

Consistent Text Accuracy in the Authorized, King James, Version

by Dr. Larry Bednar

A consistent accuracy in our traditional English Bible makes a strong case for total text accuracy, something indicative of providential intervention in text history. Consistent KJV accuracy is most striking in passages where scholars greatly contest accuracy, and numerous examples of this* argue strongly for preservation of a fully accurate textual basis, further preserved in fully accurate translation. We'll illustrate consistent accuracy, starting with a Psalm 12 promise on preserving God's Word that scholars contest, perhaps because their preferred Alexandrian New Testament text was lost for ~1500 years, doing little more than collecting dust in archives.

The Inerrant Autographs Still Speak: Consistent Translation Accuracy

True accuracy in translation is realized only through formal-equivalence principles that enable an exact equivalent by means of wording and syntax that follow literal Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic text language as closely as possible, while preserving exact context and meaning.

1. Handling a grammar difference: Preserving God's Word or His people? Ps.12

KJV

1. *Help Lord; for the godly man ceaseth; for the faithful fail from among the children of men.*
2. *They speak vanity every one with his neighbor: with flattering lips and with a double heart...*
3. *The Lord shall cut off all flattering lips, and the tongue that speaketh proud things:*
4. *Who have said, With our tongue will we prevail; our lips are our own: who is lord over us?*
5. *For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise, saith the Lord; I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him.*
6. *The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.*
7. *Thou shalt keep them O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.*
8. *The wicked walk on every side, when the vilest men are exalted.*

NASV

- (5)...*Now I will arise," says the Lord; "I will set him in the safety for which he longs."*
(6) *The words of the Lord are pure words...(7) Thou O Lord, wilt keep them. Thou wilt preserve him from this generation forever.*

NIV

- (5)...*I will now arise," says the Lord. "I will protect them from those who malign them.*
(6) *And the words of the Lord are flawless...(7) O Lord you Will keep us safe and protect us from such people forever.*

The KJV verse 12:5 says of God's words on oppression of the needy godly man...*saith the Lord, I will set him in safety.* 12:6 says God's words are pure (true), and 12:7 says He keeps (performs) His words. Context stresses deliverance of the godly, but that depends on what *saith the Lord*, His promise. His words alone promise deliverance of the godly man, and the main emphasis is on the *words* that bring deliverance. Psalm 12:7 emphasizes God keeping and also preserving *them*, His words certifying His deliverance of the righteous in David's generation and forever. God's words are all canonical, and their declared eternal preservation identifies them as written scripture, His words still certifying deliverance of the righteous today and forever.

*The present writer's Hermeneutics text provides many such examples, in addition to those noted here.

Some say *them* in 12:7 refers to the 12:5 people, but *them* loses certainty of meaning if separated from its 12:6 immediate antecedent, *words*. If the people were meant, the text would be faulty, making the pronouns ambiguous and confusing passage sense. Some dismiss the antecedent factor, saying gender discord here denies word preservation. In 12:7 *them* (a verb suffix) is masculine, and 12:6 *words* (substantive) is feminine, and Hebrew pronouns and their antecedents usually agree in gender. But Gesenius' grammar says *masculine suffixes (especially in the plural) are not infrequently used to refer to feminine substantives*.¹ Waltke & O'Connor say, *The masculine pronoun is often used for a feminine antecedent*.² (e.g. a feminine *wells* in Gen.26:15, *midwives* in Ex.1:21 and *daughters* in Is.3:16 are antecedents of a masculine *them*). Hebrew gender discord is rather common, but antecedent discord can't be without widespread confusion of sense. And Hebrew passage sense takes precedence over grammar issues like gender discord,² and the Psalm 12:6,7 sense ties *them* to *words* in the immediate context

Emphasis on God's words directs interpretation here. In Hebrew simple poetic parallelism, a theme repeats in new words, as seen in 12:6-7, a 12:6 theme on purity of God's words repeating in 12:7 to tie *them* to His words. 12:6 likens purity of His words to that of truly refined silver to stress that they're not idle words, but pure ones that will be kept; this is directly followed by a 12:7 clause on keeping *them*, tying *them* to 12:6 pure *words*, and the words (the 2nd *them*) are preserved forever to signify being kept forever. 12:7 further stresses purity by stressing God as word-keeper, making *Thou* in the first clause a separate word in the Hebrew, an emphasis device (*thou* will normally be a prefix on the Hebrew imperfect verb). And *thou* recurs in the word-preservation clause. In the KJV the added emphasis is retained with *Thou* at the start and *O Lord* at the end of the first clause on word-keeping and *thou* in the next clause on word-preservation.

The emphasis increases as Hebrew-text gender discord ties *them* to *words* (gender discord by design - see Gesenius on Nahum 3:15³). A masculine pronoun and feminine antecedent reflect Hebrew use of masculine gender to signify power/greatness and feminine to signify compassion/sustenance.⁴ Ps.12:6,7 ties feminine *words* to masculine *them* to relate compassion (stressed in 12:5) of the words to almighty God's power to keep/perform them, in accord with Hebrew prior-gender masculine language inclusive of a feminine persona⁵ (as the Psalm 12 godly man signifies men and women). And in compassion God preserves His words forever to certify to His people forever that He obligates Himself to keep/perform them forever. By right pronoun/antecedent usage, the KJV rightly relates God's compassion to His power to keep and preserve His words.

Dr. Thomas Strouse, Emmanuel Baptist Seminary, Newington, CT notes normal gender discord at Psalm 119:111,129,152,167. Here feminine nouns representing God's Word (*testmonies*) link to masculine pronouns (*they/them/they*). This too is gender discord by design, relating our need of God's testimonies for sustenance (feminine) to His power as provider (masculine) to stress loving and revering His Word to our benefit, reflecting a relationship of the churches to Christ.

An NASV *them* in 12:7 suggests keeping of God's words, but a *him* replaces the second *them*, suggesting verse-5 people are objects of preserving, when they're objects of word-keeping, and teaching on preservation of words certifying care of people is lost. And *him* ties to *them/words*, mixing the singular and plural to create ambiguity of sense (*them* can be *words*, but *him* implies *them* can be the people). This writer finds *him* is too literal, missing a difference in grammar, for *him* is good Hebrew, but poor English; this 3rd-person/singular/masculine pronoun denotes, not people, but 3rd-person/singular/masculine *word* (same as *words* of God). Hebrew has no neuter gender, *him/he* often referring to neuter terms rendered *it/that* in English (e.g. In Nu.22:20 God speaks to Balaam, and the Hebrew says, *the word that I shall speak to you, him (it/that) you shall*

do - more examples involving God's Word are Dt.30:14, Jer.18:1, Ezk.12:25). Thus Psalm 12:7 Hebrew says, *Thou shalt keep* (perform) *thy words* (them) *O Lord, thou shalt preserve thy word* (or words/them) *forever*. Word has a plural sense (*thy words* comprise *thy word*), justifying *them* for *him*.^{*} Number discord in the Psalms Hebrew is usually a poetic-style factor, but here the shift from *them* (words) to *him* (word) is didactic, emphasizing God's written words preserved for His people forever. *Words* is spoken or written scripture, but *word* stresses the written (God's verbal word is like a document: i.e. *we have his word on it*, not *words*). It's for us God's words must be preserved, requiring the written form. God preserves His Words in writing forever to show us He obligates Himself to keep them forever (by the *Living Word*). The KJV second *them* doesn't lose the purpose of the shift, a declared eternal preservation (for us) establishing the written form; *them* is rightly used twice for clarity (*it/that* is awkward and would confuse readers).

The NIV, like the extant Septuagint text, has a wrong *us* for the double *them* in 12:7. *Us*, incorrect by definition in the first use and by pointing in the second, makes the people, not *words*, objects of keeping and preservation (people are objects only of word-keeping). *Us* can't fit passage sense without altering language, and *this generation* is made *such people*. *This generation* is right, reflecting scripture preservation from the time of David to forever. In the NIV context, *this generation* would suggest protecting the righteous forever from one generation. No one needs eternal protection from one generation that can't live forever, and *such people* supports use of *us*, but isn't right translation, for *from* people isn't the right sense; *this generation* is that of David and joins with *from* and *to* / *for* to note a period from that time to eternity (the Hebrew says this), or for ever. And *this* acts as a relative pronoun,⁶ so *such* is poor (i.e. we read, *from the generation this [which] is, to forever*, not, *from the generation such is to forever*).

Scholars discount God's scripture-preserving role, perhaps because they think the true New Testament text was lost for ~1500 years. In support of their opinion, they claim God's Word is scattered among manuscripts, so men must decide what is or isn't His Word, which only ensures error. They say preservation exists only in heaven judging by the Psalm 119:89, *For ever O Lord thy word is settled in heaven*. But the sense of the Hebrew is that *settled in heaven* means heaven is where preservation is verified/supervised to make truth available to all, as there's no confusion by men in heaven. Passage context supports this, word preservation on earth being why the psalmist can obey God's testimonies (119:88) and why earth and its people endure by God's

^{*}It's said verses 12:5-7 reflect chiasmus poetic style connecting 12:5 & 7 as parallel verses of like content that both refer to people, separated by a dissimilar 12:6 on God's Words. That's refuted by a resultant ambiguity of pronouns that confuses passage sense, and by style factors disconnecting 12:5 & 7, including excessive content differences of separated verses, different speakers in 12:5 & 7 and a disconnect of the first 12:7 *them* from 12:5 *him*. Psalm 12 has two non-chiastic styles, one of simple parallel clause couplets in each verse, and a wider one of triplet/couplet/triplet verses developing a theme. Regarding the wider style, in 12:1-3 David speaks of the godly man in danger, evil men as the cause and trust in God's response. 12:4-5 is a couplet of two verses antithetical to each other; evil men directly speak a wish (we will!), and God directly speaks a response (No, I will!). In 12:6-8 David speaks of the purity of God's response, the certainty and duration of it and why it's needed. Chiasmus would require the last triplet to repeat content of the first in inverse fashion, which isn't the case. And 12:5 & 7 differ by speaker, indicating they don't connect in parallel, and thus don't both refer to people, but 12:6 & 7 connect by speaker, connecting God's words to *them*. And the 12:4-5 couplet antithesis, the evil men's intent to hurt the godly man, denied by God's words of deliverance, combines verses 4 & 5 in a separate unit, separating both from 12:7 and *them*. Finally, passage gender discord relates to the wider poetic style, the 12:5 godly man (m) being delivered by God's 12:6 words of compassion (f), and the 12:7 *them* being words also of power (m) to deliver.

laws (119:91). Verse 119:96 notes an end, or a limit, to all earthly perfection, but calls God's commandments, His words, *exceeding broad*, meaning there's no limit to their perfection, so God's words known to the psalmist on earth are perfectly preserved. KJV formal equivalence respects that perfection of the literal Hebrew and achieves total communication with total accuracy, despite a grammar difference, one that troubles other translators.

2. Unique word choice; Easter in Acts 12:4. Scholars scorn the KJV rendering, *Easter* for *pascha*, a term they say must be rendered *Passover*, as it is in modern versions.

12:2 *And he (Herod) killed James the brother of John...*

12:3 *And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also.
(Then were the days of unleavened bread).*

12:4 *And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison...intending after Easter
to bring him forth to the people.*

Scholars say the KJV followed Tyndale here in substituting *Easter* for *passover* in the New Testament. But the KJV has *passover* for *pascha* everywhere except in Acts 12. We should ask if the term has a unique sense in the Acts passage. Indeed something unique has been preserved here in the KJV. The case is like that of Isaiah 7:14 on Mary as a virgin regarding Jesus' Virgin Birth. The Hebrew for *virgin* has various possible meanings and can be rendered "maiden" or "young woman." But it can only be rendered *virgin* in Isaiah 7:14 since passage context and related word choice demand it. The *pascha* in Acts has more than one possible meaning, and *Resurrection Day*, or *Easter*, is the one demanded by context in relation to history.

In verses 2,3 Herod kills James and imprisons Peter in the *days of unleavened bread*. As others note,⁷ this can refer to the 6-day feast of unleavened bread following an initial Passover day (Lev.23:5-6, Ex.12:18 say Passover falls on the 14th day of the appropriate month, and the feast of unleavened bread is the 6 days from the 15th until the 21st day - Including Passover day makes 7 days of unleavened bread of Lev.23:6). By this interpretation Acts 12 says Jewish Passover day was over when Herod killed James and imprisoned Peter in the days of unleavened bread. Thus in verse 4, where Herod keeps Peter in prison until after Passover, this would be a Passover day coming after the Jewish one, and Acts 12 would refer to a day other than normal Passover, stipulating a different rendering. Indeed the Passover will prove not to be the Jewish one.

Yet *passover* can signify the feast day plus 6 days of unleavened bread. Its use as a 7-day event is seen in Ezekiel 45:21 that says...*in the fourteenth day of the month, ye shall have the passover, a feast of seven days; unleavened bread shall be eaten.* Acts 12:4 can seem to say Herod killed James and imprisoned Peter during a 7-day Passover that hadn't yet ended, and that he meant to kill Peter after this 7-day Jewish Passover, but that interpretation proves to be wrong.

Context and history determine translation of the Acts *pascha*, and this denies rendering *pascha* "passover." That can only mean Jewish Passover in this passage on days of unleavened bread, and that doesn't fit context/history. The lack of a fit relates to Herod's friendship with Roman Caesar Caligula (hated by Jews) and his ancestry as an Edomite, people historically antagonistic to Israel. Herod's rule was complicated,⁸ but he endured by ingratiating himself with the Jews, favoring their culture and religion.

Acts 12:3 says Herod took Peter prisoner since the Jews approved of killing James. Likely they saw James as an enemy as fast-growing Christianity threatened their religion and way of life. Herod would want to further ingratiate himself by killing Peter right after James, so he had

no reason to wait until after Jewish Passover, the first day or the 7-day feast. There was no problem with the Jews in executing Peter right after James. Yet he intended to wait, risking a problem with the Jews by a suggestion of changing his mind in acting against the foremost leader of the fast-growing church.

And scholars are wrong in saying Herod would wait until after Jewish Passover, as Jews disliked executions during their holy days. That was usually so, but there was no such concern at this time. Christians were now considered heretics by the Jews, and a public execution reinforced the Jewish position. As Acts 12:3 says, the Jews approved killing of James during holy days of unleavened bread at that time. Thus context denies interpreting Acts 12:4 to mean Herod would wait until after Jewish Passover to kill Peter.

But Pascha as Resurrection Day fits context/history. The 1st-century Jewish church observed a pascha based on the Crucifixion/Resurrection, knowing Christ is the ultimate Passover fulfilling and replacing the Jewish one. The only initial 1st-century basis for timing of pascha was that of Crucifixion/Resurrection relative to Passover timing, calling for a 3-day Crucifixion/Resurrection observance at the same time relative to 7-day Passover, with both Passovers starting in the evening to keep them closely related.* This fits Acts 12 days-of-unleavened-bread context. The Crucifixion was on a preparation day the day before Passover began that evening (Mt.27:62). Herod might kill James and imprison Peter on an evening that began Passover, or the next day, which would be in the days of unleavened bread, and he might wait to kill Peter until after the third day, Resurrection Day. That this was the case is indicated by Herod's political situation.

Herod was accepted by the Jews, but despised by the governing Romans of Judea,⁹ creating political tension. Pleasing Jewish leaders would be his priority, but with his Roman situation, Herod couldn't antagonize any large segment of Judea's population that could cause political unrest and give Roman leaders an excuse to get rid of him (they'd need a good excuse, for Caesar appointed Herod). Herod would worry about reaction of Christians to Peter's execution (the sizeable Christian population still had political status since the governing Romans wouldn't persecute them for another 20 years). While he killed James without repercussion, Herod would worry that killing famous Peter, right after James, might incite an uproar, especially if he did so on, or just before, Resurrection Day. To Christians the day of Christ's victory over death is holy, a time when public execution of Christ's most famous disciple would be very politically antagonistic, indicating mockery of Christ's resurrection victory over death. In doing so, Herod would make a political statement like, "Is this your day of victory of eternal life over death? I'll kill Christ's most famous disciple at this day and make it a day of death. I'll show you what I think of your God and faith." Christians endured persecution, but Herod saw that killing Peter and insulting Christ might incite an uproar. By executing Peter a few days after Resurrection Day, he could satisfy Jewish leaders without unduly risking widespread Christian protest adding to his Roman problem. This would seem wise to Herod and is the reason he would wait until after Christian Passover, not Jewish Passover

*In the 1st-century church, pascha was a Crucifixion/Resurrection observance starting in the evening as Jewish Passover began (the no. of days, is uncertain). In the 2nd-century eastern church, a 1-day pascha at the same time likely reflects 1st-century timing of a 3-day pascha starting that day. By starting pascha observance on Passover Day and making it a 1-day event, Resurrection-Day observance is on the day signifying Crucifixion Day, an irregularity likely deriving from an earlier 3-day event (see *Easter and Paschal Controversies*. "Evangelical Dictionary of Theology" 1984. Baker).

Thus the Acts 12:4 *pascha* denotes Christ, the Passover of Christians (1 Cor.5:7). For Jews Passover lasted 7 days, as in Ezekiel 45:21. But Christian Passover would have lasted 3 days from Good Friday to Easter. Herod meant to execute Peter after Christian Passover to avoid political antagonism, or more specifically, after Resurrection Day.

Indeed Acts 12:4 can only refer to Christian Passover. Christ's Passover superseded the Jewish one in the Resurrection, so *pascha* can only be Christian Passover in the New Testament after the Resurrection, or after John's gospel where it occurs three times. Its use in Hebrews 11:28 isn't pertinent, referring to Old Testament times. Its use in 1 Cor.5:7 shows Christian Passover superseding the Jewish one, so it must be rendered *passover*, and it clearly denotes Christian Passover since Christ and the Cross are its basis. The third use, *after pascha* in Acts 12:4, can only be "after Christian Passover" (more specifically, "after Resurrection Day," better understood by all readers). *Easter* rightly signifies Resurrection Day, even though 1st-century observance was uniquely different.

Some reject *Easter* as anachronistic since it had no Christian sense until well after the New Testament was written. That's true, but Pascha was Resurrection Day specifically by the 4th-5th century, and Resurrection Day was Easter by the 8th. Ever since the 8th century, the KJV *after Easter* has been the proper current way to note the end of the 3-day Passover Herod had to wait out to execute Peter. So why are 17th century KJV translators scorned for proper use of current terminology? Modern translators do this often and are praised for communicating with modern readers. For example, the NIV uses *gallons* (Lk.16:6, Jn.2:6), which is fine for today. But the word is anachronistic, out of place in time, and it's out of place in culture, having never applied to Hebrew, Roman or Greek culture, so *gallons* is less applicable to a New Testament setting than *Easter* is.

Only the KJV preserves Acts teaching on Christian Passover superseding the Jewish one, and use of *Easter* indicates the KJV alone is God's authorized Word in English. KJV formal equivalence achieves total accuracy and respects Greek language in using *Easter* to communicate rightly the final day of *pascha*, and thus avoid an appearance of uncertainty arising from the changing number of days *pascha* lasted in early centuries.

3. Importance of italicized words: Who killed Goliath? 2 Sam. 21:19 & 1 Chr. 20:5.

2 Samuel 21:19 (KJV)

And there was again a battle...with the Philistines, where Elhanan the son of Jaare-oregim, a Bethlehemite, slew the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

1 Chronicles 20:5 (KJV)

...there was war again with the Philistines; and Elhanan the son of Jair slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, whose spear staff was like a weaver's beam.

In modern versions at 2 Samuel 21:19, Elhanan kills Goliath, and at 1 Samuel 17 in these versions, David kills Goliath, all in accord with literal Hebrew, and confusion results. Some conservative scholars suggest copyist error in the Hebrew text, and liberal scholars suggest a contradiction, saying Elhanan, not David, killed Goliath.

In the KJV 2 Samuel, Elhanan kills the brother of Goliath, and *the brother of* is in italics, not being in the Hebrew, but added by the translators. This is the right rendering, as in 1 Chronicles. The Hebrew of 2 Samuel isn't saying Elhanan, instead of David, killed Goliath. Rather, 1 and 2 Samuel render *Goliath* as a symbolic name for two different giants, and Chronicles identifies

Elhanen's giant specifically. Early Hebrew readers would know Goliath was symbolic, and others learn this through the later Chronicles.

Israel wouldn't know proper names of Philistine strangers, especially since God required separation from idol worshippers. The Samuel text assigns to the giants names symbolizing great size, except for a verse 21:20 giant described by unique physical features, a clear indication his proper name was unknown to text scribes. All the giants are of one family (or tribe), and in 21:16,18, the giants' father (or tribe progenitor) is called *the giant*, a generic name, indicating text scribes didn't know his proper name, so names of his sons (or tribal descendants) were unknown. But Hebrew giant-killers in 2 Samuel 21 have proper names and are identified as sons of men with proper names (the scribes would certainly know proper names of their people). In the much-later Chronicles, Hebrew names don't change, indicating ongoing use of proper names, but names of giants change, symbolic names changing to invented proper names, as we'll see.

The only suggestion of a Hebrew name change is *Jaare-Oregim* (means, *forests of weavers*) in Samuel, rendered *Jair* (*he arouses/rises* [against]) in Chronicles. *Oregim* is an added symbolic name, for it disappears in Chronicles where, as we'll see, symbolic names are discarded. *Oregim* attaches to *Jaare* to stress the son's valor in defeating a man so big his spear shaft was like a weavers' beam.* Despite the different meaning, *Jair* isn't a different name, just a variation on *Jaare* preferred in the later Chronicles. *Jair* is a proper name spelled much like *Jaare* to retain the man's identity, and the new meaning still reflects the son's valor to compensate for loss of *oregim*. This is indicated, for *Jair* derives from a marginal note, a textual comment serving here to up-date spelling.

The meaning of the name Goliath is uncertain, but a suggested *conspicuous*¹⁰ (by great size) is likely correct. That *Goliath* is symbolic of great size is indicated by use of *Saph* for a giant killed by Sibbechai (2 Sam.21:18). This was the name of the head of an Arabic family in Palestine with sons of great height and strength (Jamieson, Fausset, Brown com.), so it signifies great size. And a giant killed by Abishai (2 Sam.21:17) was named, *Ishbi-benob* (means *my seat is on a high place*), symbolic of one of great stature or size.

A symbolic *Goliath* for Elhanen's giant, and a mutual Bethlehem origin, relate Elhanen to David. God raised up a tribe of Bethlehemite giant-killers by David, the original giant-killer who set the example, killing the first Goliath as all Israel cowered before him. When another Bethlehemite killed a giant, David's leadership of the tribe was recognized, indirectly or directly, and *Goliath* and *Bethlehemite* do so indirectly. The truth of this is seen as David is recognized directly in 2 Samuel 21:21 where another Bethlehemite giant-killer, Jonathan, is tied to David through his father, who is said to be David's brother in the text. This giant needs no name, his unique physical features identifying him (Similar recognition of David is in 2 Sam.8:13, his leadership being recognized in a victory of his nephew Abishai over Edomite Syrians in 1 Chron.18:12).

And David is recognized directly as Abishai (kills Ishbi-benob) is called in 2 Samuel 21:17, a son of Zeruah (David's sister). *Goliath* doesn't apply, for Abishai wasn't a Bethlehemite. He

*It's said scribes accidentally joined *oregim* (*weavers*) to *Jaare* since *weavers beam* is nearby in the text,¹¹ but that error is too great to attribute to meticulous Hebrew scribes. Error is claimed since *Jaare-oregim* (*forests of weavers*), can't be a man's name. But *oregim* is a symbolic name tied to a proper one, and the compound name can't be translated as one, as *Ed the giant*, a large man, can't be rendered *Ed Giant*. And error is claimed since *oregim* isn't in the Chronicles name, but Chronicles discards symbolic names, as we'll see. *Oregim* was added to *Jaare* to reflect the son's valor. In Hebrew patriarchal society, with men identified by the fathers' names, (son of Jesse, son of Saul, etc.), recognizing a father for his son's exploits is no surprise.

wasn't in Jesse's line, his mother being David's sister (1 Chr. 2:15,16) by marriage of David's mother to Jesse after marriage to Nahash (2 Sam.17:25). And *Goliath* doesn't apply to the giant of Sibbechai, a Hushathite Hebrew unrelated to David. *Saph* and *Ishbi-benob* distinguish non-Bethlehemites not called to be giant-killers, but following the Bethlehemite example.

1 Chronicles 20:5 identifies Elhanen's giant as a brother of David's giant (giant family/tribal relationships would be known by reputation). Chronicles assigns proper names to giants based on identities of the Hebrews who killed them, the only basis other than symbolic names Israel had for differentiating giants. In Chronicles the giant *Saph* killed by Sibbechai is Sippai that reflects salient parts of the name Sibbechai, indicating a Hebrew proper name invented for this giant (*Sa* is now *Si*, and a double consonant *pp* reflects *bb* – the Hebrew for *p* and *b* are phonetically related, both being labials pronounced with emphasis on the lips, and *ai* is a common Hebrew-name suffix, eg. Haggai, Barzillai, Abishai, etc). And *Lahmi* (means *my bread*) is a Hebrew proper name derived from Elhanen's Beth-lehem-ite identity (*lehem* is *bread*).^{*} A Hebrew proper name, *Lahmi*, is given to Elhanen's 2 Samuel 21 giant to differentiate the giants of Elhanen and David, while continuing to associate the two Hebrews by a mutual Bethlehem origin.

Knowledge that *Goliath* was symbolic couldn't be retained indefinitely, so Chronicles clarified matters. When Chronicles was written ~500 years after Samuel, *Goliath* had become the proper name for David's giant, and proper names were given to other giants. KJV translators applied the truth of 1 Chronicles 20:5 to 2 Samuel 21:19 to prevent confusion. KJV formal equivalence achieves total accuracy through use of italics that respect the Hebrew, not changing the text, while preserving exact passage context and meaning.

4. Precise grammar: Referencing God's Holy Spirit. 1 Peter 1:11.

KJV: ...*the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ...*

NIV: ...*to which the Spirit of Christ in them was pointing when he predicted the sufferings of Christ...*

RSV: ...*indicated by the Spirit of Christ within them when predicting the sufferings of Christ...*

The KJV *it* in reference to Christ's Spirit (Holy Spirit) is grammar disliked by many, but *it* is correct. The Spirit is normally referenced by neuter gender in the Greek, and at times this is proper in English, and at times it's not. For example, the Spirit can appear as a dove so that *it* is proper, as in John 1:32. And the Spirit at times is treated as part of Christ's person, so *it* is correct, as our spirit is *it*, part of our person, not the entire person. This latter circumstance is illustrated in 1 Peter 1:11, and in also Romans 8 where Paul speaks of the Spirit of Christ in 8:9 and says the Spirit *itself* in 8:16 and 8:26. But when the Spirit is spoken of as an individual personage,

^{*}*Lahmi* signifies the giant was *my bread* (my meat), made to order for my needs, as in Nu.14:9 that calls giants in Canaan battles, *bread for us*. Now since *Lahmi* derives from *Bethlehemite*, it's said the latter is a corruption of an original Samuel reading like that of Chronicles, *Lahmi, brother of*.¹¹ But *Lahmi* is an invented Hebrew name, and Hebrews wouldn't know Philistine proper names. To incur the suggested error, a scribe had to read '-t *Lahmi* as *Bét hal-Lahmi*, an error too great to escape an extremely meticulous Hebrew scribe. He'd have to mistake the sign of the definite direct object ('-t) for a word (*b-t*) and to mistake the word for brother ('-h) for ('-t), sign of the direct object¹¹ Such error seems likely to non-Hebrews, but is most unlikely for Hebrews accustomed to use of a term to signify a grammar principle. They would not mistake the sign of the direct object, a grammar principle, for a word, any more than we'd mistake English punctuation marks for words.

he is required, as in John 15:26 where He is the Comforter, an individual personage sent to earth by Christ in heaven.*

The RSV committee skipped the pronoun, which is usually acceptable, but here the meaning of the passage is affected. KJV translators accepted God's use of Greek language and gender for the New Testament, perhaps reasoning that God had a purpose in this passage that emphasizes the work of the Holy Spirit regarding the person of Christ on the Cross. This purpose may have been an emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit in testifying to Christ's person and foregoing any emphasis on His own person. Scripture says the Holy Spirit's work is to testify to the person of Christ, not to His own person (Jn.16:13,14).

The RSV rendering is grammatically correct, but it loses emphasis on the work of the Spirit in glorifying Christ. In the NIV a personal pronoun is preferred, which is incorrect grammar, and, like the RSV, it alters teaching likely intended by the Spirit Himself on the primacy of Christ's person to us. KJV formal equivalence achieves total accuracy, preserving context with exact grammar and avoiding human preferences.

5. Precise language: Straining at, or straining out, a gnat? Matthew 23:24.

Ewert claims KJV error at Matthew 23:24 that says of Pharisees and scribes, they, *strain at a gnat and swallow a camel*. The supposed right reading is *strain out a gnat*,¹² and modern versions render it that way. Now *strain out* usually translates the Greek here, but it's not correct in this context. The metaphorical language here signifies acceptance or rejection of doctrine and practice. *Swallow a camel* notes easy acceptance of great error, as in "swallow a huge lie," and *strain at a gnat* rightly notes intense effort in rejecting or accepting trivial matters. The Pharisees and scribes didn't separate (strain out) trivial matters from great ones, but ignored (swallowed) great error and fussed over (strained at) trivial matters. KJV formal equivalence achieves total preservation of textual accuracy even in minor matters, not just relying on the most common word definition, but recognizing another controlling factor, the role of metaphorical language.

6. Precise syntax: Psalm 22:8. Modern translators reject the KJV, *that he would deliver him...* and confuse the sense of prophecy fulfillment.

KJV: *He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him: let him deliver him...*

NIV: *He trusts in the Lord; let the Lord rescue him. Let him deliver him...*

NKJV: *He trusted in the Lord, let Him rescue him; Let Him deliver him...*

ESV: *He trusts in the Lord; let him deliver him; let him rescue him...*

The KJV *deliver* translates two Hebrew verbs that modern translators say are slightly different in meaning. They offer *deliver* and *rescue*, but can't differentiate the two. The ESV and others have the order *deliver-rescue*, but the NIV and others have the opposite, *rescue-deliver*, contradicting the assumed difference in meaning.** And in other verses with comparable syntax, the ESV and others render *deliver* for the Hebrew of their *rescue* (e.g. Ex.5:23, Is.44:20). Only the KJV fully maintains prophecy fulfillment here.

* In 1 John 5:8 the *Spirit* can be noted with a small *s*, He being part of Christ's person here, or can be noted with a capital *S* since Greek language here implies the Holy Spirit

**See footnote on the next page.

7. Classical Diction: Emphasizing the majesty of Christ: Titus 2:13-14.

KJV: *Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us...*

NIV: *while we wait for the blessed hope - the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ Who gave himself for us to redeem us...*

White feels the KJV here separates Christ from the title *the great God*, supposedly suggesting He's not to be called "God;" supposedly modern versions correct this.¹³ But the KJV rightly follows literal Greek, using majesty of language to convey a message on the majesty of Christ our God. By speaking of His deity and salvation role separately, the KJV emphasizes a totality of His majesty. An *of* in the expression *blessed hope and the glorious appearing of*, directly relates the expression to the entire phrase, *the great God and our Savior*. The expression refers to Christ in the Second Advent, so *the great God* and *our Savior* can both refer only to Christ. What the KJV says so eloquently is that Christ is the great God on the one hand, and our great Savior on the other hand; this is a great reason to rejoice, for this means our salvation is totally secure. This is a literary device of emphasis by diction that KJV translators were skilled in.

Critics don't grasp English/Greek literary riches so superior to contemporary language. The NIV is only linguistically correct, not communicating fully by negating emphatic language. In the process it claims for Christ only the title of our great God, as if he were only our God. As in the KJV, He is the great God, the God of all creation, and He who is so great as this consented to be our Savior. Thus the effect in the KJV is the exaltation of Christ, which is the opposite of White's perception.

Does White think *saints and faithful brethren* (Col.1:2) separates saints and faithful brethren as if they were different types? Or does he think *God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ* (Col.1:3) separates God and the Father, as if the Father were not God?

KJV formal equivalence again achieves total accuracy, preserving syntax to the extent that even the beauty of classical English/Greek diction is perfectly communicated.

*They need a difference to avoid repeating *let him deliver*. Their two emphatic clauses *let him...* with *jussive* verb sense (wish) require a colon/period pause after, *He trusts in the Lord*, not justified by Hebrew accenting/language. Their semicolon/comma pauses are efforts to justify two emphatic clauses. These pauses don't apply after *He trusted in the Lord*, the only clear one being that signified by a colon before the KJV, *let him deliver*.

Modern translators miss the issue here, effect of language/grammar on verb sense. In their two emphatic clauses, the verb in the second is *jussive* by context and accenting, justifying the emphasis and colon link (this clause can link directly to *He trusted on the Lord*, as in Mt.27:43). But the first verb isn't clearly *jussive*, nothing beyond a *contingent* sense being justified, to yield the clause, *that he would deliver him*, with no pause. This clause fits Ps.22:8 grammar as the object of the associated verb *trusted*; the object is God's deliverance of David (Jesus the Savior by resurrection), and deliverance is contingent on the trust and God's will. With no clear pause, the clause is rightly linked by *that*. Modern-version language omits the object of trust, relating the trust to nothing specific and to deliverance only by implication (trusts for what? – faithfulness, justification, a calm mind?) And repeating, *let him deliver/rescue him*, is pointless and diminishes the sense of prophecy fulfillment in Mt.27:43 that is the very reason the passage has been dictated by the Holy Spirit (see last section on text endowment). But the KJV, *that he would deliver him*, is of basic importance as the object of trust, so it's understood in Mt.27:43 and need not be repeated there, as seen by the Mt. 27:43, *if he will have him*, that refers to deliverance by/to God as the object of trust. That there's no need to repeat, *that he would deliver him*, further indicates that rendering two emphatic clauses, *let him deliver/ rescue him*, is erroneous.

KJV changes in new editions don't affect accuracy

Over the centuries, development of grammar and textual knowledge led to KJV modification like up-dating grammar and spelling and perfecting italics and marginal notes (e.g. *othes* changed to *oath's*). Drs. Paris and Blayney in the 18th century and Scrivener in the 19th were instrumental in this. Up-dating to variant language convention and textual knowledge doesn't impact text accuracy. It's a providential use of responsible scholars to extend God's supervision of the Word even to minor matters that don't affect inerrancy. Scrivener's work is apt to be the last responsible one of this type due to poor language education and irresponsible attitudes on the historic text today. Terminating of the full understanding of true historic scripture is perhaps God's will for irreverent modern society.

End Notes

1. Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar*. ed. and enlarged by E. Kautzsch. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 2nd English Ed, Cowley, A.E. 1910. Paragraphs 135-o & 144-a.
2. Waltke, B.K. & O'Connor, M.P. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Eisenbrauns. Winona Lake, IN. p106-09.
3. Gesenius. Op, Cit. paragraph 110k
4. Gesenius op. cit. paragraph 122h – see footnote #3
5. Gesenius, Op. Cit. paragraph 122-g
6. Gesenius, Op. Cit. paragraph 126-y. Gesenius said the Masora teaches that the Hebrew word is used as a relative pronoun
7. Moorman, Jack A. *Conies, Brass & Easter*. Way of Life Literature. Also in The King James Bible Page, Articles.
8. Broadman Bible Commentary. 1970. Vol.10. Nashville.
9. Funk and Wagnalls Encyclopedia. Vol.13.
10. Brown – Driver – Briggs Commentary. 2005. Hendrickson. Peabody, MA.
11. Archer, Jr, G.L. 1982. *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*. Zondervan.
12. Ewert, D. 1983. *From Ancient Tablets to Modern Translations*. Zondervan. p202.
13. White, J.R. 1995. *The King James Only Controversy*. Bethany. p201

Consistent Translation Accuracy Includes Consistent Science Accuracy

Today men of science and their supporters sometimes say that scripture is inaccurate in matters of science. Many churchmen don't know how to answer them, respecting education credentials of experts in science. Some seek to preserve a basic traditional outlook on biblical authority by adjusting their interpretation of the Bible to agree with respected scientists. Others feel the Bible is accurate only in spiritual matters and doesn't need to be so in technical matters. Some don't worry about accuracy and confine themselves to central truths in the Christian life.

But those who concede errors in scripture in some matters need to consider the implications of partial authority. If scripture isn't an authority on science, why is it an authority on salvation or morality? A work errant in one area may be so in others. Did not the God who inspired scripture create the natural world with all its technical features? Why then do some in churches today agree with notions that there's no reliable biblical revelation from God in science and yet believe there is in spiritual matters? Is God only the God of spiritual matters, and if so, how can we consider Him to be the God of creation?

To acquiesce to negative evaluations of scripture accuracy in matters of science is to ignore presumption and unenlightened pre-judgment common to all areas of human endeavor, including science. As a retired research engineer, the present writer has expertise in a broad scope of technology, and finds true scripture to be fully accurate in all matters of science it deals with. Claims of scripture inaccuracy regarding science arise from one-sided interpretations of what the Bible teaches. It's easily shown that negative opinions of fallible scientists on technical matters in scripture are not objective and are not backed by irrefutable evidence. Most of these experts show an unreasonable disrespect for anything not reflecting materialistic thinking, so they automatically dismiss anything of the supernatural. Such people have never encountered the reality of the spiritual dimension of life and judge reality only from a materialistic perspective.

The complete accuracy of scripture in technical matters will be evident from representative illustrations taken from the KJV. What we'll find is that KJV formal equivalence achieves total accuracy in matters of science, revealing science truth obscured by other translators who don't grasp the full literal truth of scripture, or perhaps don't respect its implications.

1. Jonah's big-fish experience: Are whales fish? Jonah 2 and Matthew 12:40.

Rather recently in history, scientists restricted the term *fish* to water dwellers that have gills and skeletons of bone or cartilage and that move through water by means of fins. But prior to this restriction, the term referred to all creatures living habitually in water, including lung-breathing whales. The more general earlier meaning is seen today in language convention that persists so that scientists themselves use the terms "jellyfish" and "starfish" for creatures with no skeleton or fins and "lungfish" for a creature with gills and lungs. Thus scholars aren't credible in faulting the KJV for identifying the fish of Jonah 1:17 as a lung-breathing whale in Matthew 12:40. In Jonah the more general earlier meaning of the term is used, and as we'll see, *whale* in Matthew is the correct term for the specific type of large water-dweller.

Scholars fail to discern *whale* as appropriate in other places in scripture, as in Genesis 1:21, Ezekiel 32:2 and Job 7:12. A little study shows that an Old Testament term for a large water dweller is at times rightly translated *whale* due to implications of language and context. In Genesis 1:21 scholars use an indefinite "sea monsters," but here the term refers to large sea creatures in a context of the waters bringing forth of the abundance of creation. Thus *whales* is the proper specific term since this is by far the most abundant of large sea creatures. And in Ezekiel 32:2, pharaoh, king of Egypt, is described in terms of a lion, the king of land beasts, and

in terms of a large sea creature that logically is the whale, king of sea beasts. Modern scholars are unnecessarily vague here, rendering *monster* or *dragon*; some even render *crocodile*, not realizing a concluding phrase in 32:2 on troubling of rivers (where crocodiles live) is a separate thought on Pharaoh unrelated to that of the whale.

In Job 7:12 Job says, *Am I a sea or a whale, that thou settest a watch over me?* Study shows *whale* is correct here. Job tells of his suffering by overpowering constraints placed on him and asks why he's important enough to get such special treatment. He can see why the sea is so important that a watch, or guard, must be placed on it by the land to constrain its freedom of traverse. And regarding creatures, he sees why the whale, the greatest of them, is guarded or constrained in freedom of traverse by limits imposed on the sea by the land. In their uncertainty, scholars render *sea monster*, *sea serpent* or *dragon* for the passage reference to a large sea creature. But the passage refers to the sea and a whale, the likely commonality being limits on freedom of traverse of both. The whale is the only known large sea creature that compares with the sea in terms of limits of freedom, for like the sea, the whale is constrained in its freedom of traverse only by limits imposed by land. Whales travel all over the globe to various climates and to great depths in the sea, and they truly are kings of the sea as Ezekiel 32:2 suggests.

Regarding Jonah's fish, its identification as a whale in the KJV Matthew 12:40 is the crucial matter revealing scientific reality in Jonah's 3-day survival in the fish's belly. This refutes those scholars who say the account is mythical, thinking a man swallowed by a huge fish has no air and can only be a meal. Some think Jonah died and was resurrected in the fish, but the KJV text says, *When my soul fainted within me, I remembered the Lord*, meaning Jonah's soul was about to part from his body, but he was spared (other versions say likewise). Some see the account as symbolic truth, but Christ treats it as literal reality in Matthew 12:40, likening Jonah's 3-day sojourn in the hell-like environment in the whale to His own soul's 3-day sojourn in hell where He descended after the Cross to deal with this enemy. Actually a little scientific bible study reveals the literal reality of the account and shows there's no need to invoke miracles to support it.

Context shows the fish is a whale in saying it dives to great depth in the sea. Jonah's fish takes him to the bottoms of mountains (and so the sea), and there are submerged mountain ranges in the Mediterranean Sea west of the seaport Jonah sailed from. Whales are the only large sea creatures that dive to great depths in the sea. Sperm whales often exceed 5000 ft, the approximate average depth of the Mediterranean, and have exceeded 10,000 ft. A sperm whale was God's likely choice, being the one whale that dives to such depths and is also big enough to swallow a man (It swallows giant squid larger than a man). A current failure to detect sperm whales in the Mediterranean Sea doesn't forbid their presence there on occasion and doesn't forbid their presence there in the past.

A sperm whale is immune to crushing by deep-sea pressure effects due to incompressible liquid in its body tissues, which is similar to the way a deep-sea bathyscaphe protects men at great depth. The whale's incompressible body would protect Jonah the way a bathyscaphe protects modern men.

A whale resists, and Jonah would resist, bends sickness induced by nitrogen in air during rapid whale ascents from depth. A whale filling its lungs for a dive takes in limited nitrogen, much of which is absorbed by oil in a foam that collects in whale sinuses for discharge in the spout, limiting access to the blood stream of the whale and that of Jonah.

A sperm whale's teeth are for seizing prey, not chewing it. It swallows its food, "chewing" by crushing agitation in its large first stomach. It eats squid or fish, and the alien taste of a man covered with clothing wouldn't induce agitation. The first stomach produces no digestive juices,

and the opening to the second is too small to admit Jonah for chemical digestion. Jonah would only give the whale an upset stomach, which is why he was later vomited up (at God's command). The whale had to fast 3 days to protect Jonah from stomach agitation, which suits a whale since it often endures famine, living off its own blubber.

While at great depth, the whale eats giant squid that live there, so seawater has restricted stomach access, and the stomach holds air under all conditions. A seawater fish couldn't offer oxygen to Jonah, for its gills take in only air dissolved in water, and seawater that it often drinks could easily drown Jonah in the stomach. But a sperm whale, though it breathes through its topside blowhole and usually has its head underwater, forces air into its stomach when it breaches (lunges), coming partly out of the water head-first, and it might do this just before, or while, swallowing Jonah.

But a breach couldn't give Jonah enough oxygen to survive a typical prolonged dive. More would be available if normal stomach isolation from respiratory-system air were somehow bridged, which is what's meant by Jonah 1:17 saying God *prepared* the fish for Jonah (not the NIV or NASV *provided* or *appointed* based only on word definition). Jonah's main oxygen supply would be that stored in a whale's blood hemoglobin and muscles as it prepares for a dive, and this source had to be tapped somehow. Perhaps preparation involved a birth defect allowing blood oxygen into the digestive tract and stomach anytime the whale wasn't eating, as was the case with Jonah in its stomach. Or it might involve bleeding in the first stomach at a wound caused by mechanical agitation of food for digestion (sharp debris collects in whale stomachs). In any event, carbon dioxide accumulation accompanies oxygen consumption in a whale's blood in a dive, and carbon dioxide releases oxygen from blood hemoglobin, providing oxygen to Jonah in the first stomach. In the process, rich oxygen content of muscles could be tapped. Some carbon dioxide would also be released, and build-up of this, and that in Jonah's breath, could suffocate him, necessitating fresh air and limiting time spent at depth. Whale muscles continue to work well in a dive as oxygen is used up and the remainder is sent largely to the brain. Reduced oxygen to the brain due to Jonah's use would induce early resurfacing for new air. And a sick whale, while continuing its habit of diving for food, wouldn't eat and wouldn't stay long at depth, as needed to protect Jonah from excessive carbon dioxide. Carbon dioxide would be partially absorbed by natural chemicals in limited seawater normally in the stomach for whale body-fluid needs, helping Jonah breathe. He nearly died, likely by near-suffocation in a deep dive, but he would recover as the whale returned him to land, exchanging old air for new by periodic breaching at the surface due to irritation from the stomach ache and oxygen deprivation at depth. Or, if oxygen flowed to the stomach due to a birth defect, all the whale's surface breathing would give Jonah a steady oxygen supply.

The author of Jonah wrote in full accord with modern whale technology, and a technical validity of his account reveals its reality and confirms the fish's identity as a whale. And how can a bible book written ~2800 years ago reveal how deep whales dive when men didn't discover this until recent centuries? God is the only one who knew this so long ago and the only one who knew the whale's location at the bottom of the sea and near undersea mountains (not Jonah in the whale's stomach). God is the ultimate writer of the book, the one guiding the human writer. God, who knows all about whales, put His signature on a bible book scholars call mythical; the signature is retained in the KJV, but it's erased in modern versions that fail to reveal the fish as a whale.

Regarding the theory that Jonah died inside the creature and was later resurrected, he's alive in chapter 2 as the whale consumes substantial time diving to the bottoms of submerged mountains. And the mountains are located a great distance from the coast Jonah first sailed from,

and to which the whale will travel to deposit him again, showing he was alive and breathing inside the creature for a long time, logically the entire 3 days.

It might seem Jonah died and was resurrected due to modern-version word choice in verse 2:6. The NIV is typical saying, *You brought my life up from the pit*, suggesting resurrection from the grave, but the grave was only figurative. *Pit* can translate the Hebrew here, but it doesn't fit this context. In the next NIV verse, Jonah says, *When my life was ebbing away* (on the verge of death, but he was spared). The NIV confuses the passage sense with contradictory suggestions. It can even imply Jonah went to hell if *pit* is connected with verse 2:2 where Jonah cries *out of the belly of hell*, or Sheol that's often rendered *pit*. *Pit* isn't adequate here, suggesting a location (grave and hell) when a status on death's ruin, or corruption, is indicated. The KJV *brought up my life from corruption* is correct, indicating healing from the death process, not the grave.

Jonah crying *out of the belly of hell* (Sheol) denotes a figurative hell in a figurative grave. The whale's stomach would've been like a grave, dark, wet, oxygen-thin and very conducive to claustrophobia. The digestive tract would emit ghastly food-decomposition odors, and no stable posture would be possible on the whale's wet stomach lining. Jonah would toss and roll back and forth with every motion of the whale, inducing constant sea-sickness and vomiting and retching in a hell-like experience.

2. The earth and the sun in space: The Bible doesn't teach that the sun revolves around the earth. The ancients of medieval and earlier times thought the sun did so.

2 Samuel 23:4 *And he shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth...*

Scholars think the terms "rising and setting" of the sun imply erroneous ancient thinking that the sun revolved around the earth, but the terms are used today in the science of meteorology. They signify the language of appearance that has always been a simple method of communication. To men the sun has always seemed to rise and set, and we still use the terms for convenience with no danger of being misunderstood. There should be no objection to using popular convenient language to communicate simple concepts.

But scholars who suggest the Bible is inaccurate here should consider the temporal state of their own science knowledge and the long tenure of the Bible. The Bible was written for ancient and modern man and has had to communicate to both perfectly. The ancients understood the language of appearance perfectly, and it was quite sufficient for their needs. But suppose the Bible had satisfied the complaint of modern skeptics. Suppose, instead of referring to "sunrise," it had used a modern technical description like the phrase, "the apparent revolution of the sun in one direction due to the rotational motion of the earth in the opposite direction." This would not only have been awkward in usage, it would also have made no sense to the ancients who needed to have confidence in scripture that they might believe its timeless lessons. If scripture had used the suggested contemporary description, the ancients would have seen the Bible as a strange book of wild speculation that was not to be taken seriously. Thus language of appearance is the scientifically correct method of expression for a book that speaks to men in all eras of world history, including early eras when God didn't give accurate technical knowledge of the physical universe. Now modern man can rejoice in new knowledge revealed to him with science progress in the providence of God. But he should not consider his God-given knowledge superior to that of the Bible, but should feel humbled and privileged to receive the benefit of God's pleasure in amplifying truth of the natural world in the fullness of time. In God's providence modern man still justifies use of the language of appearance, and it's still sufficient for his practical needs.

3. The Bible doesn't teach that the earth is flat. Isaiah 11:12

...gather...the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.

Some say a pre-scientific mentality is evidenced in that the phrase *four corners of the earth* suggests the ancient erroneous flat-earth belief. Again we ask if moderns use such terminology, and they do, and again there's no loss of meaning. This is figurative language, another popular and valid language feature. This is a figurative reference to the far reaches, or far extent, of a land or a domain. Actually we can envision four figurative corners of the earth in its north, south, east and west extremes of direction.

4. The Bible doesn't say the earth rests on giant pillars. The ancients thought it rested on giant pillars or giant animals, but Job, written ~4000 years ago, judging by classical scholarship, shows modern-science knowledge here.

Job 9:6

Which shaketh the earth out of her place, and the pillars thereof tremble.

Reference to pillars of the earth is figurative language on the foundation, or powers, keeping earth in stable condition. This is seen in Job 26:11 that says, *The pillars of heaven tremble...* Clearly the writer would never have imagined giant material pillars supporting the heavens, the sky and clouds. The language is figurative, referring to invisible forces stabilizing the features of the heavens and earth. Such language is very common, even being used to speak of law-abiding citizens as pillars of a community.

All who say the Bible teaches a flat four-cornered earth supported on giant pillars must explain Job 26:7 that says, *He (God)...hangeeth the earth upon nothing.* The ancient writer didn't know the earth requires no material support, weight having no significance in outer space. The earth hangs upon nothing as part of a universe that hangs upon nothing, all bodies being positioned relative to each other by interactive gravity and relative motion. When the book of Job chooses to be more literal, it shows us a modern-science view of the earth at a time in history when man thought the earth was supported on giant pillars or giant animals. Now where did the writer of the book of Job get this understanding if not from intervention by the Creator with His inerrant knowledge?

5. The Bible teaches a "modern-science" principle of wind generation on the earth.

What is the technical explanation for wind generation on the earth's surface? Can we find out from the oldest book of the Bible, written before the time of Abraham, about 4000 years ago (contrary to modern scholars who usually assign a late date).

Job 38:24 A question by God for Job.

KJV: *By what way is the light parted, which scattereth the east wind upon the earth?*

NASV: *Where is the way that the light is divided, Or the east wind scattered on the earth?*

NIV: *What is the way to the place where the lightning is dispersed, or the place where the east winds are scattered over the earth?*

Wind is generated by solar energy heating the earth's surface, causing heating and rising of air and consequent lateral air flow to fill the void that would be left by rising air. The ancient book of Job reveals this "modern" science concept, saying *light scatters* (moves) *the east wind upon the earth*. *Light* is the right term, for conversion of light energy to heat on absorption by the

earth's surface is the heating that generates wind (light conversion to heat is seen by burning paper with a lens that concentrates the sun's light, not its heat). The ancient writer of Job couldn't have known something so technical, so it must be due to Providential leading. Indeed the mechanism would've been hidden from ancient non-technical mentalities by occurrence of night winds arising from temperature differences like that prevailing between the land and sea after daytime solar heating. God as the ultimate writer of this scripture is revealed in the Hebrew text and the KJV.

The wind-generation mechanism in Job offers all that laymen need to know about wind. But it goes a step further and gives specific detail to inform modern technical people. In the phrase *by what way is the light parted*, the Bible concisely reveals the most basic technical aspect of wind generation. *By what way*, in reference to *east wind* (long-distance wind), denotes the way in terms of both the manner and the direction involved as sunlight is *parted* (its intensity is divided) to move air and generate winds of variant specific force around the world. That is, the language denotes involvement of angular directionality of the sun's rays in long-distance wind generation. More specifically, sunlight strikes the earth at various angles from the vertical at different longitudes and latitudes due to the curvature of the earth's surface so that earth heating varies with the angle of inclination of solar radiation. Because of *parting* (division) of light intensity according to the angle of inclination, variant earth surface temperatures arise, producing wind cells in which air moves from a cooler higher-pressure region to a warmer lower-pressure one.

Thus, to the question *By what way is the light parted*, the answer in terms of manner is, by the curvature of the earth's surface, a fact alluded to in Job but unknown at Job's time. The answer in terms of direction is, along curved earth paths on which varying sunlight angular directionality varies earth heating just enough in many adjacent regions to produce many wind cells of numerous specific ranges of force and direction under the influence of earth rotation. This advanced science knowledge, concisely revealed in an ancient bible book, can only be due to the Creator's omniscience, and He alone knows precise details of the matter.

Knowledge of the light/wind connection proves the divine hand on the scripture text, but modern translators break the connection, evidently due to a lack of knowledge of a well known science concept, and they remove knowledge of the divine hand on the text. They render, *or for which*, and neither word is in the Hebrew, the right one being derived by context/grammar. *Which* fits the context, reflecting true science, but modern versions alter the science and context. *Which* is correct, reflecting Hebrew grammar that makes *parted* passive voice (light is acted on, it is parted) and *scattereth* active voice (light acts on, it *scatters* wind). The result is two concepts in one thought. Modern translators alter the grammar, making both verbs passive and separating the concepts into two thoughts to make linguistic sense of the verse in the absence of their knowledge of the light/wind connection. Their scholarship is lacking, contradicting grammar rules and missing a well-known science concept. The KJV rightly reflects Hebrew grammar, and is correct technically, despite lack of knowledge of the light/wind connection in books of that day. The KJV proves to be an authorized true version by faithful translation of Job that reveals science truth long before men knew of it, while modern versions don't offer that insight, despite ready availability of the science knowledge in modern textbooks.

Modern versions exhibit other lack of science knowledge here, the NKJV *diffused* and NIV *dispersed* being indicative of light scattering, when precise parting is needed to generate winds of specific force (wind, not light, is scattered). And they exhibit other incorrect language due to Hebrew syntax brevity and variant word sense that complicate translation. The Hebrew under-

lying the KJV *By what way* implies a two-fold question (“how,” what manner and “where,” direction, along what path) that must be preserved in translation. The NASV rightly uses *divided*, but limits the question to *where*, saying, *Where is the way (path) that the light is divided*. This is obscure language, and it has a sense of location, missing the sense of direction. *Where is the way on which light is divided* is needed just to make linguistic sense in terms of location (but is still an incorrect sense); *By what way* is needed to make technical sense and preserve the linguistic senses of “manner” and “direction.” A sense of angular directionality of light striking a curved earth path isn’t visible in NASV language, but it’s visibility in the Hebrew is seen in the KJV, *By what way* (by what manner and along what path). In the KJV, technical people can see the manner of light intensity division as light angular directionality due to the well-known curvature of the earth’s surface, which enables them to see path direction as that along each curved earth path on which variable angular directionality varies earth heating in many adjacent regions to produce wind cells of variant specific ranges of force and direction on a rotating earth.

The NIV uses *what* but limits the question to *where*, saying, *What is the way to the place where* (the underlined words are added to Hebrew-text language to make *where* the only question, the addition showing the question isn’t just *where*). And *place* denotes location, missing the sense of direction. Further, the NIV *lightning* is incorrect word choice due to lack of knowledge of the light/wind connection (the Hebrew term here isn’t the normal one for *lightning*, and while it can refer to light from lightning at times, neither that kind of light nor *lightning* fits the Job 38:24 context).

6. Man's pre-scientific medical practice corrected by the Bible.

a. Blood-letting: Man's “scientific cure” for disease.

A theory that disease was due to bad blood led to centuries of blood-letting. It was still in use in the late 18th century, being performed on George Washington. It continued in the 19th, despite the early-17th century discovery that blood circulation is vital to life. If “doctors” of earlier days had believed Leviticus written about 1450 B.C, they’d have known how foolish blood-letting was. Leviticus 17:11 said blood is the essence of physical life ~3000 years before man recognized this. It says, *For the life of the flesh is in the blood*.

b. Tonsils and the appendix: Useless” leftover vestigial organs?

The Bible says all body organs are important, but evolutionists wrongly say some organs are useless leftovers of evolution. Man’s pre-scientific mentality in medical science continued in the 20th century in the theory that some body organs are vestigial, useless leftovers from evolution, and are best removed. Tonsils and the appendix were in this category not long ago, but now we know they’re important in disease-prevention.¹ Many folks who had an uninfected appendix or tonsils removed would have fared much better by trusting scripture written ~3000 years ago.

Psalm 139:15-16

15. *My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret...*

16. *Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect (unformed in the womb); and in thy book all my members were written which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.*

This tells us God knows each part of the body before it develops in the womb, so each is important to God and not without a function. David wrote in the 11th century B.C. when evolutionists say man had a modern body. David’s tonsils and appendix weren’t useless vestiges, for they were so important as to be in God’s book before David’s birth.

7. Dinosaurs and other giant reptiles are in the Bible

Evolutionists say dinosaurs were extinct millions of years before man “evolved,” so they say the Bible, that began to be written no more than 4000 years, ago, knows nothing of dinosaurs. But they are in Job, the oldest bible book, and the Bible refutes their supposed existence millions of years before man, saying God made dinosaurs when He made man (Job). The term "dinosaur" is modern, so it isn't in the Bible, but Job gives details on dinosaurs known to scientists only in modern times. The book indicates Job was acquainted with dinosaurs, and he lived in Uz that was close to the land later called Israel, so dinosaurs evidently roamed that region in pre-Israel days, explaining why the river Jordan is connected with dinosaurs in Job 40:23. Thus the book of Job reaches far back into antiquity when dinosaurs roamed the earth, and, as the only bible book that speaks of dinosaurs, it is by far the oldest one (see further comment in end-note #2).

a. Job 40:15-19,23,24 God speaks to Job of land-based dinosaurs.

15 *Behold now behemoth, which I made with thee; he eateth grass...*

16...*his strength is in his loins, and his force is in the navel of his belly.*

17. *He moveth his tail like a cedar...*

18. *His bones are as strong pieces of brass...*

19. *He is the chief of the ways of God...*

21. *He lieth under the shady trees...*

23. *Behold, he drinketh up a river and hasteneth not: he trusteth that he can draw up Jordan into his mouth.*

24: *He taketh it with his eyes...*

Behemoth is a giant dinosaur of the brachiosaurus/apatosaurus class that, like behemoth, ate grass. Like behemoth, such a dinosaur was *chief of the ways of God*, the largest creature in man's sight on land. This dinosaur was the only creature with a tail that moved like a cedar tree in respect of size and force. Behemoth had to be as big as a giant dinosaur to fit the figurative language on drinking up rivers. And, in full accord with modern dinosaur facsimiles, strength exertion, like that of behemoth, was centered in the belly to power the huge legs and tail. (dinosaurs didn't have a *navel*, but the term here means *center*, the basic dictionary sense). This dinosaur, unknown to scientists until the 19th century, fits the description of behemoth written in Job ~4000 years ago. Job 40 revealed dinosaurs millennia before man discovered their existence, so the Bible is the final authority on dinosaurs, and no evolutionist speculation can compete with the Bible that says God made man and dinosaurs together.

Evidence that dinosaurs have existed within our known history is seen by a recent find of soft flexible tissue and blood vessels in bone fossils of a Tyrannosaurus Rex dinosaur said by evolutionists to be 68 million years old.³ This organic matter decomposes too rapidly in bone fossilization to endure many thousands, let alone millions, of years exposure. Decomposition is slowed greatly by burial in flood sediments, but even then, with most contributing factors absent, shorter-term decomposition results from unavoidable natural radioactivity. Sediment from a fairly recent flood undoubtedly was involved, perhaps the Great Flood of ~4400 years ago.

RSV/NIV/NASV scholars don't defy the evolution agenda, the footnotes suggesting behemoth is a hippopotamus. The RSV verse 17 (followed by ESV/HCSV) says, he makes his tail stiff like a cedar, a possibility linguistically, but contextually, "stiff like a twig" would be needed to denote the small fan-shaped hippopotamus tail. In the Hebrew *cedar* is logically and contextually used in the sense of a huge tree bending by swaying.

The NASV verse 23 says, *If a river rages, he is not alarmed; he is confident, though the Jordan rushes to his mouth.* The NIV says, *When the river rages, he is not alarmed; he is secure though Jordan should surge against his mouth.* This language masks the great size and dinosaur identity of behemoth, suiting a much smaller river-dwelling hippopotamus. It offers incorrect syntax and word choice, distorts verse poetic style and misses verse division into two thoughts.

Passage syntax stresses behemoth's great size in a reiterative poetic style (behemoth this & behemoth that, with *he* or *his* most often opening a verse as the subject or subject possessive pronoun). This style makes behemoth the subject of the four clauses of verse 23 by 3rd-person pronouns (*he*). Indeed the NASV/NIV must follow this style and make *he*, behemoth, the subject of the very brief 2nd and 3rd clauses. But they deviate to make rivers subjects of the 1st and 4th clauses, masking behemoth's great size. Verse 23 begins *Behold*, stressing *he*, the central-figure behemoth, as the subject. Poetic style and a transitive verb make river a clause direct object, and making it a subject and using *If* or *When* for *Behold* favors unrealistic interpretation. It favors reading the Hebrew literally (NASV language) as, *If a river rages, he (the river) is not alarmed; he (the river) is confident though the Jordan rushes to his (the river's) mouth*; this is clear if the correct *Behold* is used. Actually, it's not that a river rages, but that behemoth conquers a river.* He *drinketh up a river* (poetic language), consuming it in the sense of conquering it in crossing it easily, so he *hasteneth not* to cross a river, for it's no threat due to his great size.** This is like the sense of Job 39:24 that says, *he (the horse) swalloweth the ground*, or consumes/conquers terrain⁵ (Poetic style and context make *he* a clause subject and *ground* a direct object). Modern translators are required by Hebrew language to follow this syntax. But they deviate in 40:23 where language makes it possible to imagine an alternative that avoids *he* (behemoth) as the subject and *river* as the direct object to mask behemoth's size. Lamsa's Peshitta version shows that *river* isn't the clause subject, saying, *Behold, if he plunges into the river*, but its, *if he plunges*, avoids the dinosaur identity.

Modern versions follow poetic style to make behemoth a clause subject where language forbids alternatives, as in 40:15,19,21, and they make other animals clause subjects in 39:3,7,8,14-16,18,21,22,24,25. But 40:23 is susceptible to an imagined alternative, as is 40:17. The NIV alters 40:17 as it does 40:23, ignoring poetic style and a transitive verb that make behemoth a clause subject. It makes the tail the subject, stressing tail motion over size, which further masks the dinosaur identity. Other modern translators didn't do this in 40:17, and they had no good reason to do so in 40:23

*Jamieson, Fausset, Brown Com. stipulates *overwhelm*, similar to *conquer*. Hebrew-language expert, prof. R. Gordis confirms the verb as transitive and says the raging-river concept is dubious translation.⁴

Context here is one of emphasis as God contrasts His wisdom and power with Job's. The first clause and first word emphasize the main subject, behemoth, and include a pause, so the interjection *Behold* with a comma or exclamation point is indicated. The RSV/ESV, *Behold, if the river...* is supportive of *Behold* and a pause, but wrongly adds *if* to make river a clause subject (it's *Behold* or *If*, not both). *If/when* are adverbs not invoking emphasis or a pause. The NRSV *Even if the river...* HCSV *though the river...* and NKJV *Indeed the river...* are inadequate, minimizing emphasis and eliminating a pause. And in 40:15, where the 1st clause opens in a way similar to that of 40:23, modern versions render *Behold* or an equivalent with a pause, as they must since behemoth is named there (the NASV has, *Behold now Behemoth, ...* and the NIV, *Look at the behemoth, ...*), but they open 40:23 differently. All this variety suggests modern translators trying in their own ways to discount the dinosaur identity and thus avoid defying evolution theory.

**The NIV/NASV *he is not alarmed* isn't justified; the Hebrew imperfect verb here isn't stative (state of being with verb is); the KJV intransitive fientive (action) verb *hasteth not* (JFB *trembleth not*) is correct grammar.

Another logical thought arises from that above, that behemoth can draw up Jordan into his mouth, which has a dual sense. Figuratively, *draw up*, like *drinketh up*, means that behemoth consumes/conquers Jordan, but now in the sense of traversing its full length, drawing all the way up into the river's (his) mouth. And *draw up* is literally "drink" (poetic exaggeration; a Heb. Athnah at *hasteneth* stipulates a colon, the second thought developing the first to suggest a size great enough to imagine ingesting a river).

The NASV/NIV miss the true second thought, making the two one and missing the nature of Jordan's motion. It's not that Jordan *rushes/surges*, for poetic style and a transitive verb make behemoth the subject and Jordan a direct object, and the verb as a transitive means *bring forth*, *draw up** (NASV to his mouth is ok; NKJV into his mouth and Brenton's Septuagint up into his mouth are good, yet these versions miss the other important points).

The NASV/NIV reiterate the first thought in new language, something common to Hebrew poetry, but here the second thought doesn't just repeat the first, but develops it, adding new meaning. The clause *he is confident/secure* serves only to justify the incorrect, *though the Jordan rushes/surges* that continues the improper raging-river notion and makes Jordan the subject of a clause unrelated to context on behemoth's size. A KJV *that in that he can draw up Jordan* gives the right syntax, rightly tying *trusteth* to a clause with the object of trust, conquest of Jordan, to construct the second thought by proper continued emphasis on behemoth's size.** Job 40:24 also stresses behemoth's size, saying he takes Jordan *with his eyes* (owns it), and a hippopotamus is too small to justify this figurative language on size, so *Jordan* is made the 4th clause subject.

The NASV/NIV miss both thoughts of verse 23 with private syntax and word choice. Dinosaurs are well known today, but modern scholars mistranslate to mask behemoth's identity, perhaps yielding to the modern notion that dinosaurs aren't in the Bible. The far lesser hippopotamus size requires changes to emphasize rivers twice when behemoth's great size is the one emphasis, underlying verse poetic style, syntax and word choice. By totally accurate translation, the KJV is fully correct, though dinosaurs were unknown in 1611, which is a unique distinction marking a Providentially-ordained version.

b. Job 41:1...31 God speaks to Job about sea-going dinosaur relatives

1. *Canst thou draw out leviathan with a hook...*
2. *Canst thou put a hook into his nose...*
10. *None is so fierce that dare stir him up...*
14. *Who can open the doors of his face? His teeth are terrible...*
17. *They (scales) are joined one to another, they stick together...*
21. *His breath kindleth coals, and a flame goeth out of his mouth.*
22. *In his neck remaineth strength...*
26. *The sword of him that layeth at him cannot hold...*
27. *He esteemeth iron as straw...*
31. *He maketh the deep to boil like a pot...*

*Jamieson, Fausset, Brown stipulates *draw out*. Gordis says *draw forth* and confirms the verb as transitive.⁴

***The imperfect verb rendered trusteth in the KJV is that, or the stative, is confident, so behemoth trusteth, or is confident he can draw up Jordan into his mouth; grammar suggests either one applies, but trusteth is right, better reflecting verse syntax and poetic style; is confident serves only to support the raging-river distortion. The two statives in verse 23 of modern versions can even be used to remove behemoth from verse 23 totally, through an implied English poetic metaphorical sense of the raging-river concept, that the river isn't alarmed (unmoved) and is confident (undeterred) as it rages, when that's not part of the passage subject matter.*

Many think this account is a myth, the seeming fire-breathing capability invoking "fire-breathing dragons" of ancient legends. But it's a fully credible technical description of a giant sea-going dinosaur relative, and the existence of ancient large sea-going reptiles like the plesiosaur is well known. Leviathan is very large from the satirical expressions about the foolishness of trying to fish for him, trying to put a hook in his nose. Clearly he's a large sea-going creature, and the note in verse 31 about "boiling the deep" is poetic language referring to a large wake of air bubbles that he produces in moving through the sea, giving the appearance of boiling of the deep. Large sea-going reptiles likely would have been very strong in the neck, in keeping with verse 22. From verses 10,22,27, Leviathan is obviously large, fierce and strong. The description of his scaly flesh in verses 15-17 shows that, like a dinosaur, he's a reptile. From verse 14, he clearly has great teeth like those of a dinosaur. In this anatomical detail, the ancient book of Job is consistent with modern knowledge of giant reptiles not discovered until the 19th century A.D.

Of course passage technical credibility rests on the accuracy of the note on fire coming from the creature's mouth, but here the Bible gives a physiological detail of certain large reptiles not recognized by modern scientists. Some would say it's impossible for flesh to house fire, but that's a non-technical way to view the creature. The logical way it could emit fire from its mouth is by containment of a flammable chemical in its body that is ejected from its body before ignition. The principle is as simple as that of a flame-thrower, a weapon of war. A soldier's equipment doesn't contain fire, but directs a flammable chemical through a nozzle for external ignition. The chemical is a pressurized organic compound ignited externally and propelled a distance. In an animal it's only necessary that its body contain sacs of a combustible organic liquid propelled by muscular action, ignition being automatic through the presence of an oxidizer that reacts with the compound to generate adequate heat for spontaneous combustion. If this sounds incredible to the reader, he should consider that just such a system is found in the anatomy of an insignificant insect called the bombardier beetle that uses it for self-defense against birds, frogs and the like. The insect's body produces a combustible organic compound and an inorganic oxidizer contained in sacs. Mixing the two results in an exothermic (heat-generating) chemical reaction so energetic that spontaneous combustion occurs, and an explosion is possible. The insect needs a way to slow reaction until the chemical mixture is ejected from its body, and this is achieved through a third chemical in its body, an inhibitor that slows reaction until the mixture contacts air. Thus a fiery hot emission outside the insect's body arises from a built-in chemical system in this creature's anatomy serving as natural self-defense similar in principle to a flame-thrower. Now if such a sophisticated self-defense system has been provided for a mere insect, why can't a similar one have been provided for a complex reptile?

The Job passage isn't at all technically incredible. It was once thought that men flying in the atmosphere was too incredible a notion to be taken seriously. But progressive revelation in science that God permits shows us the incredible of today is the routine of tomorrow. We should rethink "legends" on fire-emitting scaly dragons (great lizards, or dinosaurs?) so common in world cultures from the Americas to Europe to Asia to Australia. Legends are always based on a kernel of central truth, and the idea of giant reptiles spread throughout the world's cultures at one time after their creation is hardly incredible, unless you have preconceived notions about their extinction "millions of years before man evolved." It isn't scientifically correct to dismiss persistent accounts in the life of several widespread early cultures. Matters that pertain to science would have been experienced by ancient mankind, and the manner and means of reporting them would be primitive, simply because of a lack of sophistication in knowledge and understanding.

An RSV footnote saying Leviathan is a crocodile is absurd regarding the fire-emitting capability and the size so great he treats iron like straw. And Leviathan's domain isn't rivers and ponds of crocodiles, but the sea, as evident from Job and Psalm 104:25-26. Isaiah 27:1 calls Leviathan the *dragon in the sea*, fitting for a sea-going fire-emitting reptile.

The New English Bible substitutes "crocodile" for "Behemoth" and "Leviathan" right in the bible text, even calling the crocodile the "chief of beasts" and "chief of God's works," defying common sense. And this version refers to the crocodile, not as eating grass, but eating cattle as if they were grass, and it's difficult to imagine such a prodigious appetite in a creature whose stomach is much smaller than one cow. And supposedly, the crocodile emits leviathan's fire from its mouth. This version just indulges in fanciful speculation and text manipulation to justify the committee's evolution-supportive private interpretation of the identities of the beasts noted. But in this it receives very little support from other versions. While the RSV calls Leviathan a crocodile in its footnotes, it doesn't attempt much supportive text manipulation here.

End Notes

1. Parker, G. 1994. *Creation Facts of Life*. Master Books. Col. Springs. p47-56

2. Bednar, L. 2003. *Systematic Theology*. Mechling Bookbindery. Chicora, PA. p44,45.

Notes on Job dating: While biblical world history begins with Genesis by Moses, that does not mean this was the first book written. Likely Job was the first revelation inspired by God to begin the process of inscripturation as early as 2000 B.C, judging by classical scholarship. Job seems to be the earliest book, preceding the Pentateuch since it shows Job following the personally-administered animal sacrifice of Abel and Noah that preceded a priestly-administered one of Moses' time. And nothing in the book deals with Israel's origin, suggesting it was written before Israel began with Moses and so before the Pentateuch was written. Job could be a son of Jacob's son Issachar (Gen.46:13), which would place him around 1800-1700 B.C, but this is likely just another use of the respected name of famous Job, for there's nothing tying this man to the greatness of Job seen in the book of Job. And the book says nothing of Abraham, the greatest figure of his time, and Job was *the greatest of all the men of the east* (1:3), so the book was likely written before Abraham's time, likely around 2000 B.C. The name Uz, Job's land, is very old, likely deriving from Noah's great-grandson Uz (Gen.10:21-23). That Job preceded Abraham is seen in that Job's life span was the 140 years he lived after his trials (42:16) plus preceding years in which he fathered 10 children old enough to commit sins (1:1-5), for a likely possible total of ~200 years. This is comparable to the 205 years of Abraham's father, Terah, and greater than the 175 years of Abraham, the 148 years of Abraham's brother Nahor, the 147 years of Abraham's grandson Jacob and the 110 years of Jacob's son Joseph. Very likely, this places Job near Terah's time in history as man's life-span steadily decreased from a near-1000 year level of pre-flood history, a longevity associated with the pre-fall promise of eternal life.

But we ask why Job's friends Eliphaz and Bildad had personal and/or tribal names identified with descendants of Abraham (Esau, Shuah, Jokshan - Gen.25:2) and of his brother Nahor (Gen.22:20,21). And why are Chaldean and Sabean tribes and the tribe of the friend Elihu noted tied to descendants of Abraham and Nahor? Well, the name "Chaldeans" preceded Abraham's time, for his first homeland was Ur of the Chaldees (Gen.11:31), and the name "Sabeans" originated very early with Seba, Noah's great grandson (Gen.10:1-7). And the Naamathite tribe of Zophar, Job's friend, originated still earlier with the name of Cain's great granddaughter (Gen. 4:22). Indeed there's evidence that names in Job precede those of Abraham and Nahor and their lines of descent. Eliphaz in Job is called a Temanite, while 1 Chronicles 1:36 says the Teman in

Abraham's line was a son of Eliphaz. A father can't continue a clan of which his son is the patriarch, so Eliphaz in Abraham's line is a different Eliphaz. It looks like names in Abraham and Nahor's lines are repeat uses of earlier names and descent lines of Job and his friends. This isn't surprising, for as Abraham was the outstanding man in his age, so Job was in his, and children would be named after names in Job, this being the one existing scripture book at Abraham's time and for the next 500 years. Chronicles established historic record-keeping in Israel and is crucial for clues on how Job's and Abraham's genealogies might be related (The chroniclers, Ezra et al, restored the Old Testament text after Babylonian Captivity). Further evidence that names in Abraham and Nahor's lines are repeats is an inexact correlation of genealogy. Regarding Elihu the Buzite of Job, his father Barachel isn't noted in the line of Nahor, father of Huz and Buz (Gen.22:21), and Job's Ram in the line of Buz isn't in Nahor's line, the one other Ram in scripture being in Abraham's line (1 Chr.2:9 – note: Aram in Nahor's line isn't Ram, these being different names in Hebrew, both names perhaps being patterned after the Ram of Job). And Nahor's Huz and Buz are likely names derived from Job's land of Uz, reflecting a trend in Nahor's clan in that his name derived from the name of his town and his brother Haran's name derived from the district that the town of Nahor was located in.

3. Schweitzer, M.H. et al. *Science*. Vol.307. #5717. Mar.05. p1952-55.
4. Gordis, R. 1978. *The Book of Job. Commentary, New Translation and Special Studies*. Jewish Theological Seminary of America. N.Y.C.
5. Clarke, A. *Clarke's Commentary*. N.Y. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press

The Inerrant Autographs Still Speak: Consistent Accuracy in the Textual Basis

Clearly, if a translation is to preserve accuracy, its textual basis must have done so also, and the KJV basis shows evidence of this that is very convincing to true bible-believers.

The KJV Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic Textual Basis Shows No Faults

A. Passages in the traditional-type Greek text, missing in the critical-type text

1. The angel at the pool – Not a lost verse. John 5:2-7 NIV

5:2 *Now there is in Jerusalem near the sheep gate a pool which in Aramaic* is called Bethesda and which is surrounded by five covered colonnades.*

5:3 *Here a great number of disabled people used to lie...*

5:4

5:5 *One who was there had been an invalid for 38 years.*

5:6 *When Jesus saw him lying there and learned that he had been in this condition for a long time, He asked him, "Do you want to get well?"*

5:7 *"Sir," the invalid replied, "I have no one to help me into the pool when the water is stirred. While I am trying to get in, someone else goes down ahead of me."*

An omission in the NIV critical Greek text is clear from context so that verse 4 is left blank. In the absence of the verse, the passage makes no sense. In response to the Lord's question on healing, why did the invalid say he had to get into the pool, and why did he have to go in ahead of others, and what did stirring of the water have to do with healing? The KJV has a verse 4 that answers these questions. It says, *For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease* (disturbance of ease in body functions, dis-ease) *he had*. This shows why the pool is important, what stirring of the water is all about and why the man wanted to get into the pool ahead of others.

Many scholars reject the KJV verse 4, despite its logical solution to the problem and despite the fact that a great majority of Greek manuscripts have the verse as seen in the KJV.** They reject it just because a few non-traditional manuscripts they favor don't have verse 4. They prefer to believe the genuine verse 4 was lost rather than accept the KJV rendering. This would suggest that scholars and their opinions are crucial in bible preservation, and that we're at their mercy in having "all the Word of God still available" at our disposal.

The verse has also been attacked on the basis that some in the 2nd century church disputed the existence of such a miraculous pool in Jerusalem since it wasn't found at that time.¹ But such healing devices were only for Old Testament purposes and thus would pass away after Calvary when Christ became the sole focus of our healing.

*The NIV interprets here, for the Greek text says *Hebrew*, not *Aramaic*. Aramaic was common then, but Hebrew was used in some matters, especially religious ones. Actually studies suggest *Bethesda* is a Hebrew word, while the Aramaic equivalent is *Bethzatha* (Hodges, Z.C. *The Greek Text of the King James Version*. in *Which Bible*. Ed. Fuller, D.O. Inst. For Bib. Text. Studies. Gr. Rap. p29

**White ² imagines a necessity for inclusion of such a verse could make a scribe add it to the text, so he suggests impairment of his favorite text-type is normal so that correction by men is expected. He stresses the danger of adding to the text, which he thinks occurred in the traditional text, and he objects to speaking of a deletion here, even though the NIV language here plainly reveals deletion.

2. The last 12 verses of Mark: Not a lost passage. Mk.16:9-20

16:8 *And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any man; for they were afraid.*

Scholars suggest Mark's Gospel ends at verse 16:8 on a note of fear by women at the tomb, saying the last 12 verses in the KJV Mark aren't authentic, even though the subject matter is in other gospels. They suggest Mark's gospel omits events like the report of Mary Magdalene to the disciples, the Emmaus Road meeting with Jesus, the great commission and Jesus' Ascension. Scholars have Mark's Gospel ending on a note of fear instead of Resurrection triumph. Some say Mark ended his gospel here, making it abnormally different. Others say there's a lost true ending different from that of the KJV Mark.

Such theories arise just because two Alexandrian and one Latin manuscripts, and an old Syriac version omit the 12 verses. But many Greek and Latin manuscripts and many old versions and commentaries have the verses. And the Latin manuscript omitting them shows evidence of Docetist tampering, indicating omission by tampering. Supportive Traditional-Text material is very cogent, and the bible-based church and others have revered and retained the verses for centuries. All scholars offer to justify their view is their manuscript preference and imaginative arguments like a writing style of the 12 verses supposedly different from Mark's typical one. Expositors today teach that the 12 verses aren't authentic on the basis of speculative aspects of style and grammar. White discounts the major manuscript support and defends the omission with mere speculation.*

B. Passages present only in certain select traditional-type Greek manuscripts

Scholars say a true bible reading may be found in just a few manuscripts to support their theory that their preferred Greek text is best, a text that often has scant manuscript support. In this scholars grasp a textual truth but apply it to the wrong text. Alexandrian manuscript readings inferior in doctrine and accuracy, and indicative of heresy at times, can't reflect a providentially preserved text for an entire true church. But a small number of true readings do have minor manuscript support for logical orthodox reasons.

A reading affirmed by a majority of traditional manuscripts is a preservation norm. Earliest text copies would circulate in all churches, a majority (consistent) reading being a true one. But preservation of all readings would be realized only in churches retaining a biblical basis, accurate manuscripts being protected there in reaction to many other churches becoming unbiblical and tolerating tampering.^{a,b} Gnostic influence, the main cause of extreme corruption at Alexandria, likely had some influence on other eastern churches. The Greek church at large grew unbiblical, and many traditional manuscripts show a minor degree of variance with certain readings being

*White, *The King James Only Controversy*, p256, imagines anomalies in the 12 verses, like Jesus appearing in another form in verse 12, thinking this denies a physical resurrection body, but Jesus' resurrected physical body was supernatural (Lk.24:33-40). And he notes 11 disciples at the table in verse 14 (no Thomas makes 10), but the 11 were those of John 20:26 that included Thomas. And he says it's unlikely Jesus would rebuke the disciples for unbelief in their fearful post-Crucifixion state, but Jesus earlier rebuked them for unbelief when they were fearful (as in Mt.8:26). Such objections conjured up from imagination can't disqualify scripture passages.

a. Burgon, J. *The Revision Revised*. Ed. Fuller, D.O. 1983. True or False. Gr. Rapids. International Publications. p137-159 **b.** Hoskier, H. *The Codex Vaticanus and its Allies*. Ed. Fuller, D.O. 1975. "Which Bible." Inst. for Biblical Textual Studies. Gr. Rapids. p136-141

mildly distorted, while most, or nearly all, of them, exclude a few true readings. Manuscripts like these would eventually predominate as an unbiblical eastern-church sector grew large and many scribes made many copies of slightly altered texts with a few lost true readings. Manuscripts confined to biblical churches would preserve all original readings, but the proportion of these in the total would diminish greatly as small true churches became obscure in the post-apostolic era. Thus minor, or even scant, manuscript support of a few true readings is no surprise.

With total preservation marking true churches, a movement toward true faith will multiply copies of the true text, as in the case of the Reformation. In preparation for this event, the Traditional Text was renewed in the west as Constantinople fell to muslims in the Roman-empire east in 1453 A.D. Fleeing Greek scholars carried this text west where the Latin Vulgate ruled. With invention of movable-type printing at ~1450, the text was soon fixed in print and no longer subject to tampering in hand-written manuscripts. These events preceded the Reformation in the near future, so the west was providentially being prepared for Reformation-era translations to guide those seeking a return to biblical faith.

Regarding text history, God's people must place faith in His sovereignty above the views and opinions of scholars. God's Word is mainly for His people who discern it by the Spirit, so usage in the biblical church, where God's people are, will identify the true text, as Dr. Hills noted.³ Thus the present writer views renewal of the true text in the west as correcting a minor degree of error in the Traditional Text to restore its original total accuracy, resulting in the Received Text. Restoration as a process explains a history of minor variations of the Received Text as progressions toward a perfected final form in today's KJV. Critics deriding historical changes in the Received Text don't realize God won't abandon the text to the devil's servants that ever seek to alter it, but will ordain and guide His servants to maintain His truth.⁴ If God inspired men of old to write scripture, He can certainly direct later men to correct error. This would be the logical reason why Beza resorted to an unidentified textual source at Revelation 16:5, seeing that Erasmus' text missed the future aspect of God's sovereignty, only the present and past aspects being given. It's why Beza, while disagreeing with Erasmus' text on Luke 2:14, nonetheless retained a rendering contrary to his own doctrinal belief, being guided by something greater than his preferences. What looks to critics like unorthodox text development is actually God's way of restoring a text without glorifying men. Text adjustments ended when the text was finalized in the KJV of the biblical church, the only legitimate further changes being language-convention up-dating and textual commentary like that of Scrivener in the 19th century.

Now scripture is mainly for faithful laity who never imagine the text needs changes, but revere and preserve it, so translations in common vernaculars can be as important as Greek manuscripts in preserving the text. God may intervene to preserve the text in translations to override scholar corruptions in Greek manuscripts. While there's always been a true Greek text in true churches, God's Word can be fully preserved in other languages. True churches are vital in God's plan for His Word, so there's great value in the Italic Old Latin text of a biblical non-Roman European church originating in apostolic times. This church would safeguard the text for full preservation in Latin. A true translation should be providentially favored over altered Greek manuscripts to preserve the true text, and the Italic would've been a vital textual source for correcting a minor degree of error in the Traditional Text to help produce the Received Text crucial to Europe.

True translations of biblical churches help sustain text accuracy, as in the case of Latin versions and the Greek Received Text produced by Erasmus. The Roman Vulgate New Testament was

based on the Italic version of the true Latin church, and “Vulgate carryovers” in Erasmus text had a high probability of being true readings. Scholars disdain his occasional use of the Vulgate when Greek manuscripts were lacking, suggesting his Roman background influenced him. But he favored Vulgate revision by traditional manuscripts, preferring the Greek. He held certain Roman doctrines, but he had no bias, being a bold reformer of this church, even ending his days with reformers separated from Rome.

And scholars criticize what they call Erasmus' limited manuscript source, saying he could've avoided resorting to the Vulgate by recourse to the Alexandrian text, but this assumes that text is useful. The Traditional-type manuscripts of Erasmus were part of a progressive restoration plan utilizing the best available texts, so quality was quite good, and a few manuscripts sufficed to provide the entire text rather well. Scholars fail to see a providential intervention limiting Erasmus' choices to the best available manuscripts.

Erasmus' text was providentially timed, barely preceding the Reformation, for which it doubtless was intended. This timing was ensured in a unique way, an ambitious printer who wanted to have the first published Greek text, rushing Erasmus to finish his text before release of the competing Complutensian Polyglot of Spain (God uses the foolishness of men to effect His will). Now this providential timing precluded the later popularity of Alexandrian manuscripts so that they could have no real influence on Erasmus' thinking, despite their availability in Vatican archives and elsewhere. Further, this providential timing allowed the popularity of the Latin Vulgate at this time in history to force Erasmus to consider it, despite his preference for the traditional Greek. Thus Providence was in control when Erasmus resorted to the Vulgate at times.

What we must realize is that the Italic Old Latin Bible underlying the Vulgate was the text of a bible-based western church from at least the mid-2nd century on, and later a text used for Reformation-era versions. Augustine testified of the good Italic textual state in the 4th century, calling it the best in fidelity to the Greek. In the late 4th century, Jerome chose the Italic for Old Latin revision, recognizing it as the best basis for revision. He made some changes toward the Alexandrian Text (his misguided idea of revision), but pro-Alexandrian changes were limited, especially limited outside the gospels, so his Vulgate was a far better source for Erasmus than the Alexandrian text. And the certainty of providential intervention in text history maximizes confidence in Erasmus' text and the KJV based largely upon it. That “Vulgate carryovers” in Erasmus' text were actually original Italic readings of the biblical western church, is indicated by various examples, the most famous one being 1 John 5:7,8, the so-called Johannine Comma.

1. The Johannine Comma: Truth restored for lovers of truth. 1 Jn.5:5-9, KJV.

5. *Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?*
6. *This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth.*
- 7: *For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost and these three are one.*
- 8: *And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water and the blood: and these three agree in one.*
9. *...this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son.*

NIV

- 6...*And it is the Spirit who testifies, because the Spirit is the truth.*
- 7: *For there are three that testify: _____?*
- 8: *the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement.*

Introduction: Scholars reject the Comma (underlined words) in the Received Text since its primary support is Latin manuscripts. White dismisses it due to minor manuscript support beyond the Vulgate,⁴ reversing his position against major manuscript support of the last 12 verses of Mark 16. Evidently he endorses minor manuscript support only for his preferred critical text. A total of 10 Greek manuscripts, including an 8th century one, have the Comma.^a

Scholars say Erasmus opposed Comma inclusion in the text, its presence being due to a rash promise,⁴ but there are no accidents in God's Word. That Erasmus opposed it is speculation, and even if he did, it's in his text from the 3rd edition, and an inability to exclude it would show how God confounds the wise. He said he found it in a Greek manuscript, one scholars say was written at Erasmus' time, but that's just a biased view, and the date is uncertain.

The Comma pre-dated Jerome's Vulgate revision of the Italic. His prologue shows he knew of it, but omitted it; it was inserted around 800 A.D.⁵ (the Vulgate N.T. was finished an unknown time after 384 A.D.). An early Comma origin is seen by Old Latin manuscripts of the 5th-6th century and notes of 3rd-4th century Latin bishops.^{3,5,6} Priscillian quoted it before 385 A.D. In 258 A.D. Cyprian said, *the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one*, interpreting Word as Son.^a Tertullian in 215 A.D. said of the Father, Son and Comforter, *which three are one*, interpreting.^b In the 484 A.D. Council of Carthage, 400 North African bishops affirmed Comma authenticity, indicating it was a long-standing tradition under attack at that time.^b

Kenyon^c verified the Italic as of Traditional-text type. Warner said, *The version current among the western heretics (Waldenses, called heretics by Catholics) can be shown to be based upon the Greek (Traditional) and not the Latin (Vulgate).*^d 17th-century scholar Allix said of Waldensian worship, *The liturgy has the Psalms and diverse other texts of Scripture of the ancient version called the Italic.*^e And extant Waldensian Tepl/Romaunt Old Latin versions and the Vulgate are based on the Italic New Testament, but the versions agree together against the Vulgate at places,^f suggesting they follow the Traditional Text where Jerome imposed the Alexandrian.

A bible-based Latin church traces back to a Reformation church, on back to a 12th-century Waldensian church and finally to a 2nd-century Vaudois church (dwellers in Alps valleys). The Italic endured in the non-Roman western church down to and beyond the Reformation, while the Roman church began Vulgate use in the 5th century. Italic preservation continued in Erasmus' Greek Text of Reformation churches seeking a return to biblical faith, and it later continued in the KJV. Comma lineage extends all the way from ancient Vaudois churches, to Waldensian churches, to Reformation churches and to today's KJV churches, in accord with the concept of preservation of the true text in churches desiring to be biblical.

Textual analysis: Bible-believing scholar Dr. E. Hills.⁷ noted grammatical evidence of Comma authenticity. Its absence creates a textual issue, relating masculine descriptive modifiers directly to neuter-gender terms *Spirit, water* and *blood* and treating neuters as if they were masculine,

- a. Dabney, R.L. *The Doctrinal Various readings of the N.T. Greek*. Discussions: Evangelical & Theological. 1891. Vol.1. p350-390.
- b. Nolan, F. 1815. *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate...* London.
- c. Kenyon, F. 1951. *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*. N.Y. Harper. p169-171.
- d. Warner, J.H. 1922-28. Society for Promotion of Christian Knowledge. MacMillan
- e. Allix, P. D.D. *Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of the Albigeneses*. Ch.7, p51. 1989 ed. Reprinted from 1821 ed. Checked against Allix 1690-92 ed.
- f. Hurst, J.F. 1897. *History of the Christian Church*. Vol.1. N.Y. Eaton & Mains. p834.

contrary to Greek grammar. Without the Comma there's no explanation, but with the Comma present, the problem disappears. Comma masculine nouns of the Trinity, *Father* and *Word* control gender treatment of neuter nouns they associate with, and the Comma itself has masculine descriptive modifiers treating the neuter nouns as masculine. Scholars say arbitrary personalization caused the unique variation, but Hills noted that in that case *Spirit* in verse 6 of the passage would have been seen as personalized and treated as masculine, but it wasn't. White dismisses all this on the basis of style that supposedly allows such grammar deviation as normal.⁴

Linguistic evidence of Comma deletion in the NIV Greek text is seen in verses 7, 8 that are each an incomplete thought/sentence, a need to combine two Greek-text verses to complete one thought/sentence suggesting deletion. And deletion is indicated in that Spirit, water and blood of Jesus in verse 8 are by nature earthly witnesses to His deity, so the Comma portion, *And there are three that bear witness in earth* looks necessary. And evidence of deletion arises in that omitting the Comma omits *Word* in the Comma Trinity, the name John normally applies to the eternal Christ (Jn.1:1, 1 Jn.1:1, Rev.19:13).

Contextual evidence of deletion is seen in that 1 John 5:9 verifies Comma authenticity in relating the Comma heavenly witness to the verse-8 earthly witness, saying, *this is the witness of God* (witness of the Trinity of the Comma) *which he hath testified of His Son* (in the form of the verse 8 earthly witness). And the Spirit links the heavenly and earthly witnesses, being in both in verses 7 and 8. And the initial Comma portion, a heavenly testimony to Jesus as God's salvation, accords with John's gospel (In Jn.5:37, the Father sends and bears witness of Jesus, and in 1:1,14 & 8:14 Christ the Word bears witness of Himself, and in 16:13,14 the Spirit of truth [the Holy Ghost] witnesses of Jesus).

Other contextual matters affirming Comma authenticity relate to early heresy. A heresy of some significance, docetism, postulated a phantom spirit Christ who only seemed to have a body, and 1 John 4:3 refutes this in declaring Jesus as God in the flesh. Gnostic adoptionist heresy postulated a mere man Jesus temporarily indwelt by the eternal Christ, and John's refutation of this heresy has a role in proving Comma authenticity, as we shall now see.

Contrary to scholars, verse 5:6 water and blood refer, not to Jesus' baptism and shedding of blood, but His deity. Verse 5 declares His deity as God's Son as the basis of salvation victory, and 5:6 further discusses His deity, saying it is, *not by water only, but by water and blood*. Greek grammar indicates *by* has the sense, *by means of*,* saying Jesus came to earth by means of divine power signified by water and blood. Verse 5:6 reveals *water* and *blood*, in conjunction with *Spirit*, as signifying a human trinity (Son of man, Jesus) paralleled by a divine Trinity (Son of God, Christ) so that humanity and deity were in each aspect of His Trinitarian person. *Spirit*, *water* and *blood* in Jesus' earthly form testify to His authenticity as the divine Savior. The *Spirit* relates Jesus' human spirit to the Holy Spirit, both being an integral part of His person (Rom.8:9 equates the Holy Spirit and Jesus' Spirit). The *water* relates Jesus' word spoken on earth through His human soul (that calmed a storm at sea) to the divine eternal Word of heaven (that spoke the world into existence), both being an integral part of His person (Eph.5:26 relates Jesus' word to

In the 1st clause of 5:6, *water* and *blood* are in the genitive case and are unexpectedly with the preposition *dia* (by), and they appear in a more usual dative case with the preposition *en* (by) in the parallel 2nd clause. *Dia* with the genitive usually means *through* in the sense of, passing through the midst of, which is awkward here. Using *dia* with the genitive case is rare for John, the only other case in 1 Jn. being 4:9 (Findlay, G.G. 1989. *Studies in John's Epistles*. Kregel. p397). A meaning of the preposition common to both cases in 1 Jn.5:6, is indicated, instrumentality (*by means of*), and this is clearly the meaning in 1 Jn.4:9

water, the church being sanctified by washing of water by the word, and in John 15:3, His Word cleanses us, or has the nature of water). And the human bodily part of Jesus' person relates to His divine blood (Acts 20:28 calls Jesus' blood that of God - Only divine blood, free of sin-stain of a human father or mother, could cleanse us of sin. The Holy Ghost would've created the human body Christ dwelled in, consisting of directly-created divine blood and a human body indirectly created from Mary's genetic make-up and excluding her contribution to the blood.)* The Spirit in Jesus testifies that Christ came not by water alone, or not as the Eternal Word of heaven occupying a body, as in Gnostic adoptionism. He came also by blood, divine blood in His own body able to redeem us, not the powerless blood of a mere man occupied by the eternal Word.

Jesus' divine water and blood witness of His salvation mission is seen also in John 19:32-37 noting water and blood of His pierced side on the Cross in prophecy fulfillment related to His deity (Zec.12:10 on the pierced Messiah's 2nd Advent, Ex 12:46 on God's Passover lamb with no broken bone & Ex.17:1-7 on the water of life from the rock that is Christ - see 1 Cor.10:4). In relation to these Crucifixion prophecies, blood and water signify His normally-veiled deity within His humanity, and prophecy fulfillment in relation to this informs John on Jesus' deity.

Now why does the Comma treat the Spirit, water and blood as masculine? For the same reason the Spirit is *it* as part of Christ's earthly person, but *He* as a separate personage.* In 5:8 the earthly testimony is *water* signifying the divine word, and *blood* signifying divine blood embodied. Attesting the water and blood is the divine Spirit in Jesus. The 5:8 nouns of earthly testimony are treated as masculine since, though each is part (it) of Jesus' earthly person, each signifies a sovereign entity (He) in His person by the Trinity heavenly witness in the Comma (5:7 syntax creates a parallel 5:8 syntax, so 5:8 verifies Comma authenticity). The Father in heaven of the Comma testifies of His relationship to Jesus by divine blood, so the blood (it) representing the Father (He) exhibits masculinity (an earthly father/son relationship is one of blood, and Jesus' divine blood symbolizes a pure Father/Son relationship in body - a divine eternal body with hand/foot wounds in resurrection - Lk.24:39, 40). The Eternal Word in heaven of the Comma testifies by water of Jesus' word that He as the Son came in holy flesh and blood, so the water (it) representing Him exhibits masculinity. The divine Holy Ghost in heaven of the Comma testifies of His earthly ministry as Jesus' Spirit (it) verifying the water/blood testimony, so the Spirit (He) on earth exhibits masculinity. Thus the earthly *three* that *agree in one* are of divine nature, this being veiled in their earthly form, but revealed in 1 John 5:7-8. Jesus' Spirit is divine and masculine but has an apparent neuter form in His earthly state, and the divine blood in His earthly body and the divine Word in His earthly speech reflect masculinity veiled in their earthly form. In their deity the three *agree in one* (act as one), reflecting the Comma heavenly Trinity that *are one*. Jesus in His three earthly aspects of personage reflects the divine Trinity (image of God) verified by the Comma heavenly witness. He came to earth by divine power signified by water and blood that are attested by the Spirit. Thus the Comma and earthly testimonies reflect the dual Trinity of the Son of God and Son of man.

*Blood forms in the fetus, both parents contributing; with only one human parent involved, normal human blood cannot result (Henniger, H. 1990. *20 Tremendous Truths*. Springfield, Mo. Baptist Bible Trib., p88).

*The Spirit's neuter gender in verse 7, due to His impersonal title, is rendered if He is portrayed as part of Jesus' person in a verse like 5:8 (a part of a personage is *it*, not *he*). Yet Spirit masculine gender is visible in 5:8, despite invisibility in 5:7. This shows how deliberate masculine gender treatment is, reflecting the image of sovereign persons of the Trinity in Jesus' person. It also shows Erasmus' text and the KJV recognize the Holy Spirit as a person, despite Greek neuter gender.

The *Spirit water and blood* that agree in one (in one person) refute the idea of a mere man adopted by eternal Christ, the divine blood proving this by the testimony of the divine Spirit. The Trinity of heaven verifies the divine earthly witness, the Spirit witness of the water and blood, totally nullifying adoptionism. Thus the Comma is authentic, being crucial to verse-8 meaning.

Manuscript history: A pure Traditional Text renewed in the Received Text

Adoptionists, who called Jesus a man inhabited by eternal Christ, were refuted by the Trinity's Comma witness. This irrefutable witness is easily removed without distorting syntax flow, so easily that scholars prefer gnostic tampering to biblical truth. Evidently gnostics were able to eliminate the Comma from the traditional text, but couldn't corrupt the overall text freely as they did the Alexandrian, and they couldn't corrupt the Comma in the Italic.

In view of great potential for manuscript tampering and copyist error, a logical reason for good general Traditional-Text condition is periodic providential renewal to widen access to truth, using chosen servants and the biblical-church text. Renewal is part of text history (e.g. God restored tables of the law broken by Moses [Ex.32:15, 34:1], and Jeremiah restored a God-given text burned by a king [Jer.36]). Restoration of corrupted New Testament manuscripts is expected, and the 10 later manuscripts with the Comma can signify pre-Erasmus renewals. The Comma is in margins of 4 of the 10, suggesting a step toward renewal by scribes knowing of its validity.

Now Comma presence in the Received Text and the 2nd-century Italic connects the Received Text to the Greek text underlying the Italic. Manuscripts of the Italic Greek text are closest in time to originals, just half a century or so from the Revelation autograph. Thus Comma presence in the Received Text is indicative of renewal, correction of a minor degree of error imposed on the Traditional Text over the centuries to restore it perfectly in final form as the Received Text of the KJV. Comma presence in the Italic (indirectly by the Vulgate) so close to the autographs authorizes Comma inclusion in the Received Text, overruling minor Traditional-Text support as attributable to error repeated many times by many copyists in a large unbiblical church. In the Comma and other likely renewal examples, the Received Text has the earliest known connection to the autographs. Other likely renewals supported by the Latin and having minority or scant Greek manuscript support are Jn.7:53-8:11, Acts 8:37, Eph.1:18, 3:9 and Col.1:14 (the latter tells of salvation by Jesus' blood). Also likely is the Rev.22:19 *book of life* having scant Greek manuscript support. Indeed the textual history of Ephesians 3:9 implies providential intervention, with text renewal halting corruption at a point in time; a faulty *administration* replaces the true *fellowship*, but the true *through Jesus Christ* is intact. This has been the state in the Traditional text for centuries, a snapshot of a partially-corrupt verse frozen in time, suggesting intervention halting corruption by satan's agents at this point. The halt would mark ordaining of the Received Text, in printed form difficult to corrupt, to renew the Traditional Text in perfect original form.

Conclusion: The Comma endured in the Italic of biblical churches true to God's Word in Middle-Ages persecution. God ensures full preservation of His Word for biblical churches in select texts, the Italic long ago, the Greek Received Text later and the KJV today, favoring them over altered Greek manuscripts endorsed by scholars who disdain the Comma and prefer gnostic tampering. The Received Text and the Comma were God's great restoration plan, following shortly after invention of movable-type printing that ended scribal tampering in hand-written manuscripts and shortly after Greek scholars brought their Traditional-Text manuscripts west at the fall of Constantinople. It appeared shortly before the Reformation that spread true Bibles in Europe at that time in history and provided the true text for today's biblical churches.

Latin biblical-church testimony authenticates the Comma, but the eastern Greek biblical church once held it too. Both churches dwelled in the shadows of large post-apostolic churches. The eastern is barely known in history, so Comma status in its text is unknown. The general eastern church early forsook reverence of scripture, losing God's guidance needed to retain the Comma. This happened through Jerome in the general western church, but only temporarily. Perhaps the Comma returned to the entire west one day since many kept to the Old Latin Bible, resisting Jerome's version for centuries. But in the biblical Latin church it was never lost and rose again to prominence in the Reformation, for it's an original bible truth, not a Vulgate carryover.

For all who love God's Word, the Comma endures, despite scholar error. It's vital to true believers in its unusual revelation of the sacred relationship of our Savior in the Trinity that guarantees success of His mission and scripture preservation. Comma preservation shows us true scripture can never die. This encourages total devotion to Christ's Word and service in all those loving the Word through terrible persecution, for they too can never die and will receive rewards beyond imagination (1 Cor.2:9). Comma retention in the KJV and the Received Text continues God's ancient plan, and all who prefer other versions reject a privilege providentially accorded to true bible-believers.

2. The woman taken in adultery: An "unauthentic" passage can't remain in God's Word for many centuries. Jn.7:53-8:11

Modern scholars disdain the passage on the woman taken in adultery. It's not in their favored manuscripts and lacks support by most others,⁸ and they reject passages with much more support. They say it should not be taught as scripture, and NIV translators boldly question its authenticity with a note in the text just above the passage saying, "The earliest and most reliable manuscripts and other ancient witnesses do not have John 7:53-8:11." But many early Latin and some Greek manuscripts (the earliest Greek are a few 5th-century ones), early scripture lessons and references of church elders verify the passage authenticity. Augustine said it's a true reading removed from many manuscripts of his day due to intolerance of forgiveness for one guilty of adultery.⁸

The passage endured in part of the church for many centuries, unlike the Alexandrian text, and how can that be if it's spurious? It's in the Old Latin Bible, indicating truth from the text of the bible-based church, and it looks like this text was once very much an object of censors. And how can such a lengthy passage be in some traditional text copies if it isn't genuine, removal from some being far easier, and thus much more likely, than invention and addition to others? And if it's just an invention of dishonest men, how can we account for its high doctrinal quality and full compatibility with other scripture?

Language/grammar considerations: Immediately preceding the account of the woman is a passage in chapter 7 about the chief priests and Pharisees questioning officers sent to the temple to arrest Christ and explaining why they did not. Christ isn't present here. This passage ends with John 7:53 where all parties leave, and the next morning we deal with the account of the woman taken in adultery. In 8:12 we deal with a discourse between the Lord and the Pharisees.

As bible-believing scholar John Burgon noted⁸ over 100 years ago, trying to eliminate the account of the woman and relate 7:52 directly to 8:12 produces linguistic nonsense. It would have the Pharisees speaking to the officers in a lengthy episode where the Lord isn't present, followed immediately in 8:12 by, *Then spake Jesus again unto them.* The result would be quite incomprehensible, as we see by examining the passage in detail. The so-called unauthentic passage in the KJV is set off, and a few of the preceding and following verses are given below.

7:45 *Then came the officers to the chief priests and Pharisees; and they said unto them, Why have ye not brought him?*
7:46 *The officers answered, Never man spake like this man.*
7:47 *Then answered them the Pharisees, Are ye also deceived?*
7:50 *Nicodemus saith unto them...*
7:51 *Doth our law judge any man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth?*
7:52 *They answered and said unto him, Art thou also of Galilee? Search and look: for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.*

7:53 *And every man went unto his own house.*
8:1 *Jesus went up unto the mount of Olives.*
8:2 *And early in the morning he came again into the temple, and all the people came unto him; and he...taught them.*
8:3 *And the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst,*
8:4 *They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery...*
8:5 *Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou?*
8:6 *This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not.*
8:7 *So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.*
8:8 *And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground.*
8:9 *And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last; and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing...*
8:10 *When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee?*
8:11 *She said, No man Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go and sin no more.*

8:12 *Then spake Jesus again unto them, saying, I am the light of the world...*
8:13 *The Pharisees therefore said unto him, Thou bearest record of thyself...*

Verse 8:12, which all consider to be genuine, says, *Then spake Jesus again unto them.* Where did He speak the first time to *them*? The only answer is the supposedly unauthentic passage on the woman where the Lord said to scribes and Pharisees, *He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.* Grammatical/syntactical considerations require the personal pronoun *them* to refer to someone recently noted in the immediate context (Pharisees and scribes of 8:9) if the pronoun is to have meaning. In the prior passage, the Lord isn't present to speak to anyone, and that passage relates to the previous day. Thus there's no one else anywhere in the near context to relate *them* to, and the supposedly unauthentic passage has the only possible answer to the question of the identity of *them*.

Indeed 8:12 logically follows the account of the woman. But the NIV 8:12 says "when Jesus spoke again to the people, he said I am the light of the world." This changes contextual sense, allowing verse 8:12 to stand alone, not needing the preceding account of the woman to make

sense. “When” introduces a new thought and removes the sense of an 8:11-to-8:12 sequence. And “the people” suggests 8:12 action involves a discourse with the people, not the Pharisees and scribes. The NIV eliminates the need for 8:12 to refer to the account of the woman accused by the scribes and Pharisees, as if the account could be considered not genuine. But this is incorrect paraphrasing, as seen by other modern versions with the same type Greek text used for the NIV. They render the passage with the same critical words that the KJV does.

NASV: 8:12 *Again* therefore Jesus spoke to them saying, *I am the light of the world...*

RSV: 8:12 *Again* Jesus spoke to them, saying, *I am the light of the world...*

Thus the contextual-sense change in the NIV only seems to make 8:12 stand apart from the account of the woman. The Lord addresses the same persons in 8:12 He addressed in the account of the woman (scribes & Pharisees), so 8:12 refers back to the account of the woman. This is so since we know *them* is the correct word in the Greek text, and *them* are scribes and Pharisees from the account of the woman, not the people in general. Their identity is evident since after the Lord speaks to *them* in 8:12, in 8:13 the Pharisees are the ones who answer Him in all versions, including the NIV. In suggesting the *them* the Lord speaks to in 8:12, is the people, the NIV mistranslates its Greek text with inaccurate paraphrasing. Even if we were to assume *them* did refer to the people so as to eliminate the so-called unauthentic account of the woman, there’s no place where the Lord spoke a first time to the people recently enough for *them* to refer to the people. In the fairly long 7:45-52 passage preceding the account of the woman, the Lord wasn’t present to speak to anyone, only officers, priests and Pharisees being present, and this event happened the previous day. The Lord's last discourse with the people prior to the account of the woman was the previous day in 7:39, much too distant for *them* to refer to the people. A pronoun can’t link to such a distant noun when there’s much intervening material. Thus, while we can’t accept the general error resulting from skipping the account of the woman and linking 8:12 to 7:52, we can’t accept the specific error of the NIV. The NIV “solution” serves only to justify the inaccurate text note on a supposed lack of authenticity of the passage. The account of the woman won’t go away, and that’s no surprise, for truth is uncooperative with opinion.

One might think use of "the people" is justified by verse 8:2 where Christ teaches the people before the woman arrives, but this verse is part of the passage that scholars would eliminate. Clearly, in 8:12 the Lord speaks to the scribes and Pharisees, and this logically follows His first comment to them in the authentic account of the woman.

Thus we see evidence of a genuine passage removed from the text in preferred manuscripts of scholars, the verses following this passage being those with which it logically connects. The same is true at the first verse of the disputed passage. Verse 7:53 of the so-called unauthentic passage fits exactly with the last verse of what scholars say is true scripture in 7:52. Verse 7:52 concludes the conversation between officers and the Jews, and verse 7:53 follows perfectly in that it tells us each man then went to his own home. Does the reader not see the hand of Providence here in that those who tampered with the text were made to do so in such a way that the evidence of their tampering would be obvious? Clearly the passage in dispute fits perfectly into surrounding text at both ends and is absent in preferred manuscripts of scholars because, as Augustine said long ago, it was removed. John Burgon pointed this out over a century ago but was mostly ignored. Can churches lose part of God’s Word if they’re determined to? Evidently so, forgiveness for adultery illustrated in the account of the woman being repealed for them by omission from their bible texts if they want it that way. And such folly that excludes knowledge

of forgiveness for a certain sin can be continued into our times by scholars who reestablish the texts of faulty ancient manuscripts.

History and logic considerations: Those in the early church disliking the passage felt Christ pardoned the woman too easily (as if one might question the judge of the world). Man classifies sin in categories of severity, but the smallest sin will send us to the same hell that adultery will if we are not forgiven. These early-church objectors erred, not realizing the woman experienced salvation in this encounter with Christ. Salvation by simple belief produces forgiveness of all sin and has always seemed to many as too easy a route to heaven. The woman received salvation since Christ said to her, *Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more*. One not condemned by the Lord Himself has forgiveness of sins and salvation. And the Lord wasn't condoning adultery here, but was imparting Christian morality to a newly saved person in telling her to *go, and sin no more*. We readily see salvation at work here when we realize this poor trapped woman would've been convinced that in a few moments cruel Pharisees and scribes with rocks in hand were about to crush her skull for a sin condemned without reservation by God's Word. She would see herself as about to die in her sin and descend into hell for fiery eternal punishment. It's easy to see that in her moment of dreadful heart-stopping anguish, her deliverance from destruction by Christ's wisdom taught her a lesson in morality that she never forgot and that she went away from that encounter a firm believer in the God of morality and forgiveness.

Legalists complain that the law of God demanding punishment for adultery was too easily set aside here by the Lord. But such people forget that the New Testament changed many things. Forgiveness replaced condemnation when a person truly repented of sin, and there's no question that the woman truly repented of her sin in this incident. Forgiveness upon repentance is the best news sinners could ever receive, and it is the whole basis for the good news of the Gospel.

Yet the law is holy and good, and the Lord didn't ignore it. He showed the elders the law was too holy for them since no man is righteous enough to qualify to stone anyone. He did this by challenging any who were without sin to throw the first stone. What He did in this passage was to accomplish a major aspect of His mission to fulfill the law. In fulfilling it, He overruled judgment rights by unholy man under holy law, and declared God as the only righteous judge, accepting upon Himself God's judgment of man for violation of the law. He introduced mercy as the ultimate basis of judgment, giving a second chance to sinners and empowering them for better things by which they might fulfill the spirit of the law. This was the basis for introducing the church and the New Testament era to fulfill the law in the ultimate degree.

In the Old Testament era, law enforcement and judgment were established through Israel's leaders to show sin as very serious in the sight of God. But the law was a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ (Gal.3:24), revealing defilement of sin that renders us helpless in anguish and defeat under the deadly consuming fire of holy law and man's imperfect judgment. In Christ we are victorious over condemnation by the law, despite our sin nature, because His power conferred in forgiveness of sin in salvation changes the sinful heart. In this we become able to fulfill the spirit of the law, the matter of crucial importance.

The crucial doctrine by which Christ gives us victory over condemnation of the law is introduced by illustration in the New Testament here in this passage scholars would trash! Here in the account of the woman condemnation by unholy man under the law is overruled by higher authority, showing God as the only righteous ultimate judge. Since God accepts Christ's sacrifice on our behalf, Christ pays for us the price of condemnation for our violations of the law, and we are not destroyed. Thus Christ now fulfills the law for us in accepting its judgment for us,

introducing mercy, while showing us how awful sin is and changing our view of it forever in the suffering of its penalty by the divine innocent one. To refuse this New Testament passage on the woman undermines the most important doctrine of the church, the vicarious atonement, and refusal is an attempt to restore condemnation by unholy man under the law!

And the passage itself shows us just how necessary and righteous it was for Christ to overrule the judgment of men, for we see here a perfect example of just how devious man can be in his supposed righteous judgment by the law. We see this as we dig deeper into the context, which shows us the Lord did not just ignore the law. There is much more to the passage than what the fault-finding scholar sees.

The scribes and Pharisees were always trying to discredit the Lord by trying to trap Him in His words in front of witnesses, and they are trying to do that here. Indeed that is what the passage itself says in John 8:6. It is plain that these evil men enticed and induced an unwise woman into this sin to use her to attack the authority of the Lord before many witnesses. He would not have served the justice of the law by giving in to the evil plan of these men who would sacrifice a hapless woman's life in order to attack Him.

To see this plan, we should ask how the scribes and Pharisees just happened to catch a woman in the act of adultery just when the Lord was teaching the people in the temple. And how did they happen to be close enough to the temple to get her to Him before He moved away from witnesses? And there are always two parties involved in adultery, and the law commands the man and woman to be stoned, so where is the guilty man? The scribes and Pharisees set a trap, picking a crony to lure an unwise woman into a trap to use her against the Lord. A likely way to do this would be to pre-select a needy poor woman and offer her much-needed money to submit (entrapment). They push the crony aside and accost the woman, calling the attention of witnesses to her. They plan to create a situation in which the Lord must condone stoning a woman just entrapped in sin or else ignore the law. If He condones the stoning, the crony speaks up and says he arranged the affair to prove Jesus was not from God, for if He were, He would've known the woman was just induced and entrapped (He did know and so didn't satisfy their demands). Thus the Lord would look very unlike the omniscient Messiah. Worse yet, if He condoned the stoning, they could go ahead and stone her (they had rocks in hand), and they could then destroy Christ's ministry by having the crony reveal the inducement and entrapment of the woman. They could also further ensure destruction of His ministry by saying He violated His own New Testament teaching since He taught that mercy had replaced condemnation in fulfillment of the law in the New Testament era (Mt.9:13, Lk.9:56). Thus He couldn't advocate stoning without denying His own teaching and reverting to Old Testament concepts of the Pharisees.

The Lord knew all this and would never condone stoning. To do so would be to condone the evil plan of scribes and Pharisees and would at the least destroy people's confidence in Him as the Messiah. And it could easily lead to the sacrifice of the life of a misled entrapped woman, while destroying His own teaching ministry. And He'd have trouble with Roman authorities who controlled capital punishment. But if He didn't condone the stoning, He'd be represented as ignoring the Mosaic law and thus out of God's will and not the Messiah promised by Moses (Deut.18:15). The plan seemed foolproof, but, the Lord with leisurely wisdom, totally destroyed that plan. In His sovereign plan He illustrated a vital New Testament doctrine by challenging any of them who was without sin to do the stoning. Of course each one was reminded of his own sin, and beginning with the oldest, who had accumulated the most sin, they began to drop their rocks and slink away sheepishly, showing that no one is qualified to stone others. As we find elsewhere in genuine scripture, the scribes and Pharisees are trying to trap Him in His words, and in this

passage of genuine scripture, as in others, the Lord uses wisdom against them, and they fall into their own trap. No, Christ didn't ignore the law; He took it to its highest fulfillment in the New Testament era, showing that only God is ultimately qualified to judge sinners. He refuses to honor misdeeds of outwardly-sanctimonious vile men who, with rocks in hand, would kill a misled entrapped woman just to make the Lord look bad, while they claimed to honor the law.

Such falsity isn't possible in an account introducing vital doctrine like the overruling of man's judgment rights to provide the basis for the vicarious atonement and deliverance from capricious condemnation by man as Christ fulfills the letter of the law for us to enable us to fulfill the spirit of the law. And here we see Christ's omniscience in knowing the plan of men misusing the law to sacrifice a life for selfish intent, and defeating this in New Testament fashion. Such a crucial passage can't be invented by dishonest men, and the issue is vital doctrine and Satan's corruption efforts. This caused removal of the passage from many manuscripts through unwise churchmen and continuance of this folly by scholars today. Those churchmen challenged God's sovereignty and would have Christ doing just what evil men wanted Him to do. But He doesn't relinquish His righteous sovereignty. And He ordains a true Greek text and true translators like KJV scholars to ensure that we retain all of His Word.

End Notes

1. Hills, E.F. 1984. *The King James Version Defended*. Christian Research Press. Des Moines, Iowa. p146.
2. White, J.R. 1995. *The King James Only Controversy*. Bethany. p156
3. Hills, Op. Cit. p193, 209.
4. White, Op. Cit. p60-62, 85-86
5. Clarke, A. *Clarke's Commentary*. N.Y. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. p931-33.
6. Bultmann, R. 1973. *The Johannine Epistles*. Philadelphia. Fortress Press. p81.
7. Hills, Op. Cit. p211, 12.
8. Hills, Op. Cit. p150-59.

The Inerrant Text Endowed: Scripture Teaches the Dictation Concept

We've seen consistent KJV accuracy in passages where accuracy is much contested by scholars, and many examples of this argue strongly for preservation of a totally accurate textual basis further preserved by totally accurate translation. All this is possible only if God chooses and guides certain copyists and translators over the centuries and only if He intervenes in text history to overcome human error and tampering by satan's agents.

But can autograph originals written by mere error-prone men be totally accurate? Plenary/verbal inspiration, is the concept of an inerrant-text origin in God, each word and idea deriving from the Holy Spirit. This is achieved only by mechanical dictation, the Spirit determining words in the human intellect to ensure inerrancy. Scholars reject the dictation concept due to text human writing style and supposed error. We've seen evidence that true scripture has no error, and human writing style is present in the text since, contrary to how scholars' define it, dictation doesn't invoke a trance suspending writer intellect.

Dictation takes various forms, and at times style is eliminated in verbatim oral dictation. Exodus 34:27 says, *And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant...* Indeed in various Exodus verses, God speaks the very words of the law recorded therein. In Exodus 34:1 God has Moses make two stone tables, saying, *I will write upon these tables...* which is equivalent to dictation, divine writing rather than divine speaking being provided for mechanical copying. And verbatim oral dictation to the prophets is seen in a passage like Jeremiah 30:1,2 that says, *The word that came to Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Thus speaketh the Lord God of Israel, saying, Write thee all the words that I have spoken unto thee in a book.*

Dictation by a vision introduces the writer to the realm of God and speaks to his eye and his ear, and even then scripture indicates a writer has full faculty possession. The prophet in Habakkuk 2:1-3 says, *I will...watch to see what he will say unto me, and what I shall answer... And the Lord answered me, (faculties intact) and said, Write the vision, (verbal dictation is required to write) and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it. For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak (dictation in the form of vision fulfillment) ...though it tarry, wait for it... (faculties intact).*

Habakkuk 2 indicates a vision invokes verbal dictation, as is the case in Revelation 1:10,11, 2:1. John says...*I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice... saying...What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches...* Here verbatim oral dictation to the ear accompanies inspiration to the eye, as in Revelation 2:1 where Christ in the vision tells John the words he is to write, saying *Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus write; These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand...* and Christ continues, speaking the exact words to be recorded. John's intellect isn't suspended, for he retains normal human responses to his vision. He hears a voice behind him, so his audio faculties are intact, and he falls at the feet of the glorified Savior (Rev.1:17), as proper for one with operative faculties in the presence of a representation of God. And he must observe the vision, so his visual faculties are intact and he must record words he hears, so all his intellectual faculties are intact.

Dr. Phil Stringer of Landmark Baptist College, FL notes scripture's most unique example of dictation, that involving Balaam's donkey. God spoke to the prophet through the animal, as seen in Numbers 22:28 that says, *And the Lord opened the mouth of the ass, and she said unto Balaam, What have I done unto thee, that thou hast smitten me these three times? Dictation power is so great that it extends even to dumb animals.*

Scripture indicates dictation doesn't suspend human intellect. Even Balaam's donkey, that had no possible intellectual input or speaking style, showed an appearance of this. The creature's words reflect her expected "feelings" over mistreatment by Balaam. She seems involved by "intellect and speaking style," an impossibility, indicating God preserved her "viewpoint." Thus we expect preservation of a human writer's viewpoint in dictation so that he exercises intellectual faculties and writing style. Of course human faculties must be guided by the Spirit in the inspiration process to ensure inerrancy.

Dictation applies to texts showing no evidence of it, for it can be so unique that a writer retains a grasp of his subject and normal writing style, while Holy Ghost supervision of his writing bypasses his awareness. Consider Luke 1:1,3 where Luke says...*It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write...* He seems to write at a whim from memory, but his motivation can be due to the moving of the Spirit, and his words can be dictated without changing writing style, word choices being supervised without his awareness.

Scripture reveals such dictation as God works His will on us in ways we're unaware of. Consider Jesus' mother Mary, *great with child* (Lk.2:5) as the birth neared in Nazareth ~75 miles from Bethlehem. If she or Joseph knew Micah 5:2 prophecy on a Bethlehem birth, in hardships of the final stage of pregnancy, she'd never want to make a difficult trip to Bethlehem. And Joseph would dread a donkey ride with hazards of labor pains, miscarriage or premature delivery in a deserted place on the way. God had to see to such details, but how would He get her to Bethlehem to fulfill prophecy? He'd stir the mind of Caesar Augustus, a pagan with no interest in Christianity, to see a need to finance the empire in ways better than resented harsh taxes (Lk.2:1-5). There likely was a fear of rebellion over taxes at this time (Acts 5:37 notes a tax rebellion when the Roman governor of Syria was Cyrenius,¹ who ruled a little earlier as Mary and Joseph went to Bethlehem - Lk.2:2). God would move Caesar to require empire residents to enroll for taxation at their cities of origin to establish each person's connection to family assets through local authorities (most likely the harsh old publican system with private contractors was altered, using locals to make it fair, but graft by locals like Zaccheus would continue). All would pay according to ability, richer ones paying their share, and the masses not being affected enough to incite rebellion. Caesar introduced a graduated income/property tax, likely congratulating himself on "his brilliant idea" (Thompson says the tax enrollment began with Augustus,² as is logical since it accords with his *Pax Romana*, a time of peace, prosperity and tax reform). All this served to get Mary and Joseph to Bethlehem, their city of origin as descendants of David. And the summons was timed too close to the birth to allow delivery of the Child before both had to go to Bethlehem. Thus God subtly dictated His will to a vast empire without anyone realizing it.

And in Psalm 22:18, David says, *They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture*, prophesying of the Son of David, God's Messiah at the Cross ~1000 years in the future. Roman soldiers fulfilled this prophecy, verifying Jesus as God's Messiah in Matthew 27:35 that says, *They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots*. How can idol-worshipping Roman soldiers, with no interest in Christianity, possibly do such a thing? Only if God dictates acts of heathen oblivious to Him. This was a free-will act, based on desire for a little property, yet it fulfilled God's will.

Now in Psalm 22:8 we switch from dictation of acts to dictation of words. Here David speaks words of enemies who persecute and taunt him, and he prophesies of Christ, saying, ***He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him: let him deliver him...*** David's persecutors speak the words of Jesus' persecutors at the Cross 1000 years later. In Matthew 27:43, priests, scribes and elders taunted Jesus saying, ***He trusted in God; let him deliver him.*** In exercising a free-will

malice, Jesus' worst enemies fulfilled David's prophecy on His behalf, verifying Him as Son of David, God's Messiah, the last thing in the world they would willingly do.* They couldn't have known this meaning of their words, or they'd never have spoken them. This is word dictation by-passing speaker awareness in free-will word choice, literal word meaning and irreverent speaking style. It's said they mocked Jesus with David's prophecy, but they revered David and would never identify themselves with those vilifying him. And they would never relate David's words to Jesus, lest they represent them as prophecy fulfilled by their own words to testify of Jesus as Messiah. Actually they wouldn't see the verse as prophecy useful for mockery since, in itself it contains nothing indicative of prophecy.

Now if the Holy Ghost worked in these men, dictation occurred against their will, using their intellect and speaking style with no appearance of dictation. But would He work in men just previously used by satan? In Matthew 27:42 they said of Jesus...*let him now come down from the Cross, and we will believe him*, which was an attempt of satan to eliminate our salvation. The only imaginable alternative to a role of the Spirit here is God placing just the right men with just the right free-will mentalities in just the right place to fulfill His will in just the right way at the Cross. With the prophecy made ~1000 years before the Cross, this would mean God controlled, genetically or logistically, millions of people in 40-50 generations for ~1000 years. And that would mean God can choose to supervise all details of natural processes and human affairs, connecting results of free-will decisions in a way that establishes His will. That's what Matthew 10:29,30 teaches, saying, *Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing (of little value)? And one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered.* One way or another, God can make evil men in control of their faculties and speaking style, speak His words, contrary to their will, and with no appearance of dictation.

Thus the Spirit can certainly dictate to obedient servants, using their intellect and writing style with no appearance of dictation, motivating free will and permitting or negating writer word choice. Looking at matters this way, we see Luke 1:1,3 very differently. Luke seems to write at a whim from memory. But the Holy Ghost moving on his mind explains Luke's *perfect understanding*, and a moving without his awareness explains why he'd say, *It seemed good to me...to write...* Luke writes a letter by free will according to his intellect and style. But Spirit motivation of free will, and editing of word choice can be God's way to dictate each word while

*Some suggest Psalm 22:8 should read as the imperative, *Commit yourself to the Lord; let Him deliver him* (NASV), not the perfect tense, *He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him*. But this suggestion, that negates Mt.27:43 fulfillment of the Psalm prophecy, links a 2nd person command (*Commit yourself*) to a 3rd person declaration (*let Him deliver him*) in one inclusive thought. This is impossible grammar/syntax, but scholars try to justify it, saying the clause after the imperative is an aside, with taunters talking to each other. Well, declarative clauses in different persons can link in poetic/prophetic Hebrew to vary perspective (e.g. Is.52:14, 61:7). But linking a command to a declaration in combination with a difference in person, all in one thought, is absurd. The proposed imperative is a separate thought requiring separation from the declarative by extra words not in the text.

Perfect tense is correct, as verified in the inerrant New Testament and in the Septuagint. Ps.22:8 relates to Mt.27:43 where priests, elders and scribes address the people but aim their talk at Jesus to taunt Him, not wanting to address Him directly. This is clear in the Mt.27 context, the indirect taunting of these men being distinguished from a direct taunting of others (27:40,44). With no Hebrew verb form for indirect address, an imperative is used in the brief Ps.22:7,8 context to indicate words aimed at David as the men speak to others, paralleling the indirect address to Christ. Thus a perfect-tense rendering is correct, and the imperative is rendered only in a true direct address (e.g. Ps.37:5, Pr.16:3).

preserving human style. The same thing would apply to other scripture letters, the epistles of Christ's disciples. 2 Peter 1:20,21 suggests such inspiration, saying, *the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*

Psalms 22:1-18 shows such dictation as David, in very human writing style, tells of his trials by persecutors. His words are both his and those of Jesus on the Cross in verse 1, then only his in verse 2. This shows that Christ pre-incarnate is dictating David's words from the outset, even in verse 2. At verse 7 David begins a progressive transition from his words on his trials to words of Jesus on the Cross, ending in speaking entirely of Jesus in piercing of His hands and feet and casting lots for His clothing. The transition is like parting of a curtain to prove the pre-incarnate Christ dictated all David's words from the outset. David couldn't have any knowledge, by human faculties, of words in the mind of Jesus as He was on the Cross 1000 years in the future.

Psalms 69 shows similar dictation as David beseeches God over his reproach and persecution, implying such matters of the Son of David on the Cross, most notably in verse 9. In verse 21 he speaks Jesus' words on His reproach and persecution, noting vinegar and gall offered to Him at the Cross (Mt.27:34). Transition from David's words on himself to those of Jesus on the Cross again reveals Christ dictating David's words.

Zechariah 11:12,13 prophecy on betrayal of Jesus for 30 pieces of silver, is 3-way dictation. It says, *And I said unto them, If ye think good, give me my price...So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. And the LORD said unto me, Cast it unto the potter...And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord.* The speaker saying *my price* can only be Christ pre-incarnate speaking by (dictating to) Zechariah. Judas betrayed Jesus for money in a free-will act. He was not a man inclined to right-thinking, but is moved in his mind (dictated to) by Christ to do the right thing, to return the blood money to the priests and elders, and he casts it down in the temple in disgust that he's sold his soul for money. And the priests and elders who caused the Crucifixion, normally covetous men who can avoid unlawful placing of the money in the temple treasury without giving it away (giving it to a crony for a future favor), decide to use it for a potter's field to bury strangers, being moved in their minds (dictated to) by Christ to do the right thing. Christ figuratively cast the silver to the potter, casting it down in the house of the Lord by dictating thoughts of Judas and priests and elders.

End Notes

1. The King James Bible Commentary. 1999. Nashville. Thomas Nelson. p1343.
2. Thompson, J.A. 1962. The Bible and Archaeology. Gr. Rapids. Eerdmans. p375.