always the importance of the individual's action appears to be emphasized, not that of a group: Mt 2:20 τεθνηκασιν οι ζητουντες (Herod).*" [51](#) Where is the analysis provided by Turner that would "suggest" that the KJV is in error? As stated previously, it is non-existent. However, Daniel Wallace has the passage listed as a plural of category, promulgating similar notions that the passage is only referring to Herod. Not only does Dr. Wallace translate the passage as a plural in his book, but he concludes his comments on that particular translation by stating, "*the previous verse states that Herod had died. As well, v 15 signals that Jesus would stay in Egypt until the death of Herod. In 2:20, then, the idea is that 'the one who sought.' But the point, semantically, is that the child's life is no longer in danger and therefore he can safely return to Israel. The plural, then, is used to draw the focus away from the particular actor and onto the action.*" [52](#) Hence, the matter, just like the other passages cited by Mr. May, are categorical plurals which fall into the realm of exegetical insight, and not translation particularity (at least according to Turner).

Attempting to utilize Matthew 16:18, James May writes:

Matt 16:18, And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. (KJV)

The "gates of hell" as found in Matthew 16:18 of the KJV should be "the gate of hell" according to Turner. Too bad the KJV translators were not better students of the Bible (to apply Nachimson's reasoning).

This is just more confused thinking on the part of Mr. May. Turner says nothing of a singular "gate" in referring to Matthew 16:18, and neither do any of following modern versions: NASB, NIV, RSV, NKJV, NLT, etc. Turner states on page 27 of his work, "*further class. plurals: πλαται Mt 16:18 only Wi. 16:13 (elsewhere sing. for one gate).*" All of this tripe could have been avoided if Mr. May would have simply

realized his error in Matthew 14:9 (as he confessed earlier in this treatise), corrected it in his original article on the King James position, and kept his mouth shut. However, even if he felt compelled to reply, he could have saved us all the trouble of noticing how many lying liberties he can take by quoting the passage instead of interpreting it without any reference to it.

At last, we have a verse in which Turner suggests a translation, which is not compatible with the A.V. 1611: Matthew 22:7. Not only is this verse a categorical plural recommended for an English singular by Turner, but at least one modern version takes the recommendation (though not directly) as well. In reference to the passage in question, Mr. May states:

Matt 22:7. But when the king heard thereof, he was wroth: and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city. (KJV)

Matt 22:7. The king was enraged. He sent his army and destroyed those murderers and burned their city. (NIV)

Where the king "sent forth his armies" in Matthew 22:7 of the KJV, the correct translation, according to Turner, would be "sent forth his army," which is how the passage is translated in the New International Version.

In collusion with the rendition of *army* for the Greek plural τα στρατευματα Turner makes the following comments: "22:7 *army*." Granted, that I conceded that the italicized word represented Turner's suggested translation for the categorical plural, what do we say of such matters since we are now confronted with the notion of Turner's suggestion plus the NIV? As I intimidated earlier, the concept of a categorical plural leaves some leeway for the translator. For example, in this verse, Matthew 22:7, the NIV, as you can see, renders τα στρατευματα as *army*. However, just to show that this principle is not invariable, in Revelation 19 the NIV translates τα στρατευματα as "armies" in verse 14, and again in verse 19. On a similar note, the A.V. 1611 does the same thing along with the NASB in those two passages. What is interesting to glean, however, is the reason why Mr. May has ONLY used the NIV here, and has omitted the NASB? He going to use the NASB to bolster his assertion in Matthew 24:33, but neglects to here? Obviously the NASB reads with the King James in Matthew 22:7, as does the NKJV. Which is a more reasonable conclusion, that a failure to follow Turner in every degree is a resignation to inconsistency, or does it mean that there are variations of application with the categorical plural as seen with the modern versions as well as the A.V. 1611?

Commenting on Matthew 24:33, Mr. May pursues:

Matt 24:33. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. (KJV)

Matt 24:33. Even so, when you see all these things, you know that it is near, right at the door. (NIV)

Matt 24:33, even so you too, when you see all these things, recognize that He is near, right at the door. (NASB)

Where Matthew 24:33 in the KJV tells us that "it is near, even at the doors" Turner would translate, "it is near, even at the door." Both the New International Version and the New American Standard avoid what Turner suggests is an error in the KJV.

Here is another interesting situation in this textual imbroglio because with the entire entourage of diatribe from Mr. May about inconsistency, he attempts to prove error in the A.V. 1611 on inequitable grounds, yet again. At this juncture, he provides two modern versions that translate a categorical plural as an English singular, and with such, he impugns the King's English. The problem here as it was earlier, Turner makes no direct translation concession. He states, " *θυραι* in NT of one door in fixed idioms only, *ἐπὶ θυραῖς* Mt 24:33=Mark 13:29, *πρὸ τῶν θ.* fig. Jas 5:9, *πρὸ θ.* lit. Ac 12:6, elsewhere several doors Jn 20:19, 26 Ac 5:19 16:26 21:30 (5:23 sing. or pl?).⁵³ However, even if he did, how does this prove that one is to be taken over the other from a grammatical standpoint? Isn't it true with scholarship only advocates that anything goes as long as it suits their preference? Nevertheless, why take the NIV and the NASB for their singulars when the NKJV and the RSV offer their plurals in line with the King's English?

Regarding Matthew 28:9, Mr. May asserts, "*We are informed that "Zerwick (4b) suggests that the women of Mt 28:9 is a pl. of category referring only to Magdalene, in view of Jn 20:14-18."* [4] To follow this rule, the KJV must be corrected from, "*And as they went to tell his disciples...*" to "*And as she went to tell his disciples.*" Briefly, please take note of the fact that in this section, again, Mr. May has failed to provide any modern versions to prove his point although he was forward to utilize them before. However, even if Turner via Zerwick had suggested this be translated as "she went." as Mr. May has so prematurely interpreted, I could not go along with this idea of a categorical plural in this passage because of the contexts of John 20 and Matthew 28. First of all, in Matthew 28:1, there are two Mary's mentioned; one of them being Mary Magdalene. In John's account, only Mary Magdalene is mentioned (see John 20:1). Well, at this point Mr. May could say that I haven't compared the accounts properly, thereby omitting details that could provide a more feasible interpretation. However, in this case, I appeal to King James Onlyism for the answer. If you will notice in Matthew 28:9 it states, "*And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and HELD HIM BY THE FEET, and worshipped him.*" If this were a simple categorical plural referring to Mary Magdalene, this creates a real problem according to John 20:17. That verse states, "*Jesus saith unto her, TOUCH ME NOT; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.*" Obviously, the Lord made a trip to heaven and back before he saw his disciples and before the account in Matthew 28:9. However, you will get this from a King James Bible, not John 20:17 in the modern versions. Not only this, but in Matthew 28:10, the Lord Jesus told the women to tell his disciples that they would see him in Galilee; in John 20:17, Mary Magdalene's instructions are to tell them that he is ascending to heaven. Furthermore, if things

couldn't get anymore bizarre, the culmination to this puzzle is found in the last twelve verses of Mark, which are called a spurious accretion to the text by modern textual critics. By taking the words at face value, we see that this interpretation is correct indeed. In Mark 16:9, the Bible tells us that, "*when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared FIRST to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.*" In Matthew's account, categorical plural or no, TWO Mary's worship him. So, Jesus Christ sees Mary Magdalene in John 20, doesn't allow her to touch him until he makes a trip to heaven, comes back, which now coincides with Matthew 28, and then the two Mary's are told to pass instructions to his disciples. If all of this weren't enough, in Mark 16:14, Jesus Christ upbraids the disciples for not believing THEM, which had seen him after his resurrection. Of course this isn't the whole explanation, as there are other women named in Luke and Mark's accounts. However, it certainly demonstrates that the verse in Matthew 28:9 is not a categorical plural.

Moving on to Mark 2:20, Mr. May is so shallow in his Greek studies, and evidently with his Bible studies (as demonstrated with Matthew 28:9 above), that he completely missed Turner's point in regards to this verse of Scripture. Mr. May spews, "*Turner would have the first clause read 'But the day will come,' thus indicating error in the KJV.*" Actually, Turner said, "*ἡμεραι Mk 2:20 (and one day in same verse) but probably a Hebraism.*"⁵⁴ Evidentiary of his rebuttal dementia, Mr. May missed the singular *en ekeinē thē hēmera* at the end of Mark 2:20, which is what Turner was referring to when he said, "and one day in the same verse." This is pertinent because it is a singular translated as a PLURAL (A.V. "in those days" for the literal, "in that day")! With all of the misrepresentation surrounding Turner, how did Mr. May miss this sweet, little nugget?

James May brings Luke 5:21 to light in further trials to condemn the A.V. 1611. He states, "*Christ had made but one statement which the Jews would consider blasphemy. According to Turner, when the KJV in Luke 5:21 quotes the scribes and Pharisees as, 'Who is this which speaketh blasphemies?' the rendering should be, 'Who is this which speaketh blasphemy?' Once again, the NIV has the corrected reading.*" The only note that Turner has here is, "*Λk 5:21 βλασφημίας sing.*" Hence, with all of Turner's variation, does this mean that that plural Greek word for "blasphemy" here is a singular concept or should be a singular translation? Notwithstanding, although the NIV says "blasphemy" in the singular, Wallace's NET Bible reads "blasphemies" in the plural along with the A.V. 1611. How could anyone be so injudicious and so sardonic as to impute error onto the King's English with such whimsical sort of evidence?

Although Mr. May insists that John 13:4 and 19:23 are indicative of errors in the King's English because of his erected theory that one appeal to Turner's grammar must yield a surrender to all of his points (which are a very small number compared to what May has pushed on us), all that Turner said was, "*ἱματία upper garment Jn 13:4 19:23 Ac 18:6-7 (but clothes pl. Mk 5:30 et al.).*" Nevertheless, if, as I lectured earlier, the intention here is not a mere suggestion, but is indeed a dogmatic

assertion, then who else is to agree with such a conjecture? The NASB, NKJV, NET Bible, all translate these passages as plurals. Even May's beloved NIV in the passage in John 13:4 renders it neither nor, but "*clothing*." Again, all translations use the categorical plural interchangeably. Either they all are in error, or Mr. May should retract this shameful article doting about with a ploy that doesn't exist to save face for being completely wrong about the King James Bible in Matthew 14:9.

Honing in on Acts 21:28, Mr. May continues his banter, "*The Jews made this accusation against the Apostle Paul based upon their supposition that he had taken one Greek, namely Trophimus, into the Temple. Turner, following Abel, suggests that the KJV is in error here because the plural 'Greeks' should be translated as a singular.*" Actually, Turner following Abel only stated that, "*this pl. of species is used in Ac 21:28 Ἕλληνας= only Trophimus!*" Rather than take Mr. May's liberal tendencies here, we'll take Dr. Wallace's explanation as infinitely superior. Daniel Wallace "suggests," although in specific reference to Matthew 26:8, that even though one certain individual is in view, the interests of the statement were on the class of people rather than on the individual. In short, in a class case such as Acts 21:28, Trophimus is the singular representation of the collective group. Succinctly stated, "Greeks" is the ultimate address, though specific individual is present. If not, everyone else got it wrong except for May's sinister interpretation of Turner's material.

Commenting on the word "covenants" in Romans 9:4 and Ephesians 2:12, Mr. Turner writes, "*αἱ διαθηκαὶ Eph 2:12 Ro 9:4 SCK (sing. p46 BDE), sing. elsewhere in LXX NT.*" Out of this elementary observation, I'm really astounded as to how Mr. May can post the following, "*In both of these passages, Turner suggests that the Greek plural of 'covenants' should be rendered as singulars in English, which the King James translators failed to do.*" Suggest? Perhaps something to some extent. However, Mr. May has taken a practice of suggestion and transformed it into a plight of superimposition. Not only are the passages a reference to more than one covenant (to the Jews pertain the Abrahamic covenant; the Mosaic covenant; the Davidic covenant; and the New covenant [which is in two parts- see Hebrews 8; 10; Jeremiah 31]), but the A.V. 1611 is supported by the modern versions, including Wallace's NET Bible, which "suggests" that either Mr. May's ludicrous scheme is in error, or all of the other Bible versions are in error. Take your pick. If we can't be inconsistent according to the premise and conclusion that Mr. May has established for himself, then by all means he himself is going to practice what he preaches!

If you noticed carefully, James May entitled this section of his treatise, "Wallace & Turner," but it has been all of Turner until now. Finally, attempting to incorporate Dr. Wallace into the plot, Mr. May conjectures further, "*Nachimson also quotes Daniel B. Wallace in support of translating Greek plurals as English singulars in certain passages. Dr. Wallace, of Dallas Theological Seminary, has written one of the newest and most helpful Greek grammars, Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics, from which Nachimson quotes.*" As you can see if you will peruse my article, I only quoted Wallace as to give the definition of the principle of what a categorical plural is. The

reason I did that is because for Matthew 14:9, Dr. Wallace only lists the reference in his book, but doesn't translate it for us. Hence, I knew he viewed it as a plural of category, but I didn't know whether he would translate it as a singular, or if he would explain the collectiveness of it while keeping it a plural. However, in his immaturity and haste, Mr. May takes a reference listed by Dr. Wallace with not accompanying translation, and states that he meant it as a singular translation. Mr. May postulates, *"In the context of John 6:26, the Jews had just seen one miracle, namely the feeding of the 5000 (compare 6:14). Wallace sees this as a clear example of a categorical plural, thus suggesting the translation, 'because ye saw the miracle.'"* Yes, Wallace sees this as a clear example of a categorical plural, but that doesn't mean he advocates a singular translation at all. As a matter of fact, on page 404 of his book, he lists Matthew 2:20 and Hebrews 11:37 both as clear illustrations of categorical plurals, but he translates them both as plurals, NOT SINGULARS. As I stated previously, a categorical plural can be expressed by an English translation, or explained to be collective in nature although utilizing a plural translation. You have seen both in all of the major versions presented, as well as in principle. If all of that were not completely sufficient, Dr. Wallace's NET Bible renders John 6:26 as *"miraculous signs,"* and Matthew 14:9 and Mark 6:26 as, *"because of his oath."* Mr. May, AGAIN, is in engraved error, and has sinned against the Lord, the Holy Bible, and any gullible Christian who was duped enough to believe his unsupported stream of falsehood.

Mr. May's last hope of staying alive in this contest rests on his bold proclivity in reference to Mark 15:32. Of that verse he says, *"Here Wallace recognizes, as Turner did at Matthew 27:44, that only one of the two thieves reviled Christ (Luke 23:39-41). Such analysis suggests the translation, 'And he who was crucified with him reviled him,' which once again indicates a flaw in the KJV."* In reality, though, no "analysis suggests" anything. There must really be something terribly disturbed in Mr. May's head. On the extreme contrary, Dr. Wallace translates Mark 15:32 on page 405 of his book, *"οι συνεσταυρωμενοι συν αυτω ωνειδιζον αυτον- those who were crucified with him reviled him."* If that were not enough, his comments are as follows: *"the parallel in Luke 23:39 explicitly says that only one of the thieves railed against Jesus. One explanation for the differences might be that Mark emphasized the generic while Luke focused on the particular. It is as if Mark had said, 'it was not even beneath the kind of person crucified with Jesus to revile him.'"* Need we say anything more?

For the last fifty plus pages, we have kicked, analyzed, rebuked, refuted, researched, documented, and exhausted all of the outrageous, asinine, repugnant, atrocious, insidious, vituperative, supercilious, deceptive, incognito, dishonest, subtle, blunders purported by Mr. James May who is a farcical persecutor of the King James text. Unfortunately, this man has taught "classes" to Christians as the Burge Terrace Baptist Church in Indianapolis, Indiana, and has served on the staff at the same. He claims to have a Bachelor of Arts degree from Bob Jones University in Bible and Greek, as well as having had a Master of Arts degree in Theology conferred upon him. If this is the sort of intellectual constitution that is the result of a Bible and

Biblical languages education at Bob Jones University, I would pack my bags and run in the opposite direction. This "revisiting" by Mr. May is nothing short of shallow, egotistical, undocumented ridicule, compounded with speculation, hearsay, and anti-Biblical nonsense. Mr. May has manifested a perfect disregard for any honest appraisal of his claim that he believes "in the inerrancy of THE Greek text" when he can produce nothing of the sort; as shown, he failed to properly quote Nigel Turner or Daniel Wallace, thereby granting himself exclusive rights to take extravagant liberties that don't exist; he avoided addressing the substance of my original article which was a vindication of the verse in Matthew 14:9 by illustrating a similar Greek construction in Matthew 19:12, which most modern versions translate as a singular (although it is a plural in Greek); he desperately strove to take the heat off of his own error in judgment by erecting a subjective criteria of translation consistency by applying it to the A.V. 1611 and nothing else; he inconsistently used modern versions when they lined up against the A.V., but omitted their content when they agreed with the A.V.; the aforementioned was done with no final authority in mind, except for his own opinion; he pretended that the A.V. translators were unsure of themselves in their selection of certain variant readings because of marginal notes, which they placed in the 1611 edition of the A.V.; finally, he made the detrimental error of assuming the A.V. to be in error instead of giving it the benefit of the doubt as the standard English Bible which has never been superceded in almost 400 years. I pray that this response serves as a rebuke to the Bible corrector, as well as an insult to their intellects, and a complete mockery of their education. Most of all, I desire that this treatise satisfies once and for all, that the controversy as to who indeed is in error, is not the text of the King James Bible, but the mistake of the "Christian" scholar in thinking that his limited knowledge of a subject should be accepted *nemine dissentiente*. Anyone who would stoop to such perverse, all-time skullduggery in an attempt to destroy one's faith in the King's English, deserves nothing less.

[1 www.kjvonly.org](http://www.kjvonly.org)

[2 See the information regarding Matthew 14:9 in May's article located at
http://www.kjvonly.org/james/may_great_inconsistency.htm](http://www.kjvonly.org/james/may_great_inconsistency.htm)

[3 See the information concerning May's error regarding Matthew 14:9 in my article,
http://www.av1611answers.com/rudimentaryfactor.html](http://www.av1611answers.com/rudimentaryfactor.html)

[4 http://www.kjvonly.org/james/may_matthew_14_9_revisited.htm](http://www.kjvonly.org/james/may_matthew_14_9_revisited.htm)

[5 Burgon, John William. The Revision Revised; pg. 370](#)

[6 http://www.av1611answers.com/inquiryinterpretation.html](http://www.av1611answers.com/inquiryinterpretation.html)

[7 http://www.kjvonly.org/james/may_reviews.htm](http://www.kjvonly.org/james/may_reviews.htm)

[8 Riplinger, G.A. New Age Bible Versions; pg. 503](#)

9 See the correspondence from [Fred Butler](#) posted on the Correspondence Chronicles section of the A.V. 1611 Answers website, where Mr. Butler, under direct questioning, fails to deliver the simple answer to, which text constitutes the concise, specific, singular text that correlates and corresponds to such an enterprise as "God's Word."

10 The Revision Revised, pg. 272

11 Nolan, Frederick. An Inquiry Into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or the Received Text of the New Testament; pg. ix

12 Coxe, Arthur Cleveland. An Apology for the Common English Bible; pg. 16

13 James May, "The Great Inconsistency of King James Onlyism"; see link above.

14 Email submitted to me anonymously in recent days.

15 James May, Matthew 14:9 Revisited

16 The Chapel Sayings of Bob Jones Sr., pg. 4

17 Ibid, pg. 11

18 White, James. The King James Only Controversy; pg. 156 (This was published in 1995).

19 May, Revisited

20 http://www.kjvonly.org/other/jrrice_cauthorne_interview_john_r_rice.htm

21 http://www.rlhymersjr.com/Online_Sermons/03-23-03PM_KJVNotEnough.html

22 On his [website](#), Will Kinney offers solid evidence as to the validity of the A.V. 1611 reading, despite the rambling dissention of Hymers and others.

23 http://www.despatch.cth.com.au/Books_V/RuckamnHymers2.htm#4

24 <http://www.atheists.org/christianity/realbible.html>

25 See the rebuttal to Gromacki's work in: Ruckman, Peter S. The Professional Liars in Action; 1996

26 <http://www.av1611answers.com/rudimentaryfactor.html>

27 May, Revisited

28 Nachimson, Rudimentary Factor

29 May, Revisited

30 Robertson, A.T. and W. Hersey Davis. A New Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament, 1931, pg. 399

31 Ibid, pg. 402 (I am grateful for Dr. Ruckman's insight into these matters in his book, How to Teach the Original Greek, pg. 55)

32 Notice that May's comments on the A.V. 1611 only position being "a phantom" seems to be "inspired" in a antagonistic sort of way, by my own comments utilizing similar wording. For example in my article on [translation inspiration](#), I post the following words, " Again, we are presented with this phantom idea of inspiration that once existed historically, but is now admitted to be nothing more than a gust of wind that blew by many centuries ago." I'm pleased to see that Mr. May, while criticizing aspects of my material, is perhaps in a coy manifestation of sagacity, perusing others.

33 See May's comments above about "*sufficient accuracy for all matters of faith and practice*"; Wilbur Pickering, The Identity of the New Testament Text; pg. 153-154; James T. Draper, Jr. and Kenneth Keathley; Biblical Authority; pg. 92-106; Inerrancy, Edited by Norman Geisler; pg. 186-190. I will deal with this specific issue in an upcoming article, "The 'Inerrancy' of Modern Scholarship."

34 Faris, John T. The Romance of the English Bible, pg. 62-63.

35 Luke 4:4, A.V. 1611

36 Fred Butler says, "We need to also keep in mind that terms like "inerrant," "infallible," and "plenary verbal inspiration" are the theological concepts used to explain the totality of a doctrine revealed in the whole of scripture. The theological concepts of God's omnipresence and omniscience are also not stated directly in the Bible, but we can plainly determine from a reading of the whole of scripture that the Bible would affirm these attributes of God." Keep in mind that Butler's subterfuge is a complete philosophically conceived, unbiblical promulgation of nonsense. The emphasis in the Scriptures is on the "words" of God, not just the doctrine, message, or otherwise as a meaningful "whole" (John 6:63; 15:7; 14:23; 12:48; Luke 4:4; I Thessalonians 2:13; Revelation 22:18-19; Matthew 24:38; Mark 8:38, etc.).

37 See Will Kinney's articles on the subject [here](#) and [here](#).

38 Funk, Robert. A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek; Volume 2, pg. 561

39 The Revision Revised, pg. 304

40 <http://www.takeourword.com/TOW135/page2.html>

41 <http://www.american.edu/tesol/wpkernodlecavella.pdf>

42 <http://www.av1611answers.com/rudimentaryfactor.html>

43 The Revision Revised, pg. 370

44 Burgon, John William. The Last Twelve Verses of Mark; pg. 148-149: " *The Sabbath-day, in the Old Testament, is invariably.(shabbath): a word which the Greek could not exhibit more nearly than by the word σαββατον. The Chaldee form of this word is.(shabbatha) the final. (a) being added for emphasis as in Abba, Aceldama, Bethesda, Cepha, Pascha, &c: and this form,--- (I owe the information to my friend Professor Gandell,) --- because it was so familiar to the people of Palestine, (who spoke Aramaic,) gave rise to another form of the Greek name for the Sabbath, --- viz. σαββατα: which, naturally enough, attracted the article (to) into agreement with its own (apparently) plural form. By the*

Greek-speaking population of Judea, the Sabbath day was therefore indifferently called το σαββατον and τα σαββατα: sometimes again, η ημερα του σαββατου, and sometimes η ημερα των σαββατων. Σαββατα, although plural in sound, was strictly singular in sense. (Accordingly, it is invariably rendered, "Sabbatum" in the Vulgate.) Thus, in Exod. xvi.23, ---

σαββατα αναπαυσις αγια τω Κυριω: and 25, --- εστι γαρ σαββατα αναπαυσις τω Κυριω Again, -- - τη δε ημερα τη εβδομη σαββατα. (Exod. xvi.26: xxxi.14. Levit. xxiii.3.) And in the Gospel, what took place on one definite Sabbath-day, is said to have occurred εν τοις σαββασι (S. Luke xiii.10. S. Mark xii.1.)

It will, I believe, be invariably found that the form εν τοις σαββασι is strickly equivalent to εν τω σαββατω; and was adopted for convenience in contradistinction to εν τοις σαββατοις (1 Chron. xxiii.31 and 2 Chron. ii.4) where Sabbath days are spoken of."

[45](#) Ruckman, Peter S. King James Onlyism versus Scholarship Onlyism; pg. 70

[46](#) Wigram, George; The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament

[47](#) Moulton, James and Nigel Turner. A Grammar of New Testament Greek; Vol. 3; pg. 26

[48](#) Ibid.

[49](#) Robertson, A.T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in Light of Historical Research; pg. 409

[50](#) Several years ago I had an internet junkie, who was the most foul-mouthed textual insurgent I had come across to date in 2002, also claiming to be a seminary professor, send Matthew 27:44 to me as an example of error in the A.V. 1611 because of this phrase, "cast the same in his teeth." First, if the reader will use the Will Kinney links that I have provided in the endnotes above, he addresses this verse in one of his articles. However, for now suffer it for sufficiency that the following is an example of the idiocy involved with James May telling us that this phrase is obsolete. In 2002, I did some research on the passage and came up with the following: "*These texts in Tyndale are the earliest to be cited in OED as examples of a 'cast in the teeth' idiom. The form used in James, to cast a person I the teeth, is marked as obsolete, with no example cited later than 1642. The form used in Matthew and Mark, to cast something in the teeth of a person, IS STILL CURRENT ENGLISH.*" (Bridges, Ronald and Luther Weigle. The King James Bible Word Book; pg. 60; emphasis mine). I guess Mr. May has never told someone that they are "lying through their teeth," or the like. Burgon employed usage of this phrase on page xiii of the Preface to the Revision Revised, and Spurgeon did likewise on page 431 of volume 5 of the *Treasury of the Bible*, as he advised some benighted soul, "*You may throw this in the devil's teeth.*" Perhaps Mr. May is not as erudite as he would like everyone to believe.

[51](#) Moulton-Turner, pg. 25-26

[52](#) Wallace, Daniel B. Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics; pg. 404

[53](#) Moulton-Turner, pg. 27

[54](#) See, Rosenau, William. Hebraisms in the Authorized Version of the Bible; pg. 194. The phrase, "*the days come*" is considered a Hebraism meaning that the time will come in 2 Kings 20:17. This is probably the precise application in Mark 2:20.

www.geocities.com/perianthium786

<http://perianth.tripod.com>

www.youtube.com/thebibleformula

PERIANDER A. ESPLANA
P.O. Box 6
Daet 4600
Camarines Norte
Philippines