

## KING JAMES VERSION ONLY POSITION IN LIGHT OF PAULINE LAW

Proverbs 26:4,5

Answer not a fool according to his folly,  
lest thou also be like unto him.

Answer a fool according to his folly,  
lest he be wise in his own conceit.

*Sequens*, "KJV" refers to King James Version as of 2004, but not New King James Version (NKJV); and "KJVO" refers to the King James Version Only position.

Idea: have two sessions, where we answer KJVO á la Proverbs 26:4 in the first session (August 2004) and then answer KJVO á la Proverbs 26:5 in the second session (September 2004).

AUGUST SESSION: Prov. 26:4

O. Personal Statement. I generally have a high opinion of KJV overall among extant translations; I think the Byzantine text type should not be dismissed out of hand on the basis of WH; and I currently regard the Byzantine as often the preferred text (see Harry Stutz, *The Byzantine Text Type & New Testament Textual Criticism*).

I. KJVO tenets. See especially the writings of Samuel Gipp and Peter Ruckman; it is my view that David Fuller (*Which Bible?*) is primarily dealing with the TR/Byzantine text issue and not the issue of the translation).

(1) KJV is the Word of God in that each of its words is accurate and correct and sufficient, and collectively they are indeed the inerrant, inspired Word of God. Hence, the KJVO reflects the view that the Word of God is precisely that SPOKEN by the words of God, and these words are those of the presently available KJV. The view that the Word of God is simply the words of God shall be called the **syntax** or **syntactical** view of Scripture in the sequel. That KJVO is a syntactical view is further mandated by the fact that the ancient manuscripts do not matter, italicized words of the KJV are without error, and the archaic words of the KJV must be retained [S. C. Gipp, *The Answer Book*, Bible and Missionary Literature Foundation (Shelbyville, TN 37160), 1989, pp. 1–2, 11–13, 52–57, 89 (last paragraph), 90–92, 103, 117 (line 6 from bottom), and in fact the whole book].

(2) The translators were given special unction of the Holy Spirit to insure that their English translation was free of error.

(3) It is not merely unnecessary or even foolish, but rather an act of ungrateful and sinful defiance to consult Biblical manuscripts in the original tongues, since such activity is a rejection of God's perfect Bible in English for this age.

(4) The KJV is superior to any original language manuscripts—these have errors around which the translators under the supervision of the Holy Spirit navigated when translating into English.

(5) No advanced education is needed to know exactly what God has communicated, since His perfect Word is perfectly preserved for us in the KJV in English.

(6) In each age God has had a special linguistic community to which He has entrusted His Word: the Hebrew/Chaldee scriptures to Israel, the Koine Greek Scriptures to the Greek-speaking world, and the KJV to the English speaking world. Those who want to read the inerrant Word of God for the present age must do so in English.

(7) The italicized words in the KJV are also inspired and proof of the improvement of the KJV over the existing manuscripts.

(8) The KJV is the complete and final version of the Word of God—it brought together for the first time a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures with a translation of the Greek Scriptures to make a whole, inerrant Bible.

## II. Important (Pauline) questions addressed by KJVO

- (1) What is the Word of God?
- (2) What are the words of God and how are they related to the Word of God?
- (3) How is the common man to read or access the words of God and hence the Word of God? In particular, if in the Body there is neither Greek nor Jew nor Scythian (Turks, northern Arabs) nor barbarian (Germans, Celts, Mongols, Huns) nor slave nor free nor male nor female—as Pauline Law explicitly states, then by Semitic Case Law (which is the Pauline style), there are no groups whatsoever before God, hence NEITHER EDUCATED NOR UNEDUCATED.

Concerning (3), there seem to be three possibilities:

KJVO ANSWER: the Bible is inerrantly available in everyday English, namely in the KJV, so that every English-speaking person can access it.

HIGH CHURCH ANSWER: highly educated experts and/or highly spiritual persons act as intermediaries between the common man and the manuscripts and inform the common man what God has said. Cf. Tozer as quoted by Swindoll.

PAULINE ANSWER. See below.

## III Original source of KJVO—epistle dedicatory

Thesis statement: The KJV was made to solidify the religious position of King James I of Great Britain (James IV of Scotland) within the British Empire as the Head of the Church of England, especially in comparison with the papists on one side and the separatists on the other side. The papists wanted England to return to the Church of Rome; and the separatists looked at the Scriptures for themselves—even making their own translations—and had left the Church of England. Thus, irregardless of whether its wording is in fact correct in this passage or that passage, the *purpose* of the KJV translation is ANTI-PAULINE: it was dedicated to the notion of Britain as a special religious nation, even a Zion, before God with a messianic purpose and mission and as such is in egregious defiance of Pauline Law.

This thesis is amply confirmed by the dedicatory epistle of the KJV by its translators in which they dedicate this translation to James. We sample this dedication; but one should really read the whole thing—seeing is believing.

- (1) "TO THE MOST HIGH AND MIGHTY PRINCE, JAMES, *bu the Grace of God*, KING OF ..., DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, etc."
- (2) "GREAT and manifold were the blessings, most dread Sovereign, which Almighty God, the Father of all mercies, bestowed upon us the people of England, ..."
- (3) "Our Sion [i.e. Zion, i.e. England], ... this Land, ..."
- (4) "... Your Majesty's loyal and religious people ... [who] bless You in their hearts as that sanctified Person who, under God, is the immediate Author of their true happiness .. [and] they observe that the zeal of Your Majesty toward the house of God doth not slack or go backward ... [and that You cherish] the Teachers thereof by caring for the Church as a most tender and loving nursing Father."
- (5) "... there should be one more exact Translation of the holy Scriptures in the *English Tongue*; ... that the Church of *England* shall reap good fruit thereby; we hold it our duty to offer it to Your Majesty, not only as to our King and Sovereign, but as to the principal Mover and Author of the work; ..."

(6) "... it [this translation] may receive approbation and patronage from so learned and judicious a Prince as your Highness is ... So that if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by Popish Persons at home or abroad, who will therefore malign us, because we are poor instruments to make God's holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness; or if on the other hand, we shall be maligned by self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their own anvil; ..."

Statement (5) in today's English would punctuated to say "one, more exact", which meant the translators understood their charge was to make the FINAL, OFFICIAL translation of the realm—this is why it is called the AUTHORIZED VERSION—all others are UNAUTHORIZED. Further, this translation was made under the patronage of King James for the sake of the Anglican Church, to strengthen its—and hence his—position relative to the Papists on one hand and the separatists on the other hand. This must be understood in the historical context of James putting into place a "Final Solution" for separatists: whereas Elizabeth had occasionally beheaded separatist leaders, on other occasions she tolerated them; but James' policy was that separatists either return to the Anglican Church or leave England or be killed.

Thus the translators in their messianic nationalism were the first purveyors of KJVO.

(The dedicatory epistle directly violates Rom. 14:5, II Tim 2:15 (cf. I Tim. 3:9), Tit. 2:23, to say nothing of Israel's practice in such matters (Ne. 8:8). Each regenerated person is driven by the Holy Spirit to hammer things out on his own anvil, to frame things for himself/herself, ESPECIALLY when it comes to the sense of what the original documents are SAYING; and so each regenerated member of the Body of Christ is a separatist as matters would have been viewed by the translators. The 1611 KJV, under the protection of the King, was intended to suppress separatists and hence any true Body saints that might have existed at that time in England.)

#### IV. Pauline Answers to the Important Questions

My attempt to address important (Pauline) questions addressed by KJVO is now given. These comments grew out of a conversation with Phil Dennis at the TGF conference on apologetics, the key idea of "inscripturation" is Phil's idea, and subsequent discussions with Jim Hilston have influenced my thinking on how the errors of manuscript are sufficiently controlled. Rich Nath pointed out the relationship between John 17:8,10 and inscripturation.

QUESTION (1/2). The Word of God is that message which was inscripturated in the original autographs, hence the joins of the words of the original autographs, meaning the least general statements supportable by the words of God. Hence the Word of God rides *upon* the words of God and is that which is SAID by the words of God. In the sequel we shall call this the **inscripturation** or **inscripturational** view of Scripture. Note the contrast with the syntactical view implicit in the KJVO position as discussed above.

Biblical support includes the statements in Matt. 4:4 and Luke 4:4—man is not to live **upon (epi)** bread alone, but **upon (epi)** each word of God—and the statements of John 17:6,8,14—on one hand Christ gave the disciples the **words** of God, but on the other hand, He gave them the **word** of God which they have kept (the singular translates **logos**, namely that said by the Sayer, the Logos). We have not yet systematized the Biblical support for inscripturation, and this promises to be a fruitful endeavor indeed.

QUESTION (1/2). The extant manuscripts collectively and sufficiently contain the words of God that when the normative hermeneutic / grammatico-historical method is applied to these manuscripts, the SAME message can be recovered as was encoded in the original autographs.

QUESTION (1/2) God's preservation of His words is sufficiently robust and the normative hermeneutic / grammatico-historical method is sufficiently tolerant of occasional discrepancies in the manuscripts that the message that emerges is inerrant. This hermeneutic essentially has an error-correction code built in.

As an analogy, consider a musical CD. Such a CD has a spiral comprising a long series of "lands" and "pits" which should be read as "1's" and "0's". No such CD is errorless due to surface irregularities, stamping inaccuracies,

scratches, etc. Each CD player is equipped with error-correction code algorithms, which are able to contextually reconstruct the digital signal when the laser encounters glitches on the CD, just as if the CD had been without errors. Thus, despite the errors on the CD, a perfect signal is reconstructed (within the limits of that digital recording system). On the other hand, if the CD is too severely scratched, then these algorithms cannot adequately compensate and the CD player sends unpleasant noises to the amplifiers and speakers/headphones. The point of quality control in the manufacture of CD's is to insure that the errors on the CD do not exceed the capacity of the error-correction algorithms to function sufficiently to recover the original signal.

In the same manner, our collection of manuscripts, say for the Greek N. T., are not without errors. But our confidence is that God has sufficiently overseen the copying of manuscripts that their errors do not exceed the capacity of the normative hermeneutic / grammatico-historical method to recover without error and with specificity the original message that God intended for the original audience.

What is the mechanism for error and how is it constrained to stay within the threshold of the normative hermeneutic? My opinion is that mechanism is related to demonic activity (in the case of a scribe deliberately miscopying the text in front of them, as in the cases of the emendations of the Massoretic scribes and apparently the case also of the Greek scribes, this would seem to be due to demonic possession); but this demonic activity is controlled by the Holy Spirit on account of the current presence on earth of the Body of Christ (II Thess. 2:6–7). So we have the confidence that for us in the Body, the Spirit controls the errors sufficiently so that the hermeneutic of straightly plowing (II Tim. 2:15) recovers for us the original message without error. After the Body ascends with Christ to the Throne of Heaven to administer the angelic hosts, demonic activity is less restrained, but countered by the reinstatement of the Israel's charismata by which the original autographs can be given miraculously! Thus each of the Elect Gentiles, Elect Israel, and the Body can have confidence (each in its own way) in the Scriptures.

The analogy with musical CD's can be taken further. Consider the example of Christ's debates with the rabbis and Sanhedral authorities the last morning He was in the Temple. These debates are primarily recorded in Matthew (with some supplementation from the other Gospels). Now these debates were apparently conducted in Hebrew, possibly in Aramaic; but Matthew's record is in Greek; and now we translate those debates into modern English and recovered the issues being debated with the normative hermeneutic. Similarly, an analogue musical performance is captured by a microphone, the microphone analogue signal is sent to an ADC (analogue to digital converter), the digital signal recorded onto a master tape, the master tape drives the stampers to put the digital signal on a CD, the CD is read in a CD player with error-correction algorithms to make a correct digital signal, this signal goes to a DAC (digital to analogue converter), and the analogue signal is outputted to amplifiers and speakers to reproduce the analogue performance in our living rooms.

QUESTION (3) It is the obligation of EVERY member of the Body of Christ to work and labor in the Scriptures, and in particular to:

- (a) understand the Word of God in light of extant manuscripts in the original languages to the best of his/her abilities and resources, and
- (b) work to enable other members of the Body of Christ to do the same.

If the Body members will implement Rom. 12, II Tim. 2:15 (cf. I Tim. 3:9), etc, as understood by the normative hermeneutic, then the Word of God will emerge without error and with clarity (perspicuity). Also see Rom. 14:5, (cf. I Tim. 3:9), Tit. 2:23, to say nothing of Israel's practice in such matters (Ne. 8:8).

#### V. Examples of where KJV is dead wrong, but Massoretic Text / TR are uncontested

The reader should know that the following are ONLY a sample. There are many more examples.

##### (1) Acts 12:4

The word translated **Easter** is **páscha** (πάσχα), a Greek cognate of the Hebrew **pesach** (cf. the Greek verb **páschw** for **suffer**)

(a) **Páscha** occurs 29 times in the NT and in each case the KJV translates it as **Passover** with the sole exception of Acts 12:4.

(b) The Hebrew day is nighttime followed by daylight. Passover is prepared on the 14th of Nisan during the daylight and eaten the evening of the 15th of Nisan, namely on the evening of the **FIRST** day of Unleavened Bread (which is why the Passover is eaten with matzoth!!). Hence the eating of Passover, namely the festival of Passover proper, is **PART** of the festival of Unleavened Bread.

(c) **Passover** for Grecian Jews stood both for the specific festival of Passover and by synecdoche (of the part for the whole) for the whole festival of Unleavened Bread. The following is only part of the proof, but it is more than sufficient.

(i) Adult males were to appear before the Lord at the three great festivals: Unleavened Bread, Weeks, and Tabernacles—Ex. 23:15; 34:22–23, Deut. 16:16.

(ii) Luke 2:41–43 refers to the first of these festivals as **Passover** or **páscha**. Further, 2:43 speaks of the **DAYS** being completed, meaning the days of the preparation plus the seven days of Unleavened Bread, the first evening of which was the actual Passover.

(iii) Luke 22:1 is a slam-dunk:

Now the Feast of Unleavened Bread drew nigh, which is called the **páscha**.

(iv) Luke 22:7 is another slam-dunk: please read and see.

(v) John 2:13; 11:55. There is no reason for Christ or the Jews to go up to Jerusalem for Passover unless **páscha** stands for the whole festival of Unleavened Bread.

(d) In Acts 12:4, we must honor the unanimous usage of **páscha** for Passover in the small and all of Unleavened Bread UNLESS the context overrides—this is the Law regarding the normative hermeneutic (II. Tim. 2:15). But the context does not override: the context associates **páscha** with Unleavened Bread. So after **páscha** means **AFTER UNLEAVENED BREAD**. I believe this to be the Word of God on the matter.

(e) KJVO rebuts: that Passover and Unleavened Bread are separate (former is on the 14th and the latter begins on the 15th) and that the only way one could be in the days of Unleavened Bread and subsequently bring Peter out after **páscha** would be if **páscha** really meant **EASTER**, the pagan sex-tinged festival to Astarte. However:

(i) The Word of God stands against KJVO: the normative hermeneutic forces the matter.

(ii) The Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford Universal edition) stands KJVO: **Easter** by the time of 1611 had become a Catholic/Protestant synonym for the Resurrection, which they associated with Passover!!!

(g) KJV wrongfully translated this passage because of the ceremonial corruption of the Church of England; and the KJVO is wrong thrice: **Easter** is the wrong word, their argument is wrong even as measured against the confused intent of the KJV translators, and the Resurrection is to be associated with the **FEAST OF FIRSTFRUITS**.

## (2) Phil. 3:20

(a) KJV translates **politéuma** (*πολιτεύμα*) by **conversation**, which in the 1600's and 1700's (see OED and Ps. 50:23 in KJV) means manner of living and conduct.

(b) Facts of **politéuma**.

(i) **Politéuma** derives from **politéuw** (to govern or administer the affairs of state)—see Wigram's Analytical Lexicon and is neuter singular. Therefore the root meaning of **politéuma** is **seat of authority or government**.

(ii) Occurs only in Phil. 3:20 and II Macc. 12:7. In the earlier occurrence, it refers to Joppa as **the seat of authority or government** of its region.

(iii) In context, **politéuma** must be the antecedent of the pronoun in the phrase **from which also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ**. This is because **which** (*‘ου*) is genitive SINGULAR, and the other candidate for antecedent, **‘ouranoís** (HEAVENS), is PLURAL. Therefore Christ descends from the Body's **politéuma**.

(c) It is silly to say that Christ descends from a **conversation** (even in the sense of manner of living) or even a **citizenship**. Further, **politéuma** in its root meaning and only other occurrence means **seat of authority**, which makes PERFECT sense in context. I believe the Word of God here is that Christ descends from the Body's seat of authority, namely that Christ is seated where the Body will be seated in the Rapture/Ascension, and that the Body will ascend to sit jointly with Christ on His Throne, and that His Throne is our Seat of Authority.

(d) The KJV disregards the above facts and instead confuses **politéuma** with **conversation** and violates the grammatical agreement of a pronoun with its antecedent.

(3) Job 40:15; 41:12, 31–33

See the endnotes for the Job's Park talk for the documentation for how **grass, deep**, etc, should be translated. Briefly, **grass** in Job 40:15 should be translated **plants** (**khaziyr** (*plants*) comes from **khazeer** (*green*) and is often used of plants and herbs—cf. vv. 21–22, and the meaning of plants vis-a-vis grass is reinforced by the swampy environment of vv. 21--22); the entirety of 41:12 must be retranslated—**I will not keep silent concerning his supporting-limbs, or his power, or his balanced frame**; and almost the entirety of 41:31–33 must be retranslated—

**He makes the marsh-depths to boil like a pot; he makes [shallow] water  
[to be stirred] like a pot of ointment. He makes a path shine after him;  
it seems the river is grey-headed. He has no equal on land,  
one made without fear.**

(4) Isaiah 48:16

The KJV ends the verse **and now the Lord God, and His Spirit, hath sent me**, an egregious error and a DENIAL of the Trinitarian order---the One speaking is the Logos as the context amply documents. But the Hebrew text in fact states **and now Master Jehovah [the Father] hath sent Me [the Son] and His Spirit [the Spirit]**.

(5) Rom. 10:9

The KJV, in common with all other translations I have seen, is egregiously wrong here. What Paul wrote is **if thou shalt confess with thy mouth, "Lord Jesus"**, namely the confession is made personally and privately to Christ as an act of submission to Christ as Head of the Body of Christ (which the context from Verse 6 on amply supports, namely a confession apart from ritual and symbolic representation, as well as a belief in the resurrection which is in the heart and hence is private). But the KJV says **if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus**, which is not an act of direct, personal subjugation to Christ, but the confession of a propositional truth, a step in the direction which puts Christ at a distance as a piece of information to be agreed with, which confession even the demons can make. Later translations followed the KJV lead and are even more egregious **if thou shalt confess with thy mouth that Jesus is Lord**, the act of surrender to Christ as Head of the Body of Christ now being lost.

(6) Rom. 11:17,22

See the Romans notes, Translation Section, and compare Verses 17, 22 there against the KJV. One quick example is the complete disregard for the suffix **rizw** in **enkentrizw**, indicating the grafting is not into a branch, but down into the root itself, which is very significant in light of the actual structure of an olive tree and the dispensational point Paul is making in context. I can emphatically state the KJV (in common with all other available translations) makes a complete mess of Rom. 11:17–25 and Paul's clear teaching using the structure of an olive tree is repeatedly lost by the incompetent handling of the underlying Greek text.

(7) II Cor. 8:23, Phil. 2:25

In each passage, each Greek text labels Titus and Epaphroditus as **apostolos**, which the KJV translates as **messengers**, a highly prejudicial and inaccurate translation. **Messenger** would be the expected translation if the underlying Greek word were **aggelos [angelos]**; whereas **apostolos** should be translated (or transliterated) **apostle**, meaning one who comes not simply as a messenger, but as an authorized messenger with a commission. Titus and Epaphroditus were supernaturally commissioned extensions of Paul's apostolic commission. They were apostles of Paul to the Body of Christ even as Paul was the apostle of Christ to the Body of Christ. Rather than let the reader puzzle over Titus and Epaphroditus being apostles and come to realize that there is a PAULINE apostleship to the Body of Christ (even as there is a PETRINE apostleship to Israel and the Nations) comprising Paul, Sosthenes, Timothy, Titus, Epaphroditus, Epaphras, Tychicus, Silas, etc, the KJV squelches the whole matter by their egregiously inaccurate translation.

Of course, there are many places where KJV is correct and other translations are incorrect, but that is not the point being considered here.

#### VI. Examples where TR is contested, followed by KJV, and rebutted by context

(1) Eph. 3:9 The context is not dealing with **fellowship (koinonia)** as stated by TR in Eph. 3:9, but **dispensation (oikonomia)** as stated by other texts in Eph. 3:9, for the context is set by Eph. 3:2 in which the reading of **dispensation** is uncontested. In this case, TR is incorrect and the other texts are correct.

(2) Rev. 5:9,10 The uncontested context has the angelic of holy angels called the 24 elders (called the **holy watchers** in Dan. 4:17,23 and the **court** in 7:11)—and hence creatures which have never sinned and are therefore not redeemed—singing, in the case of TR, of their own redemption, a contradiction, and in the case of other texts, of the personal and national redemption of Elect Israel from diaspora, this latter not a contradiction, but absolutely in keeping with the angelic ministry to Elect Israel. In this case, TR is incorrect and the other texts are correct.

Of course, there are many cases which I have found where TR is correct and WH is incorrect, but that is not the point being considered here.

#### VII. Anti-Pauline character of KJVO (see the sources mentioned above)

(1) Charismatic in defiance of I Cor. 1:7; 13:1–13. The KJV translators were supernaturally guided, even in the italicized words which they added to the text. This defies Paul's statements in I Cor. 1:7; 13:1–13 (and even here some retranslation is needed): the charismatic gifts for the Body are finished with the revealing and confirming of the Pauline epistles, and will only resume in the Rapture-Ascension-Battle.

(2) Ethnic/groupist/nationalistic position in defiance of Rom. 10:12, I Cor. 7:18–19, Gal. 3:28; 6:15, Eph. 2:11–16, Col. 3:11. There are NO groups before God today.

(a) See dedicatory cited above: Britain is Zion, Britain is/should be the Church of England, James is the Head of the Church of England, the KJV was made to strengthen the position of James and the Church of England, etc.

(b) S. C. Gipp, *The Answer Book*, pp. 32–33: Chinese believers must come to God through the English KJV, for the English-speaking people are a special people before God to whom the perfect KJV has been entrusted.

(3) Hierarchical position (king as pharaoh, translators as translation-priests) in defiance of Rom. 10:12, I Cor. 7:18–19, Gal. 3:28; 6:15, Eph. 2:11–16, Col. 3:11 plus Eph. 4:5 (One Lord), I Tim. 2:5. See dedicatory and S. C. Gipp (*op. cit.*, 11–13, 32–34, 52–57, 63, 90–92, 154, 158–159).

SEPTEMBER SESSION: Prov. 26:5

In this session, we see how the KJVO position implodes, collapses upon itself.

#### VIII. Nonsense of making a perfect translation in this dispensation

POINT. It is inefficient, contrary to God's character, to have a PERFECT translation done by supernaturally inspired (or supervised or whatever) translators. An efficient God would have dispensed with documents in the original tongues and just inspired the translators to write the Scriptures down perfectly as prophets. With charismatic empowerment, there is no need of Hebrew or Greek manuscripts if the goal is a perfect English Bible—the Holy Spirit should have just inspired them as prophets to write it down in English. This is an absurdity, therefore there can never be a perfect translation in this dispensation (apart from the fact that such a translation would require the charismata *ab initio*, a violation of I Cor. 1:7, 13:1–13 a chosen and distinct people, a violation of the non-ethnicity of Pauline Law, etc, all as pointed out above).

The way for individual saints to know the Word of God as inscripturated is to wrestle for themselves and with the help of others in getting that Word from the words which God has seen fit to have preserved, trusting in the robustness of those words AND the error-correction implicit in the normative hermeneutic. Understanding the Word comes in no other way (Rom. 14:5, II Tim. 2:15, cf. Ne. 8:8).

The insistence on a perfect translation is therefore the position of defiance to work in the Word. Those of the KJVO position, if they are consistent—and we have seen examples of this—are hermeneutically and exegetically LAZY. Where are their works, the evidence of their having labored in the Word? (I Cor. 3:10–15)

#### IX. Multiple Revisions of KJV: 1611(1), 1611(2), 1612, 1613, 1616, 1617, 1629, 1638, 1743, 1762, 1769

In the sequel, we use the notation "Gn" or "Gn–m", where "G" refers to [S. C. Gipp, *The Answer Book*, Bible and Missionary Literature Foundation (Shelbyville, TN 37160), 1989] and "n" is page n in G and "n–m" is pages n–m in G.

(1) There were many printing errors as printers typeset the translators notes. In particular, two 1611 printings showed 100 discrepancies between them, even though the the same printers did both in Oxford apparently on the same press. Apparently the revisions of 1611, 1612, 1616 were aimed at correcting printer errors. See G17–24. And incidentally, the 1611 Cambridge KJV does not rank with any of the 1611 Oxford KJV's. WILL THE REAL 1611 KJV PLEASE STAND UP?

POINT. Apparently the God that inspired/supervised the translators to make an errorless translation, WAS UNABLE TO PREVENT THE PRINTERS FROM MAKING TYPESETTING ERRORS.

POINT. How do we KNOW that the modern KJV has ALL the errors corrected? This question cannot be affirmatively answered from the KJVO position. Since the KJVO view of the Word of God is syntactical and not inscripturational, they CANNOT KNOW THAT THEY HAVE THE WORD OF GOD, despite all their protests to the contrary. But we who trust God to have sufficiently preserved His words KNOW that if we consistently apply the normative hermeneutic both in matters of translation and exegesis, we shall HAVE the WORD of God. Ultimately, for the consistent KJVO man, he/she must simply close the book since they cannot know what errors remain and how serious they are; and this confirms our observation that such in fact do no apparent work in the Word.

Some examples:

- (a) 1611: this thing, 1638: this thing also
- (b) 1611: seek good, 1617: see God
- (c) 1611: returned, 1769: turned
- (d) 1611: thy right doeth, 1613: thy right hand doeth
- (e) 1611: the city, 1629: the city of the Damascenes
- (f) 1611: a fiery furnace, 1638: a burning fiery furnace
- (g) 1611: his place, 1638: his place

There are some 400 changes from 1611 (but which 1611???) to the present KJV. KJVO advocates say that almost all of these changes are "alleged" changes. Regenerated people will abandon KJVO and cling to a proper view of the Word of God.

(2) The way we know that we have the accurate KJV now is that God has preserved it for us to this day, despite the printing errors of the earlier editions. This is a CONTRADICTION to the syntactical point of view. See G24.

#### X. Faulty arguments by KJVO

(1) See the defense of KJV concerning Acts 12:4 in G3–8 and compare with our discussion in V(1) above. The KJVO defence is simply incompetent.

(2) The KJVO treatment of John 21:15–17 as given in G127–131 + Appendix 1 (Gipp, *op.cit.*) is simply dishonest. Gipp claims that **agapaw** and **philew** are fully interchangeable in Koine Greek and that the inerrant KJV rightly translates both by one English word **love**, and then Gipp administers a test: can one detect from the context which of **agapaw** or **philew** is intended in a given passage (without "cheating" and looking at the Greek text to see which word is used where—of course, a true, spiritual KJV man won't be looking at any Greek text!).

(a) The key to Gipp's test is that one is to use HIS statement of the standard definitions of **agapaw** and **philew**, to wit (G128): **agapaw** means "deep, intimate, selfless love", while **philew** means "casual friendly love". Now, since there are only two choices for the answer in each passage, and since none of the passages in question is consistent with the idea of casual friendly love, clearly, we would like to choose **agapaw** for each passage, which clearly shows that (in Gipp's argument) that there is no distinction between these two words and that the one English word **love** is sufficient.

(b) This is a classic case of a straw man. As determined in the TGF sessions on Romans 12 (see Jim Hilston's notes and followup), **philew** does not mean "casual friendly love", but rather for a member of the Body it indicates deep love which is the emotional response to that saint's **agapaw** of Christ as Head and His truth concerning the Body implanted in that saint at regeneration. There are parallels for Israel as the John 21 passage indicates: Peter's **philew** is rooted in his **agapaw** of Christ and His Kingdom and Christ is appealing to this fact to admonish Peter to follow through on his obligations as the Nasi of the Sanhedral Twelve (Eleven, soon to be Twelve with Matthias).

(c) If the underlying Greek text is uncontested, then knowing which word is being used would influence my understanding of the passage. Thus, the notion of the Gipp's test is faulty by design.

(3) The KJVO's treatment of Paul's citation in I Cor. 9:9 of Deut. 25:4 is dishonest and incompetent. Gipp (G55) maintains that Paul quotes the ITALICIZED phrase "the corn" AS IF it had been part of the original Hebrew text in Moses. Gipp claims this proves that the KJV was correct to put "the corn" in Moses and that Paul was essentially quoting a KJV Bible.

(a) It is true that the phrase "the corn" is implicit in Deut. 25:4, and that the italicized phrase is appropriate.

(b) IT IS FALSE THAT PAUL'S VERSION OF I COR. 9:9 HAS THE PHRASE "THE CORN". ALL the Greek texts read here, **Thou shalt not muzzle an ox treading** [i.e. which is treading]. Thus Paul (and LXX, incidentally) does NOT quote any italicized phrase.

(c) It is true that the KJV has "the corn" in I Cor. 9:9 NOT in italics; but that means the KJV VIOLATED ITS OWN POLICY and therefore CANNOT be inerrant. The KJV SHOULD HAVE italicized this phrase in I Cor. 9:9.

(d) Gipp believes the KJV to be syntactically inspired, and so the lack of italics in Paul and the italics in Moses convince him that Paul is quoting the italicized words of the KJV. This argument is completely false and rests on a tight circular argument.

(4) The KJVO's treatment of Christ's citation in Matt. 4:4 of Deut. 8:3 is dishonest and incompetent and linked to his denial of the existence of the LXX (ancient testimony notwithstanding: see Ralhf's critical edition of LXX for historical comments). Gipp (G56) maintains Christ quotes the ITALICIZED word "word" AS IF it had been part of the original Hebrew text in Moses. Gipp claims this proves that the KJV was correct to put "word" in Moses and that Christ was essentially quoting a KJV Bible.

(a) It is true that the phrase "word" is implicit in Deut. 8:3, and that the italicized phrase is appropriate.

(b) Christ apparently quoted the Hebrew/Aramaic text WITHOUT the italicized word. But Matthew in writing the Greek text quotes the LXX in which **rhma(ti)** is found; and indeed Matt. 4:4 is exactly like the wording of LXX.

(c) Gipp's argument should have been: THE LXX IS QUOTING A KJV BIBLE!!

(5) The phony dichotomy of G52–57—that we accept all the italicized words of KJV or none of them—is nonsense. We accept each interpolation on its merits in the context in question.

## X. Emphasis on Education

(1) One of the main tenets of KJVO is that the perfect KJV is accessible to everyone regardless of educational background (so long as they are educated to be English-speaking!).

(2) Gipp refers at length to the educational background of his translator-priests of the KJV: G61–63. One would think the salient point would be their supernatural empowerment. Peter had no advanced education, but rather the gifts.

(3) Gipp ostentatiously states his education on the cover and title page of his Answer Book: **Dr. Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D.** "Th.D." just was not enough, you see, for the common man reading his book to get the point! (Of course, in "arrogant" academic circles, Th.D.'s tread lightly since the Th.D. compares not so well to a Ph.D. in theology.) However, Dr. Gipp's Th.D. education apparently has some gaps, as seen throughout his *Answer Book*.

(a) The Gothic "s" is similar to our "f", but still different and distinguishable to anyone that looks closely. The distinction is as great as that between Hebrew bet(h) and k(h)af. On G19–20, it is maintained that "set" in Gothic would be "fet". No, it would not.

(b) "Whom" is the accusative even in modern English, not "who" (which is nominative). On G131, next to last line, Gipp asks, "Who will you believe?" It should be "Whom will you believe?"

(c) Same error as in (b): Gipp, *op.cit.*, p. 115: "who the devil is guiding" should be "whom the devil is guiding".

(d) "one nation, **under God**" (G116) should be "one nation under God".

(e) There is a veritable plethora of avoidable sentence fragments. Here are typical examples:

(i) G2, lin4 from bottom. "An emphasis which is **plainly** unscriptural."

(ii) G143, lines 3–4. "**IF** there is any education associated with their degree."

(iii) G143, lines 8–9. "Earned and Honorary."

(iv) G47, lines 7–8. "A feat that it has apparently accomplished 'in spades'".

(v) G98, lines 4–6 from bottom. "While the mighty mice of twentieth century scholarship would translate an entirely new version over it."

(f) Confusion of "it's" ("it is") with "its" (genitive of "it"): G31, line 2. "You can't tell a book by it's cover" should be "you can't tell a book by its cover".

(g) The claim is made that each book of the O. T. is written in Hebrew (G99), "which was alone used by the inspired historians and poets of the Old Testament". This is false. Half of the book of Daniel is in Aramaic.

(h) There are a good many run-on sentences. Here is one example: G106: "**But** it is an author's prerogative to alter his own words, but that certainly does not give others ..."

(i) In counterdistinction to (g), Moses and David wrote IN GREEK, G132: "The Greek text which was used for the translation of the King James Bible extends back through history to the pens of Moses, David, Paul, John and the other inspired writers." [We ignore the mangling of the asyndeton in which the last comma is mandatory and the "and" optional---such are very frequent in G].

(j) "One in the same" (G136) should be "one AND the same".

(k) The passive form of "mislead" is "misled"---"Fundamentalists clinging to this tenet are misled." (G85) should be "fundamentalists clinging to this tenet are misled".

(l) "It is us" (G85) should be "It is we" (memo: the verb "to be" takes a predicate NOMINATIVE).

(m) "Paying you bill" (G136) should be "paying your bill".

(n) "**AGAPE vs PHILEO**" should be "**AGAPAO vs PHILEO**" (comparing VERB with verb) or more accurately "**AGAPAO word group vs PHILEO word group**".

(o) Words that sound the same (homonyms or homophones) often do NOT mean the same (e.g. lie, lye). This is especially true of "dual" and "duel", the former meaning "of or pertaining to TWO" and the latter meaning "fight or WAR between opposing parties". "It was Origen, deceived by the duel intoxicants of education and philosophy [missing comma---another run-on sentence] who upon receipt of pure copies of scripture altered them to parallel his twisted thinking." (G39). Assuming that "dueling" was not intended---these intoxicants were not at war with each other, one would presume that "DUAL intoxicants" was intended.

## XI. Final Comment

Time fails me in analyzing all the illogical and goofy arguments inherent in the KJVO position (and I think I am being kind). The abandonment of sound reason and standard inference rules saturates Gipp's *Answer Book* and other books of this ilk. The examples given above are only a sample. One must see them for themselves in context. Also see the exchanges on TDOG and the many excellent posts there, most notably by Jim Hilston.

## KING JAMES VERSION ONLY POSITION IN LIGHT OF PAULINE LAW

Proverbs 26:4,5

Answer not a fool according to his folly,  
lest thou also be like unto him.

Answer a fool according to his folly,  
lest he be wise in his own conceit.

*Sequens*, "KJV" refers to King James Version as of 2004, but not New King James Version (NKJV); and "KJVO" refers to the King James Version Only position.

Idea: have two sessions, where we answer KJVO á la Proverbs 26:4 in the first session (August 2004) and then answer KJVO á la Proverbs 26:5 in the second session (September 2004).

AUGUST SESSION: Prov. 26:4

O. Personal Statement. I generally have a high opinion of KJV overall among extant translations; I think the Byzantine text type should not be dismissed out of hand on the basis of WH; and I currently regard the Byzantine as often the preferred text (see Harry Stutz, *The Byzantine Text Type & New Testament Textual Criticism*).

I. KJVO tenets. See especially the writings of Samuel Gipp and Peter Ruckman; it is my view that David Fuller (*Which Bible?*) is primarily dealing with the TR/Byzantine text issue and not the issue of the translation).

(1) KJV is the Word of God in that each of its words is accurate and correct and sufficient, and collectively they are indeed the inerrant, inspired Word of God. Hence, the KJVO reflects the view that the Word of God is precisely that SPOKEN by the words of God, and these words are those of the presently available KJV. The view that the Word of God is simply the words of God shall be called the **syntax** or **syntactical** view of Scripture in the sequel. That KJVO is a syntactical view is further mandated by the fact that the ancient manuscripts do not matter, italicized words of the KJV are without error, and the archaic words of the KJV must be retained [S. C. Gipp, *The Answer Book*, Bible and Missionary Literature Foundation (Shelbyville, TN 37160), 1989, pp. 1–2, 11–13, 52–57, 89 (last paragraph), 90–92, 103, 117 (line 6 from bottom), and in fact the whole book].

(2) The translators were given special unction of the Holy Spirit to insure that their English translation was free of error.

(3) It is not merely unnecessary or even foolish, but rather an act of ungrateful and sinful defiance to consult Biblical manuscripts in the original tongues, since such activity is a rejection of God's perfect Bible in English for this age.

(4) The KJV is superior to any original language manuscripts—these have errors around which the translators under the supervision of the Holy Spirit navigated when translating into English.

(5) No advanced education is needed to know exactly what God has communicated, since His perfect Word is perfectly preserved for us in the KJV in English.

(6) In each age God has had a special linguistic community to which He has entrusted His Word: the Hebrew/Chaldee scriptures to Israel, the Koine Greek Scriptures to the Greek-speaking world, and the KJV to the English speaking world. Those who want to read the inerrant Word of God for the present age must do so in English.

(7) The italicized words in the KJV are also inspired and proof of the improvement of the KJV over the existing manuscripts.

(8) The KJV is the complete and final version of the Word of God—it brought together for the first time a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures with a translation of the Greek Scriptures to make a whole, inerrant Bible.

## II. Important (Pauline) questions addressed by KJVO

- (1) What is the Word of God?
- (2) What are the words of God and how are they related to the Word of God?
- (3) How is the common man to read or access the words of God and hence the Word of God? In particular, if in the Body there is neither Greek nor Jew nor Scythian (Turks, northern Arabs) nor barbarian (Germans, Celts, Mongols, Huns) nor slave nor free nor male nor female—as Pauline Law explicitly states, then by Semitic Case Law (which is the Pauline style), there are no groups whatsoever before God, hence NEITHER EDUCATED NOR UNEDUCATED.

Concerning (3), there seem to be three possibilities:

KJVO ANSWER: the Bible is inerrantly available in everyday English, namely in the KJV, so that every English-speaking person can access it.

HIGH CHURCH ANSWER: highly educated experts and/or highly spiritual persons act as intermediaries between the common man and the manuscripts and inform the common man what God has said. Cf. Tozer as quoted by Swindoll.

PAULINE ANSWER. See below.

## III Original source of KJVO—epistle dedicatory

Thesis statement: The KJV was made to solidify the religious position of King James I of Great Britain (James IV of Scotland) within the British Empire as the Head of the Church of England, especially in comparison with the papists on one side and the separatists on the other side. The papists wanted England to return to the Church of Rome; and the separatists looked at the Scriptures for themselves—even making their own translations—and had left the Church of England. Thus, irregardless of whether its wording is in fact correct in this passage or that passage, the *purpose* of the KJV translation is ANTI-PAULINE: it was dedicated to the notion of Britain as a special religious nation, even a Zion, before God with a messianic purpose and mission and as such is in egregious defiance of Pauline Law.

This thesis is amply confirmed by the dedicatory epistle of the KJV by its translators in which they dedicate this translation to James. We sample this dedication; but one should really read the whole thing—seeing is believing.

- (1) "TO THE MOST HIGH AND MIGHTY PRINCE, JAMES, *bu the Grace of God*, KING OF ..., DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, etc."
- (2) "GREAT and manifold were the blessings, most dread Sovereign, which Almighty God, the Father of all mercies, bestowed upon us the people of England, ..."
- (3) "Our Sion [i.e. Zion, i.e. England], ... this Land, ..."
- (4) "... Your Majesty's loyal and religious people ... [who] bless You in their hearts as that sanctified Person who, under God, is the immediate Author of their true happiness .. [and] they observe that the zeal of Your Majesty toward the house of God doth not slack or go backward ... [and that You cherish] the Teachers thereof by caring for the Church as a most tender and loving nursing Father."
- (5) "... there should be one more exact Translation of the holy Scriptures in the *English Tongue*; ... that the Church of *England* shall reap good fruit thereby; we hold it our duty to offer it to Your Majesty, not only as to our King and Sovereign, but as to the principal Mover and Author of the work; ..."

(6) "... it [this translation] may receive approbation and patronage from so learned and judicious a Prince as your Highness is ... So that if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by Popish Persons at home or abroad, who will therefore malign us, because we are poor instruments to make God's holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness; or if on the other hand, we shall be maligned by self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their own anvil; ..."

Statement (5) in today's English would punctuated to say "one, more exact", which meant the translators understood their charge was to make the FINAL, OFFICIAL translation of the realm—this is why it is called the AUTHORIZED VERSION—all others are UNAUTHORIZED. Further, this translation was made under the patronage of King James for the sake of the Anglican Church, to strengthen its—and hence his—position relative to the Papists on one hand and the separatists on the other hand. This must be understood in the historical context of James putting into place a "Final Solution" for separatists: whereas Elizabeth had occasionally beheaded separatist leaders, on other occasions she tolerated them; but James' policy was that separatists either return to the Anglican Church or leave England or be killed.

Thus the translators in their messianic nationalism were the first purveyors of KJVO.

(The dedicatory epistle directly violates Rom. 14:5, II Tim 2:15 (cf. I Tim. 3:9), Tit. 2:23, to say nothing of Israel's practice in such matters (Ne. 8:8). Each regenerated person is driven by the Holy Spirit to hammer things out on his own anvil, to frame things for himself/herself, ESPECIALLY when it comes to the sense of what the original documents are SAYING; and so each regenerated member of the Body of Christ is a separatist as matters would have been viewed by the translators. The 1611 KJV, under the protection of the King, was intended to suppress separatists and hence any true Body saints that might have existed at that time in England.)

#### IV. Pauline Answers to the Important Questions

My attempt to address important (Pauline) questions addressed by KJVO is now given. These comments grew out of a conversation with Phil Dennis at the TGF conference on apologetics, the key idea of "inscripturation" is Phil's idea, and subsequent discussions with Jim Hilston have influenced my thinking on how the errors of manuscript are sufficiently controlled. Rich Nath pointed out the relationship between John 17:8,10 and inscripturation.

QUESTION (1/2). The Word of God is that message which was inscripturated in the original autographs, hence the joins of the words of the original autographs, meaning the least general statements supportable by the words of God. Hence the Word of God rides *upon* the words of God and is that which is SAID by the words of God. In the sequel we shall call this the **inscripturation** or **inscripturational** view of Scripture. Note the contrast with the syntactical view implicit in the KJVO position as discussed above.

Biblical support includes the statements in Matt. 4:4 and Luke 4:4—man is not to live **upon (epi)** bread alone, but **upon (epi)** each word of God—and the statements of John 17:6,8,14—on one hand Christ gave the disciples the **words** of God, but on the other hand, He gave them the **word** of God which they have kept (the singular translates **logos**, namely that said by the Sayer, the Logos). We have not yet systematized the Biblical support for inscripturation, and this promises to be a fruitful endeavor indeed.

QUESTION (1/2). The extant manuscripts collectively and sufficiently contain the words of God that when the normative hermeneutic / grammatico-historical method is applied to these manuscripts, the SAME message can be recovered as was encoded in the original autographs.

QUESTION (1/2) God's preservation of His words is sufficiently robust and the normative hermeneutic / grammatico-historical method is sufficiently tolerant of occasional discrepancies in the manuscripts that the message that emerges is inerrant. This hermeneutic essentially has an error-correction code built in.

As an analogy, consider a musical CD. Such a CD has a spiral comprising a long series of "lands" and "pits" which should be read as "1's" and "0's". No such CD is errorless due to surface irregularities, stamping inaccuracies,

scratches, etc. Each CD player is equipped with error-correction code algorithms, which are able to contextually reconstruct the digital signal when the laser encounters glitches on the CD, just as if the CD had been without errors. Thus, despite the errors on the CD, a perfect signal is reconstructed (within the limits of that digital recording system). On the other hand, if the CD is too severely scratched, then these algorithms cannot adequately compensate and the CD player sends unpleasant noises to the amplifiers and speakers/headphones. The point of quality control in the manufacture of CD's is to insure that the errors on the CD do not exceed the capacity of the error-correction algorithms to function sufficiently to recover the original signal.

In the same manner, our collection of manuscripts, say for the Greek N. T., are not without errors. But our confidence is that God has sufficiently overseen the copying of manuscripts that their errors do not exceed the capacity of the normative hermeneutic / grammatico-historical method to recover without error and with specificity the original message that God intended for the original audience.

What is the mechanism for error and how is it constrained to stay within the threshold of the normative hermeneutic? My opinion is that mechanism is related to demonic activity (in the case of a scribe deliberately miscopying the text in front of them, as in the cases of the emendations of the Massoretic scribes and apparently the case also of the Greek scribes, this would seem to be due to demonic possession); but this demonic activity is controlled by the Holy Spirit on account of the current presence on earth of the Body of Christ (II Thess. 2:6-7). So we have the confidence that for us in the Body, the Spirit controls the errors sufficiently so that the hermeneutic of straightly plowing (II Tim. 2:15) recovers for us the original message without error. After the Body ascends with Christ to the Throne of Heaven to administer the angelic hosts, demonic activity is less restrained, but countered by the reinstatement of the Israel's charismata by which the original autographs can be given miraculously! Thus each of the Elect Gentiles, Elect Israel, and the Body can have confidence (each in its own way) in the Scriptures.

The analogy with musical CD's can be taken further. Consider the example of Christ's debates with the rabbis and Sanhedral authorities the last morning He was in the Temple. These debates are primarily recorded in Matthew (with some supplementation from the other Gospels). Now these debates were apparently conducted in Hebrew, possibly in Aramaic; but Matthew's record is in Greek; and now we translate those debates into modern English and recovered the issues being debated with the normative hermeneutic. Similarly, an analogue musical performance is captured by a microphone, the microphone analogue signal is sent to an ADC (analogue to digital converter), the digital signal recorded onto a master tape, the master tape drives the stampers to put the digital signal on a CD, the CD is read in a CD player with error-correction algorithms to make a correct digital signal, this signal goes to a DAC (digital to analogue converter), and the analogue signal is outputted to amplifiers and speakers to reproduce the analogue performance in our living rooms.

QUESTION (3) It is the obligation of EVERY member of the Body of Christ to work and labor in the Scriptures, and in particular to:

- (a) understand the Word of God in light of extant manuscripts in the original languages to the best of his/her abilities and resources, and
- (b) work to enable other members of the Body of Christ to do the same.

If the Body members will implement Rom. 12, II Tim. 2:15 (cf. I Tim. 3:9), etc, as understood by the normative hermeneutic, then the Word of God will emerge without error and with clarity (perspicuity). Also see Rom. 14:5, (cf. I Tim. 3:9), Tit. 2:23, to say nothing of Israel's practice in such matters (Ne. 8:8).

#### V. Examples of where KJV is dead wrong, but Massoretic Text / TR are uncontested

The reader should know that the following are ONLY a sample. There are many more examples.

##### (1) Acts 12:4

The word translated **Easter** is **páscha** (πάσχα), a Greek cognate of the Hebrew **pesach** (cf. the Greek verb **páschw** for **suffer**)

(a) **Páscha** occurs 29 times in the NT and in each case the KJV translates it as **Passover** with the sole exception of Acts 12:4.

(b) The Hebrew day is nighttime followed by daylight. Passover is prepared on the 14th of Nisan during the daylight and eaten the evening of the 15th of Nisan, namely on the evening of the **FIRST** day of Unleavened Bread (which is why the Passover is eaten with matzoth!!). Hence the eating of Passover, namely the festival of Passover proper, is **PART** of the festival of Unleavened Bread.

(c) **Passover** for Grecian Jews stood both for the specific festival of Passover and by synecdoche (of the part for the whole) for the whole festival of Unleavened Bread. The following is only part of the proof, but it is more than sufficient.

(i) Adult males were to appear before the Lord at the three great festivals: Unleavened Bread, Weeks, and Tabernacles—Ex. 23:15; 34:22–23, Deut. 16:16.

(ii) Luke 2:41–43 refers to the first of these festivals as **Passover** or **páscha**. Further, 2:43 speaks of the **DAYS** being completed, meaning the days of the preparation plus the seven days of Unleavened Bread, the first evening of which was the actual Passover.

(iii) Luke 22:1 is a slam-dunk:

Now the Feast of Unleavened Bread drew nigh, which is called the **páscha**.

(iv) Luke 22:7 is another slam-dunk: please read and see.

(v) John 2:13; 11:55. There is no reason for Christ or the Jews to go up to Jerusalem for Passover unless **páscha** stands for the whole festival of Unleavened Bread.

(d) In Acts 12:4, we must honor the unanimous usage of **páscha** for Passover in the small and all of Unleavened Bread UNLESS the context overrides—this is the Law regarding the normative hermeneutic (II. Tim. 2:15). But the context does not override: the context associates **páscha** with Unleavened Bread. So after **páscha** means **AFTER UNLEAVENED BREAD**. I believe this to be the Word of God on the matter.

(e) KJVO rebuts: that Passover and Unleavened Bread are separate (former is on the 14th and the latter begins on the 15th) and that the only way one could be in the days of Unleavened Bread and subsequently bring Peter out after **páscha** would be if **páscha** really meant **EASTER**, the pagan sex-tinged festival to Astarte. However:

(i) The Word of God stands against KJVO: the normative hermeneutic forces the matter.

(ii) The Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford Universal edition) stands KJVO: **Easter** by the time of 1611 had become a Catholic/Protestant synonym for the Resurrection, which they associated with Passover!!!

(g) KJV wrongfully translated this passage because of the ceremonial corruption of the Church of England; and the KJVO is wrong thrice: **Easter** is the wrong word, their argument is wrong even as measured against the confused intent of the KJV translators, and the Resurrection is to be associated with the **FEAST OF FIRSTFRUITS**.

## (2) Phil. 3:20

(a) KJV translates **politéuma** (*πολιτεύμα*) by **conversation**, which in the 1600's and 1700's (see OED and Ps. 50:23 in KJV) means manner of living and conduct.

(b) Facts of **politéuma**.

(i) **Politéuma** derives from **politéuw** (to govern or administer the affairs of state)—see Wigram's Analytical Lexicon and is neuter singular. Therefore the root meaning of **politéuma** is **seat of authority or government**.

(ii) Occurs only in Phil. 3:20 and II Macc. 12:7. In the earlier occurrence, it refers to Joppa as **the seat of authority or government** of its region.

(iii) In context, **politéuma** must be the antecedent of the pronoun in the phrase **from which also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ**. This is because **which** (*‘ου*) is genitive SINGULAR, and the other candidate for antecedent, **‘ouranoís** (HEAVENS), is PLURAL. Therefore Christ descends from the Body's **politéuma**.

(c) It is silly to say that Christ descends from a **conversation** (even in the sense of manner of living) or even a **citizenship**. Further, **politéuma** in its root meaning and only other occurrence means **seat of authority**, which makes PERFECT sense in context. I believe the Word of God here is that Christ descends from the Body's seat of authority, namely that Christ is seated where the Body will be seated in the Rapture/Ascension, and that the Body will ascend to sit jointly with Christ on His Throne, and that His Throne is our Seat of Authority.

(d) The KJV disregards the above facts and instead confuses **politéuma** with **conversation** and violates the grammatical agreement of a pronoun with its antecedent.

(3) Job 40:15; 41:12, 31–33

See the endnotes for the Job's Park talk for the documentation for how **grass, deep**, etc, should be translated. Briefly, **grass** in Job 40:15 should be translated **plants** (**khaziyr** (*plants*) comes from **khazeer** (*green*) and is often used of plants and herbs—cf. vv. 21–22, and the meaning of plants vis-a-vis grass is reinforced by the swampy environment of vv. 21--22); the entirety of 41:12 must be retranslated—**I will not keep silent concerning his supporting-limbs, or his power, or his balanced frame**; and almost the entirety of 41:31–33 must be retranslated—

**He makes the marsh-depths to boil like a pot; he makes [shallow] water  
[to be stirred] like a pot of ointment. He makes a path shine after him;  
it seems the river is grey-headed. He has no equal on land,  
one made without fear.**

(4) Isaiah 48:16

The KJV ends the verse **and now the Lord God, and His Spirit, hath sent me**, an egregious error and a DENIAL of the Trinitarian order---the One speaking is the Logos as the context amply documents. But the Hebrew text in fact states **and now Master Jehovah [the Father] hath sent Me [the Son] and His Spirit [the Spirit]**.

(5) Rom. 10:9

The KJV, in common with all other translations I have seen, is egregiously wrong here. What Paul wrote is **if thou shalt confess with thy mouth, "Lord Jesus"**, namely the confession is made personally and privately to Christ as an act of submission to Christ as Head of the Body of Christ (which the context from Verse 6 on amply supports, namely a confession apart from ritual and symbolic representation, as well as a belief in the resurrection which is in the heart and hence is private). But the KJV says **if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus**, which is not an act of direct, personal subjugation to Christ, but the confession of a propositional truth, a step in the direction which puts Christ at a distance as a piece of information to be agreed with, which confession even the demons can make. Later translations followed the KJV lead and are even more egregious **if thou shalt confess with thy mouth that Jesus is Lord**, the act of surrender to Christ as Head of the Body of Christ now being lost.

(6) Rom. 11:17,22

See the Romans notes, Translation Section, and compare Verses 17, 22 there against the KJV. One quick example is the complete disregard for the suffix **rizw** in **enkentrizw**, indicating the grafting is not into a branch, but down into the root itself, which is very significant in light of the actual structure of an olive tree and the dispensational point Paul is making in context. I can emphatically state the KJV (in common with all other available translations) makes a complete mess of Rom. 11:17–25 and Paul's clear teaching using the structure of an olive tree is repeatedly lost by the incompetent handling of the underlying Greek text.

(7) II Cor. 8:23, Phil. 2:25

In each passage, each Greek text labels Titus and Epaphroditus as **apostolos**, which the KJV translates as **messengers**, a highly prejudicial and inaccurate translation. **Messenger** would be the expected translation if the underlying Greek word were **aggelos [angelos]**; whereas **apostolos** should be translated (or transliterated) **apostle**, meaning one who comes not simply as a messenger, but as an authorized messenger with a commission. Titus and Epaphroditus were supernaturally commissioned extensions of Paul's apostolic commission. They were apostles of Paul to the Body of Christ even as Paul was the apostle of Christ to the Body of Christ. Rather than let the reader puzzle over Titus and Epaphroditus being apostles and come to realize that there is a PAULINE apostleship to the Body of Christ (even as there is a PETRINE apostleship to Israel and the Nations) comprising Paul, Sosthenes, Timothy, Titus, Epaphroditus, Epaphras, Tychicus, Silas, etc, the KJV squelches the whole matter by their egregiously inaccurate translation.

Of course, there are many places where KJV is correct and other translations are incorrect, but that is not the point being considered here.

#### VI. Examples where TR is contested, followed by KJV, and rebutted by context

- (1) Eph. 3:9 The context is not dealing with **fellowship (koinonia)** as stated by TR in Eph. 3:9, but **dispensation (oikonomia)** as stated by other texts in Eph. 3:9, for the context is set by Eph. 3:2 in which the reading of **dispensation** is uncontested. In this case, TR is incorrect and the other texts are correct.
- (2) Rev. 5:9,10 The uncontested context has the angelic of holy angels called the 24 elders (called the **holy watchers** in Dan. 4:17,23 and the **court** in 7:11)—and hence creatures which have never sinned and are therefore not redeemed—singing, in the case of TR, of their own redemption, a contradiction, and in the case of other texts, of the personal and national redemption of Elect Israel from diaspora, this latter not a contradiction, but absolutely in keeping with the angelic ministry to Elect Israel. In this case, TR is incorrect and the other texts are correct.

Of course, there are many cases which I have found where TR is correct and WH is incorrect, but that is not the point being considered here.

#### VII. Anti-Pauline character of KJVO (see the sources mentioned above)

- (1) Charismatic in defiance of I Cor. 1:7; 13:1–13. The KJV translators were supernaturally guided, even in the italicized words which they added to the text. This defies Paul's statements in I Cor. 1:7; 13:1–13 (and even here some retranslation is needed): the charismatic gifts for the Body are finished with the revealing and confirming of the Pauline epistles, and will only resume in the Rapture-Ascension-Battle.
- (2) Ethnic/groupist/nationalistic position in defiance of Rom. 10:12, I Cor. 7:18–19, Gal. 3:28; 6:15, Eph. 2:11–16, Col. 3:11. There are NO groups before God today.
  - (a) See dedicatory cited above: Britain is Zion, Britain is/should be the Church of England, James is the Head of the Church of England, the KJV was made to strengthen the position of James and the Church of England, etc.
  - (b) S. C. Gipp, *The Answer Book*, pp. 32–33: Chinese believers must come to God through the English KJV, for the English-speaking people are a special people before God to whom the perfect KJV has been entrusted.
- (3) Hierarchical position (king as pharaoh, translators as translation-priests) in defiance of Rom. 10:12, I Cor. 7:18–19, Gal. 3:28; 6:15, Eph. 2:11–16, Col. 3:11 plus Eph. 4:5 (One Lord), I Tim. 2:5. See dedicatory and S. C. Gipp (*op. cit.*, 11–13, 32–34, 52–57, 63, 90–92, 154, 158–159).

SEPTEMBER SESSION: Prov. 26:5

In this session, we see how the KJVO position implodes, collapses upon itself.

#### VIII. Nonsense of making a perfect translation in this dispensation

POINT. It is inefficient, contrary to God's character, to have a PERFECT translation done by supernaturally inspired (or supervised or whatever) translators. An efficient God would have dispensed with documents in the original tongues and just inspired the translators to write the Scriptures down perfectly as prophets. With charismatic empowerment, there is no need of Hebrew or Greek manuscripts if the goal is a perfect English Bible—the Holy Spirit should have just inspired them as prophets to write it down in English. This is an absurdity, therefore there can never be a perfect translation in this dispensation (apart from the fact that such a translation would require the charismata *ab initio*, a violation of I Cor. 1:7, 13:1–13 a chosen and distinct people, a violation of the non-ethnicity of Pauline Law, etc, all as pointed out above).

The way for individual saints to know the Word of God as inscripturated is to wrestle for themselves and with the help of others in getting that Word from the words which God has seen fit to have preserved, trusting in the robustness of those words AND the error-correction implicit in the normative hermeneutic. Understanding the Word comes in no other way (Rom. 14:5, II Tim. 2:15, cf. Ne. 8:8).

The insistence on a perfect translation is therefore the position of defiance to work in the Word. Those of the KJVO position, if they are consistent—and we have seen examples of this—are hermeneutically and exegetically LAZY. Where are their works, the evidence of their having labored in the Word? (I Cor. 3:10–15)

#### IX. Multiple Revisions of KJV: 1611(1), 1611(2), 1612, 1613, 1616, 1617, 1629, 1638, 1743, 1762, 1769

In the sequel, we use the notation "Gn" or "Gn–m", where "G" refers to [S. C. Gipp, *The Answer Book*, Bible and Missionary Literature Foundation (Shelbyville, TN 37160), 1989] and "n" is page n in G and "n–m" is pages n–m in G.

(1) There were many printing errors as printers typeset the translators notes. In particular, two 1611 printings showed 100 discrepancies between them, even though the the same printers did both in Oxford apparently on the same press. Apparently the revisions of 1611, 1612, 1616 were aimed at correcting printer errors. See G17–24. And incidentally, the 1611 Cambridge KJV does not rank with any of the 1611 Oxford KJV's. WILL THE REAL 1611 KJV PLEASE STAND UP?

POINT. Apparently the God that inspired/supervised the translators to make an errorless translation, WAS UNABLE TO PREVENT THE PRINTERS FROM MAKING TYPESETTING ERRORS.

POINT. How do we KNOW that the modern KJV has ALL the errors corrected? This question cannot be affirmatively answered from the KJVO position. Since the KJVO view of the Word of God is syntactical and not inscripturational, they CANNOT KNOW THAT THEY HAVE THE WORD OF GOD, despite all their protests to the contrary. But we who trust God to have sufficiently preserved His words KNOW that if we consistently apply the normative hermeneutic both in matters of translation and exegesis, we shall HAVE the WORD of God. Ultimately, for the consistent KJVO man, he/she must simply close the book since they cannot know what errors remain and how serious they are; and this confirms our observation that such in fact do no apparent work in the Word.

Some examples:

- (a) 1611: this thing, 1638: this thing also
- (b) 1611: seek good, 1617: see God
- (c) 1611: returned, 1769: turned
- (d) 1611: thy right doeth, 1613: thy right hand doeth
- (e) 1611: the city, 1629: the city of the Damascenes
- (f) 1611: a fiery furnace, 1638: a burning fiery furnace
- (g) 1611: his place, 1638: his place

There are some 400 changes from 1611 (but which 1611???) to the present KJV. KJVO advocates say that almost all of these changes are "alleged" changes. Regenerated people will abandon KJVO and cling to a proper view of the Word of God.

(2) The way we know that we have the accurate KJV now is that God has preserved it for us to this day, despite the printing errors of the earlier editions. This is a CONTRADICTION to the syntactical point of view. See G24.

#### X. Faulty arguments by KJVO

(1) See the defense of KJV concerning Acts 12:4 in G3–8 and compare with our discussion in V(1) above. The KJVO defence is simply incompetent.

(2) The KJVO treatment of John 21:15–17 as given in G127–131 + Appendix 1 (Gipp, *op.cit.*) is simply dishonest. Gipp claims that **agapaw** and **philew** are fully interchangeable in Koine Greek and that the inerrant KJV rightly translates both by one English word **love**, and then Gipp administers a test: can one detect from the context which of **agapaw** or **philew** is intended in a given passage (without "cheating" and looking at the Greek text to see which word is used where—of course, a true, spiritual KJV man won't be looking at any Greek text!).

(a) The key to Gipp's test is that one is to use HIS statement of the standard definitions of **agapaw** and **philew**, to wit (G128): **agapaw** means "deep, intimate, selfless love", while **philew** means "casual friendly love". Now, since there are only two choices for the answer in each passage, and since none of the passages in question is consistent with the idea of casual friendly love, clearly, we would like to choose **agapaw** for each passage, which clearly shows that (in Gipp's argument) that there is no distinction between these two words and that the one English word **love** is sufficient.

(b) This is a classic case of a straw man. As determined in the TGF sessions on Romans 12 (see Jim Hilston's notes and followup), **philew** does not mean "casual friendly love", but rather for a member of the Body it indicates deep love which is the emotional response to that saint's **agapaw** of Christ as Head and His truth concerning the Body implanted in that saint at regeneration. There are parallels for Israel as the John 21 passage indicates: Peter's **philew** is rooted in his **agapaw** of Christ and His Kingdom and Christ is appealing to this fact to admonish Peter to follow through on his obligations as the Nasi of the Sanhedral Twelve (Eleven, soon to be Twelve with Matthias).

(c) If the underlying Greek text is uncontested, then knowing which word is being used would influence my understanding of the passage. Thus, the notion of the Gipp's test is faulty by design.

(3) The KJVO's treatment of Paul's citation in I Cor. 9:9 of Deut. 25:4 is dishonest and incompetent. Gipp (G55) maintains that Paul quotes the ITALICIZED phrase "the corn" AS IF it had been part of the original Hebrew text in Moses. Gipp claims this proves that the KJV was correct to put "the corn" in Moses and that Paul was essentially quoting a KJV Bible.

(a) It is true that the phrase "the corn" is implicit in Deut. 25:4, and that the italicized phrase is appropriate.

(b) IT IS FALSE THAT PAUL'S VERSION OF I COR. 9:9 HAS THE PHRASE "THE CORN". ALL the Greek texts read here, **Thou shalt not muzzle an ox treading** [i.e. which is treading]. Thus Paul (and LXX, incidentally) does NOT quote any italicized phrase.

(c) It is true that the KJV has "the corn" in I Cor. 9:9 NOT in italics; but that means the KJV VIOLATED ITS OWN POLICY and therefore CANNOT be inerrant. The KJV SHOULD HAVE italicized this phrase in I Cor. 9:9.

(d) Gipp believes the KJV to be syntactically inspired, and so the lack of italics in Paul and the italics in Moses convince him that Paul is quoting the italicized words of the KJV. This argument is completely false and rests on a tight circular argument.

(4) The KJVO's treatment of Christ's citation in Matt. 4:4 of Deut. 8:3 is dishonest and incompetent and linked to his denial of the existence of the LXX (ancient testimony notwithstanding: see Ralhf's critical edition of LXX for historical comments). Gipp (G56) maintains Christ quotes the ITALICIZED word "word" AS IF it had been part of the original Hebrew text in Moses. Gipp claims this proves that the KJV was correct to put "word" in Moses and that Christ was essentially quoting a KJV Bible.

(a) It is true that the phrase "word" is implicit in Deut. 8:3, and that the italicized phrase is appropriate.

(b) Christ apparently quoted the Hebrew/Aramaic text WITHOUT the italicized word. But Matthew in writing the Greek text quotes the LXX in which **rhma(ti)** is found; and indeed Matt. 4:4 is exactly like the wording of LXX.

(c) Gipp's argument should have been: THE LXX IS QUOTING A KJV BIBLE!!

(5) The phony dichotomy of G52–57—that we accept all the italicized words of KJV or none of them—is nonsense. We accept each interpolation on its merits in the context in question.

## X. Emphasis on Education

(1) One of the main tenets of KJVO is that the perfect KJV is accessible to everyone regardless of educational background (so long as they are educated to be English-speaking!).

(2) Gipp refers at length to the educational background of his translator-priests of the KJV: G61–63. One would think the salient point would be their supernatural empowerment. Peter had no advanced education, but rather the gifts.

(3) Gipp ostentatiously states his education on the cover and title page of his Answer Book: **Dr. Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D.** "Th.D." just was not enough, you see, for the common man reading his book to get the point! (Of course, in "arrogant" academic circles, Th.D.'s tread lightly since the Th.D. compares not so well to a Ph.D. in theology.) However, Dr. Gipp's Th.D. education apparently has some gaps, as seen throughout his *Answer Book*.

(a) The Gothic "s" is similar to our "f", but still different and distinguishable to anyone that looks closely. The distinction is as great as that between Hebrew bet(h) and k(h)af. On G19–20, it is maintained that "set" in Gothic would be "fet". No, it would not.

(b) "Whom" is the accusative even in modern English, not "who" (which is nominative). On G131, next to last line, Gipp asks, "Who will you believe?" It should be "Whom will you believe?"

(c) Same error as in (b): Gipp, *op.cit.*, p. 115: "who the devil is guiding" should be "whom the devil is guiding".

(d) "one nation, **under God**" (G116) should be "one nation under God".

(e) There is a veritable plethora of avoidable sentence fragments. Here are typical examples:

(i) G2, lin4 from bottom. "An emphasis which is **plainly** unscriptural."

(ii) G143, lines 3–4. "**IF** there is any education associated with their degree."

(iii) G143, lines 8–9. "Earned and Honorary."

(iv) G47, lines 7–8. "A feat that it has apparently accomplished 'in spades'".

(v) G98, lines 4–6 from bottom. "While the mighty mice of twentieth century scholarship would translate an entirely new version over it."

(f) Confusion of "it's" ("it is") with "its" (genitive of "it"): G31, line 2. "You can't tell a book by it's cover" should be "you can't tell a book by its cover".

(g) The claim is made that each book of the O. T. is written in Hebrew (G99), "which was alone used by the inspired historians and poets of the Old Testament". This is false. Half of the book of Daniel is in Aramaic.

(h) There are a good many run-on sentences. Here is one example: G106: "**But** it is an author's prerogative to alter his own words, but that certainly does not give others ..."

(i) In counterdistinction to (g), Moses and David wrote IN GREEK, G132: "The Greek text which was used for the translation of the King James Bible extends back through history to the pens of Moses, David, Paul, John and the other inspired writers." [We ignore the mangling of the asyndeton in which the last comma is mandatory and the "and" optional---such are very frequent in G].

(j) "One in the same" (G136) should be "one AND the same".

(k) The passive form of "mislead" is "misled"---"Fundamentalists clinging to this tenet are misled." (G85) should be "fundamentalists clinging to this tenet are misled".

(l) "It is us" (G85) should be "It is we" (memo: the verb "to be" takes a predicate NOMINATIVE).

(m) "Paying you bill" (G136) should be "paying your bill".

(n) "**AGAPE vs PHILEO**" should be "**AGAPAO vs PHILEO**" (comparing VERB with verb) or more accurately "**AGAPAO word group vs PHILEO word group**".

(o) Words that sound the same (homonyms or homophones) often do NOT mean the same (e.g. lie, lye). This is especially true of "dual" and "duel", the former meaning "of or pertaining to TWO" and the latter meaning "fight or WAR between opposing parties". "It was Origen, deceived by the duel intoxicants of education and philosophy [missing comma---another run-on sentence] who upon receipt of pure copies of scripture altered them to parallel his twisted thinking." (G39). Assuming that "dueling" was not intended---these intoxicants were not at war with each other, one would presume that "DUAL intoxicants" was intended.

## XI. Final Comment

Time fails me in analyzing all the illogical and goofy arguments inherent in the KJVO position (and I think I am being kind). The abandonment of sound reason and standard inference rules saturates Gipp's *Answer Book* and other books of this ilk. The examples given above are only a sample. One must see them for themselves in context. Also see the exchanges on TDOG and the many excellent posts there, most notably by Jim Hilston.

## KING JAMES VERSION ONLY POSITION IN LIGHT OF PAULINE LAW

Proverbs 26:4,5

Answer not a fool according to his folly,  
lest thou also be like unto him.

Answer a fool according to his folly,  
lest he be wise in his own conceit.

*Sequens*, "KJV" refers to King James Version as of 2004, but not New King James Version (NKJV); and "KJVO" refers to the King James Version Only position.

Idea: have two sessions, where we answer KJVO á la Proverbs 26:4 in the first session (August 2004) and then answer KJVO á la Proverbs 26:5 in the second session (September 2004).

AUGUST SESSION: Prov. 26:4

O. Personal Statement. I generally have a high opinion of KJV overall among extant translations; I think the Byzantine text type should not be dismissed out of hand on the basis of WH; and I currently regard the Byzantine as often the preferred text (see Harry Stutz, *The Byzantine Text Type & New Testament Textual Criticism*).

I. KJVO tenets. See especially the writings of Samuel Gipp and Peter Ruckman; it is my view that David Fuller (*Which Bible?*) is primarily dealing with the TR/Byzantine text issue and not the issue of the translation).

(1) KJV is the Word of God in that each of its words is accurate and correct and sufficient, and collectively they are indeed the inerrant, inspired Word of God. Hence, the KJVO reflects the view that the Word of God is precisely that SPOKEN by the words of God, and these words are those of the presently available KJV. The view that the Word of God is simply the words of God shall be called the **syntax** or **syntactical** view of Scripture in the sequel. That KJVO is a syntactical view is further mandated by the fact that the ancient manuscripts do not matter, italicized words of the KJV are without error, and the archaic words of the KJV must be retained [S. C. Gipp, *The Answer Book*, Bible and Missionary Literature Foundation (Shelbyville, TN 37160), 1989, pp. 1–2, 11–13, 52–57, 89 (last paragraph), 90–92, 103, 117 (line 6 from bottom), and in fact the whole book].

(2) The translators were given special unction of the Holy Spirit to insure that their English translation was free of error.

(3) It is not merely unnecessary or even foolish, but rather an act of ungrateful and sinful defiance to consult Biblical manuscripts in the original tongues, since such activity is a rejection of God's perfect Bible in English for this age.

(4) The KJV is superior to any original language manuscripts—these have errors around which the translators under the supervision of the Holy Spirit navigated when translating into English.

(5) No advanced education is needed to know exactly what God has communicated, since His perfect Word is perfectly preserved for us in the KJV in English.

(6) In each age God has had a special linguistic community to which He has entrusted His Word: the Hebrew/Chaldee scriptures to Israel, the Koine Greek Scriptures to the Greek-speaking world, and the KJV to the English speaking world. Those who want to read the inerrant Word of God for the present age must do so in English.

(7) The italicized words in the KJV are also inspired and proof of the improvement of the KJV over the existing manuscripts.

(8) The KJV is the complete and final version of the Word of God—it brought together for the first time a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures with a translation of the Greek Scriptures to make a whole, inerrant Bible.

## II. Important (Pauline) questions addressed by KJVO

- (1) What is the Word of God?
- (2) What are the words of God and how are they related to the Word of God?
- (3) How is the common man to read or access the words of God and hence the Word of God? In particular, if in the Body there is neither Greek nor Jew nor Scythian (Turks, northern Arabs) nor barbarian (Germans, Celts, Mongols, Huns) nor slave nor free nor male nor female—as Pauline Law explicitly states, then by Semitic Case Law (which is the Pauline style), there are no groups whatsoever before God, hence NEITHER EDUCATED NOR UNEDUCATED.

Concerning (3), there seem to be three possibilities:

KJVO ANSWER: the Bible is inerrantly available in everyday English, namely in the KJV, so that every English-speaking person can access it.

HIGH CHURCH ANSWER: highly educated experts and/or highly spiritual persons act as intermediaries between the common man and the manuscripts and inform the common man what God has said. Cf. Tozer as quoted by Swindoll.

PAULINE ANSWER. See below.

## III Original source of KJVO—epistle dedicatory

Thesis statement: The KJV was made to solidify the religious position of King James I of Great Britain (James IV of Scotland) within the British Empire as the Head of the Church of England, especially in comparison with the papists on one side and the separatists on the other side. The papists wanted England to return to the Church of Rome; and the separatists looked at the Scriptures for themselves—even making their own translations—and had left the Church of England. Thus, irregardless of whether its wording is in fact correct in this passage or that passage, the *purpose* of the KJV translation is ANTI-PAULINE: it was dedicated to the notion of Britain as a special religious nation, even a Zion, before God with a messianic purpose and mission and as such is in egregious defiance of Pauline Law.

This thesis is amply confirmed by the dedicatory epistle of the KJV by its translators in which they dedicate this translation to James. We sample this dedication; but one should really read the whole thing—seeing is believing.

- (1) "TO THE MOST HIGH AND MIGHTY PRINCE, JAMES, *bu the Grace of God*, KING OF ..., DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, etc."
- (2) "GREAT and manifold were the blessings, most dread Sovereign, which Almighty God, the Father of all mercies, bestowed upon us the people of England, ..."
- (3) "Our Sion [i.e. Zion, i.e. England], ... this Land, ..."
- (4) "... Your Majesty's loyal and religious people ... [who] bless You in their hearts as that sanctified Person who, under God, is the immediate Author of their true happiness .. [and] they observe that the zeal of Your Majesty toward the house of God doth not slack or go backward ... [and that You cherish] the Teachers thereof by caring for the Church as a most tender and loving nursing Father."
- (5) "... there should be one more exact Translation of the holy Scriptures in the *English Tongue*; ... that the Church of *England* shall reap good fruit thereby; we hold it our duty to offer it to Your Majesty, not only as to our King and Sovereign, but as to the principal Mover and Author of the work; ..."

(6) "... it [this translation] may receive approbation and patronage from so learned and judicious a Prince as your Highness is ... So that if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by Popish Persons at home or abroad, who will therefore malign us, because we are poor instruments to make God's holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness; or if on the other hand, we shall be maligned by self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their own anvil; ..."

Statement (5) in today's English would punctuated to say "one, more exact", which meant the translators understood their charge was to make the FINAL, OFFICIAL translation of the realm—this is why it is called the AUTHORIZED VERSION—all others are UNAUTHORIZED. Further, this translation was made under the patronage of King James for the sake of the Anglican Church, to strengthen it—and hence his—position relative to the Papists on one hand and the separatists on the other hand. This must be understood in the historical context of James putting into place a "Final Solution" for separatists: whereas Elizabeth had occasionally beheaded separatist leaders, on other occasions she tolerated them; but James' policy was that separatists either return to the Anglican Church or leave England or be killed.

Thus the translators in their messianic nationalism were the first purveyors of KJVO.

(The dedicatory epistle directly violates Rom. 14:5, II Tim 2:15 (cf. I Tim. 3:9), Tit. 2:23, to say nothing of Israel's practice in such matters (Ne. 8:8). Each regenerated person is driven by the Holy Spirit to hammer things out on his own anvil, to frame things for himself/herself, ESPECIALLY when it comes to the sense of what the original documents are SAYING; and so each regenerated member of the Body of Christ is a separatist as matters would have been viewed by the translators. The 1611 KJV, under the protection of the King, was intended to suppress separatists and hence any true Body saints that might have existed at that time in England.)

#### IV. Pauline Answers to the Important Questions

My attempt to address important (Pauline) questions addressed by KJVO is now given. These comments grew out of a conversation with Phil Dennis at the TGF conference on apologetics, the key idea of "inscripturation" is Phil's idea, and subsequent discussions with Jim Hilston have influenced my thinking on how the errors of manuscript are sufficiently controlled. Rich Nath pointed out the relationship between John 17:8,10 and inscripturation.

QUESTION (1/2). The Word of God is that message which was inscripturated in the original autographs, hence the joins of the words of the original autographs, meaning the least general statements supportable by the words of God. Hence the Word of God rides *upon* the words of God and is that which is SAID by the words of God. In the sequel we shall call this the **inscripturation** or **inscripturational** view of Scripture. Note the contrast with the syntactical view implicit in the KJVO position as discussed above.

Biblical support includes the statements in Matt. 4:4 and Luke 4:4—man is not to live **upon (epi)** bread alone, but **upon (epi)** each word of God—and the statements of John 17:6,8,14—on one hand Christ gave the disciples the **words** of God, but on the other hand, He gave them the **word** of God which they have kept (the singular translates **logos**, namely that said by the Sayer, the Logos). We have not yet systematized the Biblical support for inscripturation, and this promises to be a fruitful endeavor indeed.

QUESTION (1/2). The extant manuscripts collectively and sufficiently contain the words of God that when the normative hermeneutic / grammatico-historical method is applied to these manuscripts, the SAME message can be recovered as was encoded in the original autographs.

QUESTION (1/2) God's preservation of His words is sufficiently robust and the normative hermeneutic / grammatico-historical method is sufficiently tolerant of occasional discrepancies in the manuscripts that the message that emerges is inerrant. This hermeneutic essentially has an error-correction code built in.

As an analogy, consider a musical CD. Such a CD has a spiral comprising a long series of "lands" and "pits" which should be read as "1's" and "0's". No such CD is errorless due to surface irregularities, stamping inaccuracies,

scratches, etc. Each CD player is equipped with error-correction code algorithms, which are able to contextually reconstruct the digital signal when the laser encounters glitches on the CD, just as if the CD had been without errors. Thus, despite the errors on the CD, a perfect signal is reconstructed (within the limits of that digital recording system). On the other hand, if the CD is too severely scratched, then these algorithms cannot adequately compensate and the CD player sends unpleasant noises to the amplifiers and speakers/headphones. The point of quality control in the manufacture of CD's is to insure that the errors on the CD do not exceed the capacity of the error-correction algorithms to function sufficiently to recover the original signal.

In the same manner, our collection of manuscripts, say for the Greek N. T., are not without errors. But our confidence is that God has sufficiently overseen the copying of manuscripts that their errors do not exceed the capacity of the normative hermeneutic / grammatico-historical method to recover without error and with specificity the original message that God intended for the original audience.

What is the mechanism for error and how is it constrained to stay within the threshold of the normative hermeneutic? My opinion is that mechanism is related to demonic activity (in the case of a scribe deliberately miscopying the text in front of them, as in the cases of the emendations of the Massoretic scribes and apparently the case also of the Greek scribes, this would seem to be due to demonic possession); but this demonic activity is controlled by the Holy Spirit on account of the current presence on earth of the Body of Christ (II Thess. 2:6-7). So we have the confidence that for us in the Body, the Spirit controls the errors sufficiently so that the hermeneutic of straightly plowing (II Tim. 2:15) recovers for us the original message without error. After the Body ascends with Christ to the Throne of Heaven to administer the angelic hosts, demonic activity is less restrained, but countered by the reinstatement of the Israel's charismata by which the original autographs can be given miraculously! Thus each of the Elect Gentiles, Elect Israel, and the Body can have confidence (each in its own way) in the Scriptures.

The analogy with musical CD's can be taken further. Consider the example of Christ's debates with the rabbis and Sanhedral authorities the last morning He was in the Temple. These debates are primarily recorded in Matthew (with some supplementation from the other Gospels). Now these debates were apparently conducted in Hebrew, possibly in Aramaic; but Matthew's record is in Greek; and now we translate those debates into modern English and recovered the issues being debated with the normative hermeneutic. Similarly, an analogue musical performance is captured by a microphone, the microphone analogue signal is sent to an ADC (analogue to digital converter), the digital signal recorded onto a master tape, the master tape drives the stampers to put the digital signal on a CD, the CD is read in a CD player with error-correction algorithms to make a correct digital signal, this signal goes to a DAC (digital to analogue converter), and the analogue signal is outputted to amplifiers and speakers to reproduce the analogue performance in our living rooms.

QUESTION (3) It is the obligation of EVERY member of the Body of Christ to work and labor in the Scriptures, and in particular to:

- (a) understand the Word of God in light of extant manuscripts in the original languages to the best of his/her abilities and resources, and
- (b) work to enable other members of the Body of Christ to do the same.

If the Body members will implement Rom. 12, II Tim. 2:15 (cf. I Tim. 3:9), etc, as understood by the normative hermeneutic, then the Word of God will emerge without error and with clarity (perspicuity). Also see Rom. 14:5, (cf. I Tim. 3:9), Tit. 2:23, to say nothing of Israel's practice in such matters (Ne. 8:8).

#### V. Examples of where KJV is dead wrong, but Massoretic Text / TR are uncontested

The reader should know that the following are ONLY a sample. There are many more examples.

##### (1) Acts 12:4

The word translated **Easter** is **páscha** (πάσχα), a Greek cognate of the Hebrew **pesach** (cf. the Greek verb **páschw** for **suffer**)

(a) **Páscha** occurs 29 times in the NT and in each case the KJV translates it as **Passover** with the sole exception of Acts 12:4.

(b) The Hebrew day is nighttime followed by daylight. Passover is prepared on the 14th of Nisan during the daylight and eaten the evening of the 15th of Nisan, namely on the evening of the FIRST day of Unleavened Bread (which is why the Passover is eaten with matzoth!!). Hence the eating of Passover, namely the festival of Passover proper, is PART of the festival of Unleavened Bread.

(c) **Passover** for Grecian Jews stood both for the specific festival of Passover and by synecdoche (of the part for the whole) for the whole festival of Unleavened Bread. The following is only part of the proof, but it is more than sufficient.

(i) Adult males were to appear before the Lord at the three great festivals: Unleavened Bread, Weeks, and Tabernacles—Ex. 23:15; 34:22–23, Deut. 16:16.

(ii) Luke 2:41–43 refers to the first of these festivals as **Passover** or **páscha**. Further, 2:43 speaks of the DAYS being completed, meaning the days of the preparation plus the seven days of Unleavened Bread, the first evening of which was the actual Passover.

(iii) Luke 22:1 is a slam-dunk:

Now the Feast of Unleavened Bread drew nigh, which is called the **páscha**.

(iv) Luke 22:7 is another slam-dunk: please read and see.

(v) John 2:13; 11:55. There is no reason for Christ or the Jews to go up to Jerusalem for Passover unless **páscha** stands for the whole festival of Unleavened Bread.

(d) In Acts 12:4, we must honor the unanimous usage of **páscha** for Passover in the small and all of Unleavened Bread UNLESS the context overrides—this is the Law regarding the normative hermeneutic (II. Tim. 2:15). But the context does not override: the context associates **páscha** with Unleavened Bread. So after **páscha** means AFTER UNLEAVENED BREAD. I believe this to be the Word of God on the matter.

(e) KJVO rebuts: that Passover and Unleavened Bread are separate (former is on the 14th and the latter begins on the 15th) and that the only way one could be in the days of Unleavened Bread and subsequently bring Peter out after **páscha** would be if **páscha** really meant EASTER, the pagan sex-tinged festival to Astarte. However:

(i) The Word of God stands against KJVO: the normative hermeneutic forces the matter.

(ii) The Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford Universal edition) stands KJVO: **Easter** by the time of 1611 had become a Catholic/Protestant synonym for the Resurrection, which they associated with Passover!!!

(g) KJV wrongfully translated this passage because of the ceremonial corruption of the Church of England; and the KJVO is wrong thrice: **Easter** is the wrong word, their argument is wrong even as measured against the confused intent of the KJV translators, and the Resurrection is to be associated with the FEAST OF FIRSTFRUITS.

## (2) Phil. 3:20

(a) KJV translates **politéuma** (*πολιτεύμα*) by **conversation**, which in the 1600's and 1700's (see OED and Ps. 50:23 in KJV) means manner of living and conduct.

(b) Facts of **politéuma**.

(i) **Politéuma** derives from **politéuw** (to govern or administer the affairs of state)—see Wigram's Analytical Lexicon and is neuter singular. Therefore the root meaning of **politéuma** is **seat of authority or government**.

(ii) Occurs only in Phil. 3:20 and II Macc. 12:7. In the earlier occurrence, it refers to Joppa as **the seat of authority or government** of its region.

(iii) In context, **politéuma** must be the antecedent of the pronoun in the phrase **from which also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ**. This is because **which** (*‘ου*) is genitive SINGULAR, and the other candidate for antecedent, **‘ouranoís** (HEAVENS), is PLURAL. Therefore Christ descends from the Body's **politéuma**.

(c) It is silly to say that Christ descends from a **conversation** (even in the sense of manner of living) or even a **citizenship**. Further, **politéuma** in its root meaning and only other occurrence means **seat of authority**, which makes PERFECT sense in context. I believe the Word of God here is that Christ descends from the Body's seat of authority, namely that Christ is seated where the Body will be seated in the Rapture/Ascension, and that the Body will ascend to sit jointly with Christ on His Throne, and that His Throne is our Seat of Authority.

(d) The KJV disregards the above facts and instead confuses **politéuma** with **conversation** and violates the grammatical agreement of a pronoun with its antecedent.

(3) Job 40:15; 41:12, 31–33

See the endnotes for the Job's Park talk for the documentation for how **grass, deep**, etc, should be translated. Briefly, **grass** in Job 40:15 should be translated **plants** (**khaziyr** (*plants*) comes from **khazeer** (*green*) and is often used of plants and herbs—cf. vv. 21–22, and the meaning of plants vis-a-vis grass is reinforced by the swampy environment of vv. 21--22); the entirety of 41:12 must be retranslated—**I will not keep silent concerning his supporting-limbs, or his power, or his balanced frame**; and almost the entirety of 41:31–33 must be retranslated—

**He makes the marsh-depths to boil like a pot; he makes [shallow] water  
[to be stirred] like a pot of ointment. He makes a path shine after him;  
it seems the river is grey-headed. He has no equal on land,  
one made without fear.**

(4) Isaiah 48:16

The KJV ends the verse **and now the Lord God, and His Spirit, hath sent me**, an egregious error and a DENIAL of the Trinitarian order---the One speaking is the Logos as the context amply documents. But the Hebrew text in fact states **and now Master Jehovah [the Father] hath sent Me [the Son] and His Spirit [the Spirit]**.

(5) Rom. 10:9

The KJV, in common with all other translations I have seen, is egregiously wrong here. What Paul wrote is **if thou shalt confess with thy mouth, "Lord Jesus"**, namely the confession is made personally and privately to Christ as an act of submission to Christ as Head of the Body of Christ (which the context from Verse 6 on amply supports, namely a confession apart from ritual and symbolic representation, as well as a belief in the resurrection which is in the heart and hence is private). But the KJV says **if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus**, which is not an act of direct, personal subjugation to Christ, but the confession of a propositional truth, a step in the direction which puts Christ at a distance as a piece of information to be agreed with, which confession even the demons can make. Later translations followed the KJV lead and are even more egregious **if thou shalt confess with thy mouth that Jesus is Lord**, the act of surrender to Christ as Head of the Body of Christ now being lost.

(6) Rom. 11:17,22

See the Romans notes, Translation Section, and compare Verses 17, 22 there against the KJV. One quick example is the complete disregard for the suffix **rizw** in **enkentrizw**, indicating the grafting is not into a branch, but down into the root itself, which is very significant in light of the actual structure of an olive tree and the dispensational point Paul is making in context. I can emphatically state the KJV (in common with all other available translations) makes a complete mess of Rom. 11:17–25 and Paul's clear teaching using the structure of an olive tree is repeatedly lost by the incompetent handling of the underlying Greek text.

(7) II Cor. 8:23, Phil. 2:25

In each passage, each Greek text labels Titus and Epaphroditus as **apostolos**, which the KJV translates as **messengers**, a highly prejudicial and inaccurate translation. **Messenger** would be the expected translation if the underlying Greek word were **aggelos** [**angelos**]; whereas **apostolos** should be translated (or transliterated) **apostle**, meaning one who comes not simply as a messenger, but as an authorized messenger with a commission. Titus and Epaphroditus were supernaturally commissioned extensions of Paul's apostolic commission. They were apostles of Paul to the Body of Christ even as Paul was the apostle of Christ to the Body of Christ. Rather than let the reader puzzle over Titus and Epaphroditus being apostles and come to realize that there is a PAULINE apostleship to the Body of Christ (even as there is a PETRINE apostleship to Israel and the Nations) comprising Paul, Sosthenes, Timothy, Titus, Epaphroditus, Epaphras, Tychicus, Silas, etc, the KJV squelches the whole matter by their egregiously inaccurate translation.

Of course, there are many places where KJV is correct and other translations are incorrect, but that is not the point being considered here.

#### VI. Examples where TR is contested, followed by KJV, and rebutted by context

(1) Eph. 3:9 The context is not dealing with **fellowship (koinonia)** as stated by TR in Eph. 3:9, but **dispensation (oikonomia)** as stated by other texts in Eph. 3:9, for the context is set by Eph. 3:2 in which the reading of **dispensation** is uncontested. In this case, TR is incorrect and the other texts are correct.

(2) Rev. 5:9,10 The uncontested context has the angelic of holy angels called the 24 elders (called the **holy watchers** in Dan. 4:17,23 and the **court** in 7:11)—and hence creatures which have never sinned and are therefore not redeemed—singing, in the case of TR, of their own redemption, a contradiction, and in the case of other texts, of the personal and national redemption of Elect Israel from diaspora, this latter not a contradiction, but absolutely in keeping with the angelic ministry to Elect Israel. In this case, TR is incorrect and the other texts are correct.

Of course, there are many cases which I have found where TR is correct and WH is incorrect, but that is not the point being considered here.

#### VII. Anti-Pauline character of KJVO (see the sources mentioned above)

(1) Charismatic in defiance of I Cor. 1:7; 13:1–13. The KJV translators were supernaturally guided, even in the italicized words which they added to the text. This defies Paul's statements in I Cor. 1:7; 13:1–13 (and even here some retranslation is needed): the charismatic gifts for the Body are finished with the revealing and confirming of the Pauline epistles, and will only resume in the Rapture-Ascension-Battle.

(2) Ethnic/groupist/nationalistic position in defiance of Rom. 10:12, I Cor. 7:18–19, Gal. 3:28; 6:15, Eph. 2:11–16, Col. 3:11. There are NO groups before God today.

(a) See dedicatory cited above: Britain is Zion, Britain is/should be the Church of England, James is the Head of the Church of England, the KJV was made to strengthen the position of James and the Church of England, etc.

(b) S. C. Gipp, *The Answer Book*, pp. 32–33: Chinese believers must come to God through the English KJV, for the English-speaking people are a special people before God to whom the perfect KJV has been entrusted.

(3) Hierarchical position (king as pharaoh, translators as translation-priests) in defiance of Rom. 10:12, I Cor. 7:18–19, Gal. 3:28; 6:15, Eph. 2:11–16, Col. 3:11 plus Eph. 4:5 (One Lord), I Tim. 2:5. See dedicatory and S. C. Gipp (*op. cit.*, 11–13, 32–34, 52–57, 63, 90–92, 154, 158–159).

SEPTEMBER SESSION: Prov. 26:5

In this session, we see how the KJVO position implodes, collapses upon itself.

#### VIII. Nonsense of making a perfect translation in this dispensation

POINT. It is inefficient, contrary to God's character, to have a PERFECT translation done by supernaturally inspired (or supervised or whatever) translators. An efficient God would have dispensed with documents in the original tongues and just inspired the translators to write the Scriptures down perfectly as prophets. With charismatic empowerment, there is no need of Hebrew or Greek manuscripts if the goal is a perfect English Bible—the Holy Spirit should have just inspired them as prophets to write it down in English. This is an absurdity, therefore there can never be a perfect translation in this dispensation (apart from the fact that such a translation would require the charismata *ab initio*, a violation of I Cor. 1:7, 13:1–13 a chosen and distinct people, a violation of the non-ethnicity of Pauline Law, etc, all as pointed out above).

The way for individual saints to know the Word of God as inscripturated is to wrestle for themselves and with the help of others in getting that Word from the words which God has seen fit to have preserved, trusting in the robustness of those words AND the error-correction implicit in the normative hermeneutic. Understanding the Word comes in no other way (Rom. 14:5, II Tim. 2:15, cf. Ne. 8:8).

The insistence on a perfect translation is therefore the position of defiance to work in the Word. Those of the KJVO position, if they are consistent—and we have seen examples of this—are hermeneutically and exegetically LAZY. Where are their works, the evidence of their having labored in the Word? (I Cor. 3:10–15)

#### IX. Multiple Revisions of KJV: 1611(1), 1611(2), 1612, 1613, 1616, 1617, 1629, 1638, 1743, 1762, 1769

In the sequel, we use the notation "Gn" or "Gn–m", where "G" refers to [S. C. Gipp, *The Answer Book*, Bible and Missionary Literature Foundation (Shelbyville, TN 37160), 1989] and "n" is page n in G and "n–m" is pages n–m in G.

(1) There were many printing errors as printers typeset the translators notes. In particular, two 1611 printings showed 100 discrepancies between them, even though the the same printers did both in Oxford apparently on the same press. Apparently the revisions of 1611, 1612, 1616 were aimed at correcting printer errors. See G17–24. And incidentally, the 1611 Cambridge KJV does not rank with any of the 1611 Oxford KJV's. WILL THE REAL 1611 KJV PLEASE STAND UP?

POINT. Apparently the God that inspired/supervised the translators to make an errorless translation, WAS UNABLE TO PREVENT THE PRINTERS FROM MAKING TYPESETTING ERRORS.

POINT. How do we KNOW that the modern KJV has ALL the errors corrected? This question cannot be affirmatively answered from the KJVO position. Since the KJVO view of the Word of God is syntactical and not inscripturational, they CANNOT KNOW THAT THEY HAVE THE WORD OF GOD, despite all their protests to the contrary. But we who trust God to have sufficiently preserved His words KNOW that if we consistently apply the normative hermeneutic both in matters of translation and exegesis, we shall HAVE the WORD of God. Ultimately, for the consistent KJVO man, he/she must simply close the book since they cannot know what errors remain and how serious they are; and this confirms our observation that such in fact do no apparent work in the Word.

Some examples:

- (a) 1611: this thing, 1638: this thing also
- (b) 1611: seek good, 1617: see God
- (c) 1611: returned, 1769: turned
- (d) 1611: thy right doeth, 1613: thy right hand doeth
- (e) 1611: the city, 1629: the city of the Damascenes
- (f) 1611: a fiery furnace, 1638: a burning fiery furnace
- (g) 1611: his place, 1638: his place

There are some 400 changes from 1611 (but which 1611???) to the present KJV. KJVO advocates say that almost all of these changes are "alleged" changes. Regenerated people will abandon KJVO and cling to a proper view of the Word of God.

(2) The way we know that we have the accurate KJV now is that God has preserved it for us to this day, despite the printing errors of the earlier editions. This is a CONTRADICTION to the syntactical point of view. See G24.

#### X. Faulty arguments by KJVO

(1) See the defense of KJV concerning Acts 12:4 in G3–8 and compare with our discussion in V(1) above. The KJVO defence is simply incompetent.

(2) The KJVO treatment of John 21:15–17 as given in G127–131 + Appendix 1 (Gipp, *op.cit.*) is simply dishonest. Gipp claims that **agapaw** and **philew** are fully interchangeable in Koine Greek and that the inerrant KJV rightly translates both by one English word **love**, and then Gipp administers a test: can one detect from the context which of **agapaw** or **philew** is intended in a given passage (without "cheating" and looking at the Greek text to see which word is used where—of course, a true, spiritual KJV man won't be looking at any Greek text!).

(a) The key to Gipp's test is that one is to use HIS statement of the standard definitions of **agapaw** and **philew**, to wit (G128): **agapaw** means "deep, intimate, selfless love", while **philew** means "casual friendly love". Now, since there are only two choices for the answer in each passage, and since none of the passages in question is consistent with the idea of casual friendly love, clearly, we would like to choose **agapaw** for each passage, which clearly shows that (in Gipp's argument) that there is no distinction between these two words and that the one English word **love** is sufficient.

(b) This is a classic case of a straw man. As determined in the TGF sessions on Romans 12 (see Jim Hilston's notes and followup), **philew** does not mean "casual friendly love", but rather for a member of the Body it indicates deep love which is the emotional response to that saint's **agapaw** of Christ as Head and His truth concerning the Body implanted in that saint at regeneration. There are parallels for Israel as the John 21 passage indicates: Peter's **philew** is rooted in his **agapaw** of Christ and His Kingdom and Christ is appealing to this fact to admonish Peter to follow through on his obligations as the Nasi of the Sanhedral Twelve (Eleven, soon to be Twelve with Matthias).

(c) If the underlying Greek text is uncontested, then knowing which word is being used would influence my understanding of the passage. Thus, the notion of the Gipp's test is faulty by design.

(3) The KJVO's treatment of Paul's citation in I Cor. 9:9 of Deut. 25:4 is dishonest and incompetent. Gipp (G55) maintains that Paul quotes the ITALICIZED phrase "the corn" AS IF it had been part of the original Hebrew text in Moses. Gipp claims this proves that the KJV was correct to put "the corn" in Moses and that Paul was essentially quoting a KJV Bible.

(a) It is true that the phrase "the corn" is implicit in Deut. 25:4, and that the italicized phrase is appropriate.

(b) IT IS FALSE THAT PAUL'S VERSION OF I COR. 9:9 HAS THE PHRASE "THE CORN". ALL the Greek texts read here, **Thou shalt not muzzle an ox treading** [i.e. which is treading]. Thus Paul (and LXX, incidentally) does NOT quote any italicized phrase.

(c) It is true that the KJV has "the corn" in I Cor. 9:9 NOT in italics; but that means the KJV VIOLATED ITS OWN POLICY and therefore CANNOT be inerrant. The KJV SHOULD HAVE italicized this phrase in I Cor. 9:9.

(d) Gipp believes the KJV to be syntactically inspired, and so the lack of italics in Paul and the italics in Moses convince him that Paul is quoting the italicized words of the KJV. This argument is completely false and rests on a tight circular argument.

(4) The KJVO's treatment of Christ's citation in Matt. 4:4 of Deut. 8:3 is dishonest and incompetent and linked to his denial of the existence of the LXX (ancient testimony notwithstanding: see Ralhf's critical edition of LXX for historical comments). Gipp (G56) maintains Christ quotes the ITALICIZED word "word" AS IF it had been part of the original Hebrew text in Moses. Gipp claims this proves that the KJV was correct to put "word" in Moses and that Christ was essentially quoting a KJV Bible.

(a) It is true that the phrase "word" is implicit in Deut. 8:3, and that the italicized phrase is appropriate.

(b) Christ apparently quoted the Hebrew/Aramaic text WITHOUT the italicized word. But Matthew in writing the Greek text quotes the LXX in which **rhma(ti)** is found; and indeed Matt. 4:4 is exactly like the wording of LXX.

(c) Gipp's argument should have been: THE LXX IS QUOTING A KJV BIBLE!!

(5) The phony dichotomy of G52–57—that we accept all the italicized words of KJV or none of them—is nonsense. We accept each interpolation on its merits in the context in question.

## X. Emphasis on Education

(1) One of the main tenets of KJVO is that the perfect KJV is accessible to everyone regardless of educational background (so long as they are educated to be English-speaking!!).

(2) Gipp refers at length to the educational background of his translator-priests of the KJV: G61–63. One would think the salient point would be their supernatural empowerment. Peter had no advanced education, but rather the gifts.

(3) Gipp ostentatiously states his education on the cover and title page of his Answer Book: **Dr. Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D.** "Th.D." just was not enough, you see, for the common man reading his book to get the point! (Of course, in "arrogant" academic circles, Th.D.'s tread lightly since the Th.D. compares not so well to a Ph.D. in theology.) However, Dr. Gipp's Th.D. education apparently has some gaps, as seen throughout his *Answer Book*.

(a) The Gothic "s" is similar to our "f", but still different and distinguishable to anyone that looks closely. The distinction is as great as that between Hebrew bet(h) and k(h)af. On G19–20, it is maintained that "set" in Gothic would be "fet". No, it would not.

(b) "Whom" is the accusative even in modern English, not "who" (which is nominative). On G131, next to last line, Gipp asks, "Who will you believe?" It should be "Whom will you believe?"

(c) Same error as in (b): Gipp, *op.cit.*, p. 115: "who the devil is guiding" should be "whom the devil is guiding".

(d) "one nation, **under God**" (G116) should be "one nation under God".

(e) There is a veritable plethora of avoidable sentence fragments. Here are typical examples:

(i) G2, lin4 from bottom. "An emphasis which is **plainly** unscriptural."

(ii) G143, lines 3–4. "**IF** there is any education associated with their degree."

(iii) G143, lines 8–9. "Earned and Honorary."

(iv) G47, lines 7–8. "A feat that it has apparently accomplished 'in spades'".

(v) G98, lines 4–6 from bottom. "While the mighty mice of twentieth century scholarship would translate an entirely new version over it."

(f) Confusion of "it's" ("it is") with "its" (genitive of "it"): G31, line 2. "You can't tell a book by it's cover" should be "you can't tell a book by its cover".

(g) The claim is made that each book of the O. T. is written in Hebrew (G99), "which was alone used by the inspired historians and poets of the Old Testament". This is false. Half of the book of Daniel is in Aramaic.

(h) There are a good many run-on sentences. Here is one example: G106: "**But** it is an author's prerogative to alter his own words, but that certainly does not give others ..."

(i) In counterdistinction to (g), Moses and David wrote IN GREEK, G132: "The Greek text which was used for the translation of the King James Bible extends back through history to the pens of Moses, David, Paul, John and the other inspired writers." [We ignore the mangling of the asyndeton in which the last comma is mandatory and the "and" optional---such are very frequent in G].

(j) "One in the same" (G136) should be "one AND the same".

(k) The passive form of "mislead" is "misled"---"Fundamentalists clinging to this tenet are misled." (G85) should be "fundamentalists clinging to this tenet are misled".

(l) "It is us" (G85) should be "It is we" (memo: the verb "to be" takes a predicate NOMINATIVE).

(m) "Paying you bill" (G136) should be "paying your bill".

(n) "**AGAPE vs PHILEO**" should be "**AGAPAO vs PHILEO**" (comparing VERB with verb) or more accurately "**AGAPAO word group vs PHILEO word group**".

(o) Words that sound the same (homonyms or homophones) often do NOT mean the same (e.g. lie, lye). This is especially true of "dual" and "duel", the former meaning "of or pertaining to TWO" and the latter meaning "fight or WAR between opposing parties". "It was Origen, deceived by the duel intoxicants of education and philosophy [missing comma---another run-on sentence] who upon receipt of pure copies of scripture altered them to parallel his twisted thinking." (G39). Assuming that "dueling" was not intended---these intoxicants were not at war with each other, one would presume that "DUAL intoxicants" was intended.

## XI. Final Comment

Time fails me in analyzing all the illogical and goofy arguments inherent in the KJVO position (and I think I am being kind). The abandonment of sound reason and standard inference rules saturates Gipp's *Answer Book* and other books of this ilk. The examples given above are only a sample. One must see them for themselves in context. Also see the exchanges on TDOG and the many excellent posts there, most notably by Jim Hilston.