

Seven Infallible Proofs of the King James Bible's Inspiration

Part 1

- **It's Alive!**

“The Word of God, Which Liveth and Abideth Forever” 1 Peter 1:23

Part 2

- **Linguistic Proof**

“the Spirit speaketh expressly...” (1 Tim. 4:1)
‘God’s Spirit’ more correct than ‘God-breathed’

Part 3

- **Historical Opposition**

Calvinist B.B. Warfield first to move locus of inspiration to lost originals

Part 4

- **Scriptural Proof**

What does “All scripture is given by inspiration of God” mean?

Part 5

- **Historical Proof**

Wycliffe and Coverdale say English Bible is Holy Ghost authored

Part 6

- **More Scriptural Proof**

Part 7

- **Christians Must Have Scripture; All Such Is Given By Inspiration**

Part 1 “Liveth and Abideth For Ever”

Your Holy Bible is alive — handle with care!

“...not of corruptible seed, but of **incorruptible**, by the **word** of God, which, **liveth** and abideth **for ever**” (1 Pet. 1:23).

“The **words** that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are **life**” (John 6:63).

“...who received the **lively** oracles to give unto us” (Acts 7:38).

“For the **word** of God is **quick...**” [The Bible contrasts the “quick and the dead” 2 Tim. 4:1].

“Liveth,” But Where?

If the word of God liveth and abideth forever, where is it? The actual ‘originals’ have not been the recipient of the promise of preservation, as they have long since dissolved. As has been demonstrated in the previous chapters, all currently printed Greek and Hebrew editions contain the idiosyncratic ideas of their individual editors. The answer to the question, ‘Where is this living word of God’ lies in God’s promise given in Isaiah 28 and fulfilled in Acts 2.

“With men of **other tongues** and other lips will **I speak...**saith the Lord” (1 Cor. 14:21).

In this verse God says, “I speak” “**other tongues.**” Notice that the words “other tongues” are plural. Vernacular Bibles are God speaking, just as truly as he did to the Greeks and Hebrews. His living, speaking voice has not diminished as he

speaks with “other tongues.” He is still speaking. Today’s Holy Bibles, be they English or Korean, are *not* just preserved museum words or accurate but lifeless equivalencies. They are his very “spirit” and “life.” Jesus says, “The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life” (John 6:63). They contain just as much of the spirit and life of God as did the originals. The word of God which “**liveth** and **abideth forever**” was inspired, is inspired and will be inspired, forever. In the King James Bible, we hold in our hands the very “**word** of God, which **liveth** and **abideth for ever**” (1 Pet. 1:23). “[L]iveth” and “abideth” define inspiration and preservation. Inspiration abides and its life is preserved.

The inherent “spirit” and “life” of scripture are what enables it to bring forth the **spiritual** new birth. Only living things can reproduce themselves. 1 Peter 1:23 says, “Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which **liveth** and **abideth forever**.” It “liveth,” just as Jesus said; his words “are...life.” We can hide the scripture in our hearts (Ps. 119:11); we can handle it (2 Cor. 4:2); it is nigh us, even in our mouth (Rom. 10:8). And finally, we will be judged by it (John 12:48). Its life is “incorruptible.” It is alive. The Holy Bible is actually God speaking now.

Toad’s lungs are living breathing things. Why would God continue to make them perfectly, to breathe out only a croak of toad’s breath, and not make vernacular Bibles, which speak his very words, just as alive? Or did the Bible croak? New versions are buried when their copyright owner dies, since they are no longer propelled by the hot air of advertising campaigns.

The King James Bible remains alive; its English words are drawn from what Wycliffe calls the inspired “Scriptures in tongues,” which were born in Acts 2. The KJB is the Biblical

English through which God can speak to the two billion people who speak English as a first or second language. They are *his* English words. Remember, *he* invented languages at the tower of Babel; he also said, “I speak” “other tongues.”

Earlier he spoke a Biblical form of Koine Greek to many in the first centuries after Christ. The book of Revelation records the warning Christ gave to the Greek-speaking church: He said that their candlestick (that is, their church which holds forth the light of the word of God) would be removed if they did not repent. The unorthodox character of the Greek Orthodox church since the 5th century exhibits its continued rebellion. This is evidenced in their Greek manuscripts, which remove such things as 1 John 5:7 and Acts 8:37, which reproves their heresy of infant baptism. Therefore their candlestick was removed. By 600 A.D this form of ancient Greek was replaced by Modern Greek. No one today speaks Biblical Koine Greek. We have a living God who speaks to living people. God now speaks through pure vernacular Holy Bibles which sprung from the intervention of the Holy Ghost recorded in Acts 2, as foretold in Isa. 28:11, 13, and 14. The chapter “The Wobbly Unorthodox Greek Orthodox Crutch” details the questionable character of Greek manuscripts. The chapter “The Scriptures to All Nations” demonstrates the work of the Holy Ghost in providing scriptures for “every nation under heaven,” as described in Acts.

(The word ‘inspired’ is derived from the verse, “All scripture is given by inspiration of God...” Grammatically, the Bible *can* be called ‘inspired.’ Consider this grammatically identical parallel: ‘All pure water is produced by the distillation of Jones Bottled Water Company.’ This water is therefore called ‘distilled water,’ just as the Bible is called ‘inspired scripture.’ As a word of personal testimony I might add that before I was saved I was determined to read the *entire* university library. But when I finally read the King James Bible in my late twenties, I knew it was not a book written by man. I got saved and have never gotten over the *difference* between it and other books. It is alive. Later as a professor, the Lord knew I would witness to students, so he spread me thin, teaching 17 *different* college courses, including upper division courses in over six *different* and highly divergent majors, several in which I had no academic experience. This necessitated *much* more reading. After sixty years in a world of books, I can say that the King James Bible stands *so far* above the books of even the best and brightest men, one could never attribute it to the brilliance of the translators.)

Part 2**“Now the Spirit Speaketh Expressly...” (1 Tim. 4:1)**

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God” (2 Tim. 3:16).

What does “given by inspiration” mean? What is “All scripture”? These questions hopefully will be resolved for the reader in this section. I will begin with a discussion of the Greek text, only because that is where this discussion usually, and I might add, somewhat incorrectly begins. My analysis will be Biblical and will not come from the standard corrupt secularized lexicons and critical editions (such as Strong, Vine, Zodhiates, Moulton, Milligan, Thayer, Wuest, Trench, Vincent, Liddell, Scott, Persbacher, Gesenius, Brown, Driver, Briggs, Scrivener, Berry, Beza, Westcott, Hort, Aland, Metzger, Green, and Ginsburg — all are proven unreliable in various degrees in this book and *New Age Bible Versions*).

The Greek word “**theopneustos**” is translated “is given by inspiration of God.” The first part of the word is *theo* which means “God.” The second part, from *pneuma*, is almost always translated as “spirit” (**322** times; 91 times as ‘Ghost’ or ghost; once as ‘wind,’ once as ‘**life**,’ and **never** as ‘breath’ or ‘breathed’ (J.B. Smith, *Greek-English Concordance*, Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1983). Given the vast preponderance of the translation of this Greek word into English as “spirit,” it is logically translated with the English “spir,” as seen in the word “**inspiration**.” The use of the word “spir,” meaning “spirit,” lines up perfectly with John 6:63, where Jesus defines his words. He said,

“[T]he **words** that **I speak** unto you, they are **spirit**, and they are **life**.”

In other words, the word of God is not just ink on paper, like other books; its words are “spirit.” Since the spirit of God is alive, his words are also alive. Consequently John 6:63 concludes that the word of God is “life.”

(It would only be marginally correct to say that *theopneustos* is connected directly with the breath of God (i.e. Acts 9:1 *ēmpnēō* “breathing out”), since there are *different* Greek words used for ‘breathed,’ such as that used in John 20:22 from the root *phusaō* and that used in Acts 17:25 (*pnoe*’). The latter is translated **once** as “breath” and once as “wind” in Acts 2:2. The spelling of *theopneustos* (i.e. from the noun *pneuma*) precludes it being from the verb *pneo*, as Phil Pins suggests, in his effort to separate it from the noun ‘spirit’ and join it to the verb ‘breathe.’ The current repetition of the definition of “*theopneustos*” as “divinely breathed” comes directly from liberals such as James Strong and Harold K. Moulton. It is rooted in their penchant for **secularizing** Bible words.)

Breath is tangible; the spirit is not tangible. Those who are afraid to call the KJB “inspired” are wrongly focusing on the *physical* character of Strong’s or Moulton’s erring definition, “breathe”; they know that God did close the canon and stopped the physical sign gifts. But God’s “Spirit” is still striving with man, comforting man, and leading man into all truth. God never said the Spirit would not *translate* the canon; he did provide for this in Acts 2 when “every man heard them speak in his own language” from “every nation under heaven.” Although the Greek word *pneuma* can be seen in secular English as ‘pneumonia’ and ‘pneumatic,’ both relating to air, its Biblical usage is *exclusively* as ‘spirit,’ never as ‘breathe.’ Even Hodge, as noted in Augustus Strong’s *Systematic Theology* on p. 198 admitted that ‘spirit’ is the correct correlative.

Not surprisingly, corrupt new bible versions, such as the NIV, replace “inspiration” with the *secular* word “breathed,” thereby erasing the root ‘spir’ and its connection to the Spirit of

God. The Calvinist produced *English Standard Version* (ESV) similarly says “breathed out” (yet the word “out” also appears in no Greek texts).

Secular Dictionaries and the Word “inspiration”

Remember:

1. Dictionaries are written by fallible men.
2. Dictionaries contain numerous definitions, which apply to distinct contexts; these definitions are not interchangeable to other contexts.

(To understand that the varied definitions of a word *cannot* be intermixed, look at the dictionary definition of the word “save.” *Webster’s New College Dictionary* shows that its varied meanings include:

- “To copy (data) from a computer’s main memory to a storage medium so that it can be used again,”
- “To accumulate money or goods,” “to prevent an opponent from scoring or winning, esp. in hockey,”
- “A game in which a relief pitcher preserves a victory by protecting a team’s lead,”
- “To prevent waste,”
- “To treat with care in order to avoid fatigue, wear or damage,” and
- “To put aside for future use.”

The definition “To deliver from sin,” which is the theological definition, is also listed. If one used any of the other definitions of the word ‘saved,’ to describe what Jesus Christ did for us, they would be wrong.)

As one might expect, dictionaries, made by unregenerate men, often give very weak or strictly secular definitions of “inspiration.” After giving several secular definitions of ‘inspiration’ (including “breathing”), which do not apply to theological contexts, the *Webster’s New World Dictionary* says that in theological contexts, (“Theo.”) ‘inspiration’ means “a **divine influence** upon human beings, as that resulting in the writing of the Scriptures.” The Webster’s II gives six different usages, of which only one includes “breathing”; only one of the six applies to the Bible. That one says to “arouse by the **divine influence**.” The word “divine” is a quality, a descriptive adjective; it is not “God,” who is a person. The term “influence” implies a minor involvement, not an all-encompassing one. Even their theological definition is watered-down.

Other more expanded dictionaries give a long list of definitions based upon context. These can be misused by those who apply the wrong definition to the wrong context. The Webster’s 1828 Dictionary gives three separate definitions of “inspiration”; the first two definitions are secular and the third definition is theological. The first two include inhaling and breathing; they are distinct from the third usage and definition which says, “The **infusion** of ideas into the mind by the Holy **Spirit**...All Scripture is given by inspiration of God 1 Tim. iii.” According to this, inspiration is the work of God’s Spirit, not God’s breath.

The twenty volume unabridged *Oxford English Dictionary* also actually uses 2 Tim. 3:16 as a sample of the strictly theological usage of the word ‘inspiration’. Those who do not know how to use the OED or Webster’s 1828 grasp *any part* of their lengthy entries on “inspiration”; this cannot be done. The OED, for example, divides all words into their *various* usages

by Roman numerals (i.e. I, II, III, IV et al.). Under each usage is given *examples* of the word in historical contexts which elicit that particular definition. The word 'inspiration' is divided into two categories (i.e. I, II). The first usage (I) is "Literal (physical)." It includes as "rare" the action of blowing. It includes, as much more common, the action of "breathing in." No scriptures are used as an example.

The second usage (II) is the "Figurative senses." It too is divided into two headings. The first includes, "The action of inspiring; the fact or condition of being inspired." The verse in question falls under this category. The first of these is theological ("a. spec. Theo., etc"). The very verse in question, "2 Tim. iii. 16," is cited from Tyndale's New Testament as the perfect example of the theological usage of the word "inspiration." (The definition of Bible words comes from the Bible itself!) It defines the usage in 2 Tim. 3:16 as,

"A special immediate action or **influence** of the **Spirit of God**...upon the human mind or soul; said esp. of that divine influence under which the books of **Scripture** are held to have been written"

Under this category another example includes a A.D. 1450-1530 citation which says, "He sente the holy goste on **Penthecoste** sondaye to **enspyracyon** of hys dyscyples." (He sent the Holy Ghost on Pentecost Sunday to inspiration of his disciples.) Interesting, this old quotation connects the word "inspiration" with Acts 2, as suggested in this chapter.

The second subcategory under "Figurative senses" includes secular usages, which are defined as "a breathing or infusion into the mind or soul."

According to the plan of the OED and other dictionaries, a word used in the very *example* for *one* kind of usage could never be defined by the definition of *another* kind of usage. Since the OED, like Webster's, selects 2 Tim. 3:16 itself to give the definition of "inspiration," and defines it as the "influence of the Spirit of God," then one could not use the OED or Webster's to support the definition "breathed" for that very context (see OED, s.v. inspiration, vol. 7, p. 1036). Understanding how to use, not misuse, a dictionary is a most basic skill. Highly refined tools, such as the OED, should not be used by novices to promote their agenda.

A word's context is the determiner of usage and meaning. That is why the OED's definition ("influence of the **Spirit of God**,") is taken directly from the words of 2 Tim. 3:16 ("inspiration of **God**"). A dictionary's definition of Bible words came originally from the Bible itself; therefore there is no reason to consult a secular dictionary to define Bible words. This can best be seen by viewing the unabridged OED. To take another context, particularly a secular one, to define the word 'inspiration' as "breathed," is the agenda of someone who either knows nothing about lexicography or has an agenda to secularize the Bible (e.g. Strong, Moulton, Trench et al.).

One must understand the origin, history, and purpose of the OED and other dictionaries, as demonstrated in works such as, *Lost For Words*, a history of the OED by Oxford professor Lynda Mugglestone. The founder of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, R.C. Trench, was rabidly against the Holy Bible and its all pervading influence and sociological control. He wanted the dictionary to show that words were being used in society in ways which differed from the historical Bible usage. He wrote two entire books *against* the KJB: *On the Authorized*

Version of the New Testament, in connection with some recent proposals for its Revision (New York, 1858) and *Synonyms of the New Testament* (Cambridge, 1854). In these books he set the stage for the watered-down liberal definitions seen in today's new versions. On the title page of one of these books, he placed the same serpent logo used by Luciferian H.P. Blavatsky. Because of his hatred for the KJB, he was asked to be a member of the Westcott-Hort *Revised Version* Committee. He merits an entire chapter in this book for his vile re-definition of Bible words. As one might expect, *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary's* definition of 'inspiration' also drops the name "God" for the adjective "Divine." It charges that the inspiration of the Scriptures "are believed by **some**" only. Instead of citing the Bible, it sites Trench's friend and Ghostly Guild founder, "B.F. Westcott" writing what the "early Fathers" believed, instead of what the scripture states. (Other chapters in this book detail the heresies of these ancient Catholic "Fathers.")

The OED editors, which followed Trench, also believed that they were *not* compiling prescriptive 'definitions,' but descriptive *samples* of how a word has been used in different contexts (secular, not always Bible-based contexts). The OED will allow the inclusion of the Biblical definition of words, but merely sets it in the midst of numerous other usages. To take one of its secular definitions and apply it to re-define the Bible's historic usage is to fall squarely into the clutching hands of R.C. Trench, whose official portrait shows him donning the 'X' medallion of the Masonic Grand Scottish Knights of St. Andrew.

God demands no knowledge of Greek or the methodology of lexicographers. The definition of "inspiration" is "plain to him that understandeth" (Prov. 8:9). The word "inspiration" is

a compound word. Even a child can see the definition within the word ‘in-spir-ation.’ Any English-speaker has been pre-conditioned to know the meaning of the phonemes “in” and “spir,” through their previous usage in the Bible and elsewhere. The brain stores words in files in alphabetical order. The ‘spir’ file will take the mind directly to the word “spirit.” It is called cognitive scaffolding. (*In Awe of Thy Word* explains this in great detail.) The suffix ‘ation’ changes a verb into a noun of action (e.g. visit-ation, vex-ation). Therefore ‘in-spir-ation’ conveys the active (because the subject, ‘scripture,’ is passive) sense of the **Spirit** acting **in** the scriptures.

Men have always known that it is by God’s Spirit, not his breath, that the succession of the scripture “is given.” Oliver Cromwell in his 1653 *Speech the First* said,

“The true Succession is through the **Spirit** given in its measure. The **Spirit is given** for that use, ‘To make proper Speakers-forth of God’s eternal Truth;” (Cromwell used the 1638 KJB, not the Geneva.).

King James I said in his 1599 treatise, *Basilikon Doron*,

“The whole scripture is dited [dictated] by God’s **Spirit**, thereby (as by **lively** word) to instruct and rule the whole Church militant, **till the end of the world.**”

Finally, the Bible itself makes it clear that the ever-abiding Spirit of God, not the one-time breath of God, gives life unto the scriptures:

“It is the **spirit** that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the **words** that I speak unto you, they **are spirit.**...” (John 6:63).

Some will call the Bible, the 'word of God' (ignoring what those three words mean), but they will not admit that the Bible's words are still spirit (**inspiration**). But the Bible is "the sword of **the Spirit**, which is the word of **God**" (Eph. 6:17). The Bible is written, "**not** in the words which **man**'s wisdom teacheth, but which the **Holy Ghost** teacheth, comparing **spiritual** things with **spiritual**" (1 Cor. 2:13).

This verse makes it clear that the fleshly minds of the King James translators, or any other translators, cannot profit in the giving of the Holy Bible, without the indwelling direction of the Spirit of God. This is inspiration. Psalm 12:6, 7 says,

"The **words of the Lord** are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. **Thou** shalt keep them, O LORD, **thou** shalt preserve **them** from this generation for ever."

The words which the LORD keeps and preserves are still *his words*; they do not degrade into the words of mere translators, even after being "being tried in a furnace of earth." These verses contravene those who wrongly say that God inspired the originals, but the translators preserve them "for ever." Only the Spirit can convey his own words; otherwise they would not be the "words of the LORD," but would become the words of a translator. Because the Spirit gives the words, they are never just ink on paper, but are themselves 'spirit.' Hence, the word "in-**spir**-ation" is a perfect description of the way in which the quickening Spirit gives words which "are spirit." The Bible says of God's word, "they are spirit, and they are life." The qualities 'spirit' and 'life' cannot be separated. Words which are no longer 'spirit,' cannot be said to have "life" and therefore will not "liveth and abideth forever."

The word 'preserve' inherently requires an object of preservation. *Something* must be preserved. There is no preservation without an object of preservation. If I said, "The blue suit is preserved," the suit would still be blue; it would still be a suit. A preserved entity retains *all of the qualities* of the original.

To wrongly substitute God's 'breath' for God's 'spirit' is to:

- 1.) ignore the pertinent scriptural parallels of the word 'spirit.'
- 2.) ignore the component definitional phonemes in the word 'in-spir-ation.
- 3.) ignore the preponderant translation of the word *pneuma* as 'spirit,' and never as 'breath.' (Pneumatology is the study of the Holy Spirit.)
- 4.) follow the definition of liberals, such a H. K. Moulton (and his father, the corrupt lexicographer and his grandfather, a member of the RV committee) and Bible reviser, James Strong, whose agenda was to replace the Spirit-filled KJB with his own ASV hot air. These men could only support their 'beloved' new versions by maintaining that the Spirit of God had *not* been involved in the previous pure English Bible's translation, but merely had spoken aloud, with his breath, in the distant past, constraining himself to three dead languages. (Modern Greek and Hebrew are not ancient Biblical Greek and Hebrew).
- 5.) And finally, to wrongly substitute God's 'breath' for God's 'Spirit' is to disavow the abiding inspiration of God's words. This resigns inspiration to an act of past history and makes today's Holy Bibles the mere words of men, having no authority or claim to inerrancy, because they are not the words of God.

“Is Given”

If the scripture “is given by inspiration,” then the ‘inspired originals-only theory’ collapses. The old B.B. Warfield theory that only the original scripture *was given by inspiration* mandates the changing of the word “is given” to “was given” or “is being given until the canon closes.” The construction does not allow for these. The italicized word “is,” used in all Bible versions, good and bad, is demanded in Greek and English construction. The past tense word “was” is not even an option.

(Invariably, those who deny the inspiration of the Holy Bible, use past tense words, such as “were given” in their explanations. For example, *The Miracle of Inspiration* wrongly parallels 2 Tim. 3:16’s present tense “is given” with the past tense “was once delivered” from Jude 1:3, doing violence to the latter’s parallel past tense verse in Jude 17, which identifies and limits verse three to “the words which **were spoken before** of the apostles...” (e.g. Paul, Peter, and other apostles, not Jude, Mark, Luke etc.) (H.D. Williams, *The Miracle of Biblical Inspiration: A Refutation of Perfection of Translation...*, Bible For Today, 2009, pp. 104, 113, 10, 18, 27, 67, 68, 104 et al.). Phil Pins wrongly says “...to say “**is** given” is the verb phrase seems incorrect.” His switch from the KJB’s “is given” to “once given,” is wrongly based upon the idea that the Greek word “given,” *which does not appear in any Greek text*, might be an “aorist Greek participle.” To this imaginary Greek word, he adds the Jehovah Witness/ASV reading, wherein the solitary word “is” is placed *later* in the sentence (i.e. “All scripture once given by inspiration of God is...” (Phil Pins’s unpublished *Elementary Greek Workbook*, c. April, 2009 draft; *Emphatic Diaglott*, Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society, NY, 1942). It unhappily appears that both Pins and Williams may have become contaminated by their association with the NIV’s progenitor, Moody Bible Institute. The “enemy” may “prevail against” a man of “great strength” and “faith,” such as Samson, Pins, and Williams, when he wanders into enemy territory where Delilah’s dictionaries “pressed him daily with her words” (Judges 16, Hebrews 11).

The KJB construction reads, “is given by inspiration of God and is profitable...” For those who insist on an analysis of Greek, observe that in Greek the sentence has no predicate (verb). It has, however two Greek words, which are translated “is given by inspiration of God” and “profitable.” In such a case, when these two words are connected by the conjunction “and,” they must both be preceded by the present tense verb “is.”

Of Phil Pins's suggested JW reading, even Strong's *Cyclopedia* warns that, "this rendering is liable to insuperable objections" as "both" must include a verb [i.e. "is"] "if either of them" does. It says that a reading such as Pins's "is at variance with a common rule of Greek syntax, which requires...if there be an ellipsis of the substantive verb this verb must be supplied ...Now there exists precisely such an ellipsis [omission] in the case before us; and as there is nothing in the context which would lead to any exception to the rule, we are bound to yield to its force." "[T]he evidence in favor of the common rendering, derived from the fathers, and almost all the versions, is most decided." The *Cyclopedia* associates Pins's reading with the critic Semler and those who would suggest that "inspiration belongs to a part of scripture" only (McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, vol. 4, pp. 612-613).

In plainer words, the verb "is" must be inserted with "given" and "profitable"; it cannot be "was," nor "is being," nor can the word "is" be used only once. Therefore, according to Greek grammar rules, inspired scripture "is." (It is not merely settled in heaven, as scripture is described as "profitable" to man). Having taught English to Greek speaking adults, I can attest to the fact that the usage of "is given," in both English and Greek, is a "continuing action," to use the words of Polly Powell, a former instructor of English at Clemson University (phone conversation). In English, "is given" is a present tense verb; it is not time sensitive. In this context "is given" cannot be bound to the time of the writing of the Bible. It is an irregular verb and its passive voice indicates that the scripture receives the action of the 'spirit' (spir) of God. The liberals of the 1800s, and yet today, try vigorously to view the Bible as an historic, not a living document. That approach, applied to this context, is non-grammatical.

The following examples of the usage of the phrase “is given,” seen elsewhere in the Bible, demonstrate that it might not describe an historical event (e.g. ‘once given’), but often refers to a continuing phenomenon or a perpetual promise.

Job 37:10 “By the breath of God frost **is given**.” Frost is given by God yet today.

Ezek. 33:24 “the land **is given** us for an inheritance.” God’s gift of the land to Abraham and his descendents is perpetual.

Mark 6:2 “what wisdom is this which **is given** unto us.” God is still giving wisdom daily to those who ask.

Rom. 5:5 “the Holy Ghost which **is given** unto us.” He is still given to those who receive Jesus Christ as their Saviour.

Rom. 12:6 “the grace that **is given** to us.” Grace is given to believers daily.

1 Cor. 1:4 “the grace of God which **is given** you by Jesus Christ.”

1 Cor. 11:15 “her hair **is given** her for a covering.” Hair is replaced daily. To those who would say that “is given” in 2 Tim. 3:16 refers to the one-time inspiration of the Bible and that Bibles are no longer “given by inspiration,” one must ask, ‘Are all women now bald?’ No, because hair “is given” repeatedly as it falls out. God even keeps track of the number of our hairs; how much more would he attend to *his* very words?

Eph. 4:7 “But unto everyone of us **is given** grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ.”

Phil. 1:29 “for unto you **is given** in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake.” If you live godly in Christ Jesus, you will suffer persecution yet today.

According to these verses the Christian “is given” “grace,” “wisdom,” “the Holy Ghost,” and even a continual supply of “covering” hair. It would be unscriptural, given the context in 2 Tim. 3:16, to say that “is given” refers only to the *then current* giving of the canon of scriptures. Just as in the aforementioned verses, this context, demands that a perpetual, continual aspect be applied. The very end of the sentence in 2 Tim. 3:16 says,

“All scripture **is given** by inspiration of God, **and** is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: **That** the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”

Just as the aforementioned verses show that the phrase “is given” is used in verses which must apply to *all* Christians, historic and present, 2 Tim. 3:16 too must apply to all Christians, not just those who lived when the scriptures were first given. We need God’s life giving inspired scriptures more than we need lost hairs replaced.

Only scripture “given by inspiration” is “profitable.” It “is given by inspiration of God” for a purpose. That purpose is “**That**” the Christian can profit. Inspiration is absolutely necessary for true “doctrine” and “instruction.” Unless the Holy Bible is the very words of God himself, it cannot be an *infallible* guide to doctrine.

Ecclesiastes 12:11 is an interesting parallel. It says,

“The preacher sought out to find out **acceptable words**: and that which was written was upright, even **words of truth**. The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of

assemblies, which **are given from one shepherd**. And further, by these, my son, be admonished..."

The **words** of truth, that is, the Holy Bible, "**are given**" from our good **Shepherd**, the Spirit of truth, who promises to "guide" us "into all truth" (John 16:13). The translators or the "masters of assemblies" merely fasten them down to paper.

Part 3

Warfield Moves the Inspiration Bull's Eye

Jesus Christ is the *target* of hatred by this world. His living Spirit-inspired words, which give his express will on this earth,

are the *bull's eye*. Christians who stand with Christ's word at the very bull's eye will not only suffer persecution, but they will also be subject to a *constant* barrage of attack. The word of God brings the same reproach he bore. His word is the only vestige on earth of Jesus Christ, other than the Holy Ghost and the testimony of born again Christians. Many move slightly off center to avoid the unremitting assault of questioning scribes and mocking bystanders. Those edging away from the bull's eye are still 'for Jesus,' but the desire not to appear "foolish" finds puffed egos seeking ways and means to avoid the "shame" that comes from saying that you have a book in which God actually talks to man (Acts 5:41, Heb. 12:2).

The living "powerful" quality of the King James Bible incites sinful men to "mock" and "question" it, just as they did Jesus Christ, the living Word, when he was on earth (Mark 10:34; Matt. 22:15, Mark 8:11, et al.). (The thought seems to

be — ‘Point a finger at it, before it points one back.’) The apostles scurried away when Jesus was tried and crucified. When the KJB is likewise tried with accusing questions, even some of the best men scurry under the cover of a Greek text, some lexicon, or the elusive ‘originals.’ (The answer to every KJB question has been given in eight books: my five books and the three written by Maynard, Bouw, and Moorman, all offered by A.V. Publications 1-800-435-4535.)

Calvinists such as Carl Barth (1886-1968) and B.B. Warfield (1851-1921), although defending a semblance of traditional Christianity against German rationalism, were among the first to erect imaginary castles to house the word of God, *outside of* the tangible ‘Holy Bible.’ Jesus is the “Word” (capital ‘W’ John 1:1); the scriptures are the “word” (small ‘w’). Carl Barth (and Heinrich Brunner), the fathers of neo-orthodoxy, wrongly claimed that the ‘word’ of God did not actually exist on earth. To them the Bible was merely a fallible man-made book, speaking of Christ, the Word. Therefore Barth began capitalizing the letter ‘W’ when he referred to the ‘word.’ This was just one of many weak ‘Christian’ accommodations to the 19th century skeptics’ claims that the Holy Bible could not stand up under their “science falsely so-called.” (Today too many copy his liberal capitalization of the letter ‘W’ when referring to the ‘word,’ not knowing the unscriptural character of such a switch.)

Pastors say, “Open your Bibles to....” Sunday School teachers say, “I hope you all brought your Bibles.” There are those, however who say that the ‘Bible is inspired,’ but actually *mean* that only the originals or some Greek text is inspired. They are practicing Semler’s deceptive theory of accommodation. They are trying to give the impression of orthodoxy to their listeners or readers. When I use the term ‘Holy Bible’ or ‘Bible’ I mean what every church-going person

means and exactly what the dictionary calls the “Bible”— “the sacred **book** of Christianity including the Old and the New Testament.” A ‘book’ is defined by Webster as “a set of written or printed pages fastened on an end and enclosed between protective covers.” This describes precisely the Holy Bible Christians read and have in their homes. A ‘book’ is nowhere identified as ‘dissolved animal skins or parchments which have been written on’; neither is a ‘Bible’ thought of by *anyone* as a rare and unreadable Greek text. No living person identifies a ‘Bible’ as any of these things, except perhaps those ‘clergy’ who, like Humpty Dumpty say, “When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean.” When children and politicians, like Clinton, do this, it is called lying. The new definition and usage of the word ‘Bible,’ as the lost originals or conflicting Greek and Hebrew manuscripts or editions, is a neologism, that is, “a new meaning for an already established word” (Webster’s II New College Dictionary).

The Unabridged 20-volume *Oxford English Dictionary* defines “**Bible**” as, “The **Scriptures** of the Old and New Testament.” As such, the verse “All scripture is given by inspiration of God” would mean that the “Bible” “is given by inspiration of God.” One merely needs to see the OED to determine that the **Bible is scripture** and according to the Bible “All scripture is given by inspiration.”

B.B. Warfield was one of the first American theologians to declare war on the Holy Bible’s inspiration. In the 1800s this American Presbyterian theologian found himself too close to the bull’s eye, the Holy Bible. He unwisely positioned himself under a constant barrage of attack when, in 1876, he went to study for a year in Leipzig, Germany under the higher critics, who denied that God had given man the Bible. Warfield brought

to Germany a letter of introduction by Philip Schaff, ASV Chairman and organizer, with the Luciferians, of the Parliament of World Religions. Warfield's questionable associations and dead Calvinism left him no match for the twisted German assault on the Bible. There he readily absorbed the 18th century rationalism of German and other 'Enlightenment' philosophers, which exalt human reason and rule out revelation as a source of knowledge (e.g. Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibniz). Compounding this, he was exposed to the modernism of Schleiermacher, Hume, and Kant, which flatly deny any miraculous intervention by God. These philosophers all redirected their 'faith' from faith in the Holy Bible to a faith in man. Such dark naturalistic philosophies have cast a lingering shadow over the *miraculous* nature of the Holy Bible in the minds of even seminary graduates.

Warfield sought to merge what he learned in Germany with his previous conservatism. On one hand Warfield wrote against the rank unbelief of Briggs, the German higher critic (and author with Brown and Driver of the corrupt English edition of Gesenius' *Hebrew Lexicon*, unwisely used today; see chapters on Gesenius, Brown, Driver, and Briggs). However, Warfield could not defend the Bible in hand. He did not have a strong enough background in manuscript evidence or a humble enough faith in the scriptures to counter the barrage of textual variants and 'problems' thrust at him in the German classroom. He invented a plan whereby he could retain the creed, that stated that 'the Bible' was inspired. He redefined the word 'Bible' for seminary students. **He moved the locus of inspiration from the Holy Bible to the lost originals.** This "biblical paradigm shift" by B.B. Warfield contravenes every previous belief and church confession (e.g. Turretin c. 1687, Westminster, 1646, London Baptist, 1677 et al.). Warfield could still defend the

inspiration of 'the Bible' with vigor, and he did, but he *now* stated that this inspiration related only to the originals. He was the spokesman for his compromising contemporaries at Princeton who felt that only the originals "were" inspired. A.A. Hodge, son of textual critic Charles Hodge, who himself had studied two years in Germany, had planted the seed in Warfield's mind; Warfield's fellow associates **first** put this new heresy in print at the Niagara conference in 1878. Princeton was the first place in history to harbor this particular shift from an inspired Holy Bible in hand to inspired originals, long gone. Warfield used the Westcott and Hort RV; his "heresies" in other areas (Ecumenical Calvinism) reveal that he was not "approved" according to 1 Cor. 11:19. Hence his view of inspiration should be rejected.

In order to divest themselves of a living book that contains the words of the Spirit of God, today's liberals have adopted his distinction between the so-called 'originals' and the word of God extant today in vernacular Holy Bibles. His 'original' idea about the originals has "crept in unaware" into Bible school textbooks and doctrinal statements. It provides a comfortable respite for those who, as Jesus said, are "ashamed of me and my words," when questions arise (Mark 8:38).

Commenting on Warfield's departure from the historic faith is Dr. James Sightler, a medical doctor and son of Dr. Harold Sightler, the famous and now deceased pastor from Greenville, S.C.. Dr. Sightler took the pulse of the King James Bible and determined that it was alive. His booklet *Lively Oracles* is his dissertation on the inspiration of the KJB. In his earlier classic, *A Testimony Founded Forever*, Dr. James Sightler writes,

“It has been stated by Sandeen that the **Princeton** Theologians Archibald Alexander Hodge and Benjamin Breckinridge **Warfield**, in 1881, were the **first to claim inspiration for the original autographs only** and to exchange the doctrine of providential preservation for restoration of the text by critics. This **shift** was accompanied by a change from reliance on internal verification of the scripture by the **witness of the Spirit** and the structural integrity of the **entire Bible** to reliance on external evidences. Actually it was Warfield’s teacher and predecessor at Princeton, Charles Hodge, father of A.A. Hodge, who was the first to take up naturalistic text criticism and abandon the doctrine of providential preservation. It should also be remembered that the Niagara Creed of 1878, adopted at the Niagara Conference on Prophecy, which was dominated by a coalition of **Princeton graduates** and followers of J.N. Darby, may well have been the **first document** to claim inspiration for every word of scripture “provided such word is found in the **original manuscripts**”” (emphasis mine; See Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1970, pp. 103-131 as cited by James Sightler, *A Testimony Founded Forever*, Greenville, SC: Sightler Publications, 2001, pp. 31, 32 et al.; Sightler’s book gives an entire chapter which documents Warfield’s heretical shift. John Asquith has written a book entitled *Further Thoughts on the Word of God: Defending the Inspiration of the AV 1611*, which I also recommend.)

Dr. Gary La More of Canada wrote an entire paper detailing Warfield’s cowardly retreat,

“Having been encouraged by A.A. Hodge to defend the Princeton view of verbal inspiration against an attack by the critical theories of Charles A. Briggs, Warfield found himself on the horns of a dilemma... Warfield’s solution was to **shift his doctrine of inerrancy to include only the original autographa**; no longer holding to the belief in the inerrancy of the Bible of the Reformers, the Traditional Text. Thus he moved that **if the locus of providence were now centered** in restoration via “Enlightenment” textual criticism, rather than preservation of the traditional texts, then **we need not concern ourselves with the criticisms lodged at the text of Scripture presently (and historically!) used in the Church**” (Gary La More, *B.B. Warfield and His Followers*, Scarborough, Ontario, Canada: Grace Missionary Baptist Church, 2007, pp. 27-28).

Warfield accommodated the Bible to modern scientific rationalism, empiricism, and naturalism. Like doubting Thomas, Warfield must see it, not just believe it. Many were drawn to his naturalistic idea because they did not know how to defend their Bibles from the barrage of questions arising out of Germany. As La More observed, Warfield’s accommodation is a comfortable resort today for those who cannot answer questions about why the KJB reads as it does and do not want to appear “foolish.” It is frightening to think that a non-soul-winning German-trained Calvinist is dictating from the grave his originals-only theory of inspiration to those who disavow many of his other beliefs and practices. Warfield’s inspired ‘originals only’ still stains many churches’ ‘Statement of Faith.’ The churches who have such statements think that their creed is orthodox and have no

knowledge of its heterodox origin. They do not realize that it was merely an accommodation to the infidels in Germany who found imaginary faults in the Bible.

Warfield's invention has darkened the sense and spread a faltering faith to even good Christians such as John Burgon, Edward Hills, and their modern day proponents, some of whom have covered and acquiesced to alleged spots or conceivable future updates or improvements to the KJB. These men have become rationalists, naturalists and modernists *in practice* by exalting man's role in the transmission of the Bible and denying the miraculous intervention of God. The Bible says, "**Thou** shalt preserve them..." It is *his* work. What shall he preserve? He shall preserve *his words* — not replace them with men's words. Unwittingly, they have in a sense adopted the neo-orthodox position that the Bible (that we have) only contains God's message (but accurately translated by men into English).

To them Bibles are no longer God's own English words. Remember, he said "I speak" "other tongues." Practically speaking they have adopted the same view as those who create and use modern versions, who say that the Bible was inspired only in the originals and consequently they are free to reconstitute it themselves according to rationalistic methods. There is not a lot of difference (in presumption, not text) between *men* making NIVs and *men* making the 'updated' KJV Easy-Reader or KJV Evidence Bible (Ray Comfort). Is the Holy Bible God's words or man's? There is no middle ground. The title even says 'Holy' Bible. Since when can unholy men make a wholly holy book? (Chapters 8, 9, and 10 of *In Awe of Thy Word* show the mathematically miraculous nature of the KJB which could not have been instilled by man.)

Another author observes,

“Throughout the twentieth century, a view of inspiration gained ascendancy among evangelicals and many fundamentalists that marked a **departure** from that which was **previously** confessed by believers since New Testament days...Recent scholarship has shown that men like Princeton professor Benjamin Warfield (1851-1921) were not as committed to the Biblical doctrine of verbal inspiration as we are sometimes led to believe. Thinking to answer rationalist theologians on their own ground and legitimize textual studies, these men began to suggest that only the autographs (originals) were inspired; apographs (copies) were not. For this reason many of the Statements of Faith issued by various bodies now speak of the Scriptures being inspired ‘as originally given’ whereas before this time the conviction was that inspired Scripture was preserved in the copies. **All this took place almost unnoticed**, but we are being asked to swallow a real whopper! The apostle Paul is right, “Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools” (Romans 1:22).

What this means is that as the originals have long since turned to dust, no inspired text exists today...Warfield’s book on biblical inspiration is still hailed as a ‘classic,’ but his viewpoint has done more to undermine confidence in Scripture than almost any other in the last 150 years or so” (David W. Norris, *The Big Picture*, pp. 295-296 as cited in La More, pp. 20-21).

Warfield fought higher criticism, but adopted lower criticism, which is the rationalistic belief that the inspired originals had been lost for a millennium and a half and could be reconstructed by Westcott, Hort, and Schaff on the RV and ASV committees. Warfield said Westcott and Hort “furnish us for the first time with a really scientific method” which “will meet with speedy universal acceptance” (as cited in La More, note 13 pp. 17, 27 et al.; also see Mark A. Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism*, 2nd ed., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1991).

In 1886 Warfield wrote the first book in America promoting textual criticism (*Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*). Calhoun's history of Princeton says, "His positive attitude toward textual criticism influenced many to appreciate the science and to value the new translations of the Bible [RV and ASV]..." (David Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, Vol. 2, "The Majestic Testimony 1869-1929," pp. 113-115). Schaff invited Warfield to contribute his Hortian views on manuscript genealogy to his heretical *Companion to the Greek Testament and English Version*. Sightler says, "Westcott, Hort, Schaff, and Warfield...all knew that Griesbach openly denied the Deity of Christ, and yet they followed his methods in preference to those of Frederick Nolan, who was a believer. They reasoned in circular fashion that the best readings were in codices B and Aleph, therefore B and Aleph gave the best textual evidence [Vaticanus and Sinaiticus]" (Sightler, p. 31).

Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield should have followed in his maternal grandfather and namesake's footsteps. Robert Breckinridge was a lawyer and Presbyterian minister who single-handedly stopped the wavering American Bible Society from printing their own revised version of the KJB thirty years before the RV. This version was edited and corrupted by men including John McClintock (of McClintock and (James) Strong's *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*). This version omitted such important doctrines as, "God was manifest in the flesh" (Sightler, p. 35).

Each generation must remember that—

"With the ancient is wisdom; and in length of days understanding" (Job 12:12).

“...ask for the **old paths**, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein” (Jer. 6:16).

The Holy Bible has always been recognized as the locus of inspiration, that is, until the Egyptian locusts saw its fruitful boughs and swarmed to consume it.

Part 4

“All scripture”

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God” (2 Tim. 3:16). Just what does the phrase “is given by inspiration” include? What is “All scripture”? Why does God begin the sentence with the word “All”? Linguists call this ‘fronting,’ whereby the author places the most important point in the front of the sentence. “All” modifies and describes “scripture.” The definition of ‘All’ will be included in the Bible’s definition of ‘scripture.’ Does ‘All’ mean ‘the originals from Genesis to Revelation’? Or does ‘all’ include copies and vernacular editions also? The Bible’s usage of the word “scripture” will answer that question.

God purposely placed the *sole* verse on the inspiration of scripture in a context identifying the inspired “scripture” as what a grandmother and a mother (2 Tim. 1:5) had taught to a child. God placed inspired scriptures within the easy grasp of a child. Why? Jesus said, “...thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes” (Matt. 11:25). In the context and verse immediately preceding 2 Tim. 3:16 Paul said to Timothy, “and that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures...All scripture is given by inspiration

of God...” In this immediate context the “scripture” is something that Timothy knew as a child. Timothy did not know what the originals said; he had only heard what the copies said. Therefore copies, even thousands of years after the originals, are a part of “All scripture” and are therefore “given by inspiration of God.” We read about the copies in Deut. 17:18 which state, “he shall write him a **copy** of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites” (also see Josh. 8:32). Proverbs 25:1 says, “These are also proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah king of Judah **copied** out.”

Its “life” “is given” as it is transferred on to other media. Its life “is given” over and over again, and it never diminishes. It is “the voice of the **living** God speaking...” (Deut. 5:26).

Not just the immediate context of 2 Tim. 3:16, but every usage of the word “scripture[s]” in the New Testament refers to copies or translations, not the originals. Therefore the word “scripture” cannot refer to the originals alone. The eunuch read “scriptures”; the Bereans searched “scriptures”; Apollos was “mighty in the scriptures.” None of these people had any ‘originals.’ What is included in “All scripture is given by inspiration of God”? Note the following:

- In Acts 17:11 we read that the Bereans “searched the **scriptures** daily.” They did not search the originals.
- In Acts 18:28 Apollos was, “shewing by the **scriptures** that Jesus was the Christ.” He did not have originals.
- In Matt. 21:42 Jesus asked them, “Did ye never read in the **scriptures**.” They did not have the originals to read.

- In Matt. 22:29 Jesus told them, “Ye do err, not knowing the **scriptures.**” If the scriptures were only the inaccessible originals, why would he chide them for not knowing the scriptures? (See also Mark 12:24.)
- In Luke 24:45 “opened he their understanding, that they might understand the **scriptures.**” What point would there be in understanding something that neither they, nor anyone else had.
- In John 5:39 Jesus told them to “Search the **scriptures...**” How could they if the scriptures were only the originals?
- In Acts 17:2 “Paul...reasoned with them out of the **scriptures.**” He did not have the Old Testament originals.
- In Mark 12:10 Jesus asked, “have ye not read this **scripture...**” Why would he ask them, if only the originals were scripture and they did not have them?
- John 2:22 says that “they believed the **scripture.**” Who would believe something they had never seen?
- Rom. 15:4 says that “**we** through patience and comfort of the **scriptures** might have hope.” Did only those who actually saw the originals have this promise?
- 2 Peter 3:16 warns that some would “wrest, as they do also the other **scriptures.**” Did they break into the Corinthian church at midnight, find their original letter from Paul, steal it and change it? Or did they read copies or vernacular editions and “wrest” them?

If “All scripture is given by inspiration of God,” then all of the “scripture,” noted in the aforementioned verses, is inspired. We must conclude that the Bible uses the terms “scripture” and “scriptures” to describe something *other than* just the originals. Therefore the term “All scripture” *cannot* refer to only the

originals, 'from Genesis to Revelation.' It must include copies of the originals, as well as vernacular versions, as the following section will prove. Therefore the verse — "All scripture is given by inspiration of God" — is stating that the originals, the copies, and the vernacular translations are "given by inspiration of God." When God's Holy Bible does not match man's seminary textbook, the latter is wrong.

"All Scripture...to All Nations"

Romans 16:26 refers to "the **scriptures** of the prophets...made **known to all nations**." One cannot *know* something that is in another language. What he does know is referred to as "scriptures," "All" of which are "given by inspiration of God" according to 2 Tim. 3:16. Many say that a Greek *translation* of the Hebrew Old Testament was used by Timothy, who knew the "**scriptures**" and whose father was a Greek. "Apollos, born at Alexandria," and "mighty in the **scriptures**" may also have had a Greek translation of the Old Testament (Acts 18:24-28). (Theirs was certainly not the Vaticanus sold today as the Septuagint, nor would Jews in Israel, including Jesus, have used a Greek Bible.)

Other usages of the word "scripture" might also include vernacular copies. Of the Ethiopian eunuch it says, "The place of the **scripture** which he read..." (Acts 8:32). *The Cambridge History of the Bible* speaks of the Ethiopians, who were originally converted to Judaism after the Queen of Sheba met with Solomon (1 Kings 10:1-13; for details see chapter on Ginsburg's Hebrew text). To this day they still have their ancient Ethiopic version of the Old and New Testament. The eunuch may have been reading out of this Ethiopic Old Testament. Philip no doubt had the gift of tongues and "began

at the same **scripture**, and preached unto him Jesus.” Acts says that the eunuch had “scripture” and 2 Tim. 3:16 says that “All scripture” is “given by inspiration.” Therefore vernacular editions are “given by inspiration.” It “is given” over and over again by the Spirit of God. If man can make a computer program that can translate a document in a split second, could not God’s Spirit do better?

Word of God = Scriptures

The **scriptures** are the written words of God. The Bible equates “scriptures” with the word of God.

“the **word of God** came, and the **scripture** cannot be broken...” (John 10:35).

“And ye have not his **word** abiding in you...search the **scriptures**” (John 5:38, 39).

“...they received the **word** with all readiness of mind, and searched the **scriptures**...” (Acts 17:11).

The phrase “the word of God” summarizes and re-iterates the fact that the Holy Bible is still God’s words, not man’s words (i.e. not the words of the KJB translators, etc.). Some have tried to re-define the few simple words — “the word of God.” In any other usage the phrase ‘the word of John’ means that they are John’s words, not someone else’s. The Bible reiterates:

“when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it **not as the word of men**, but as it is in truth, the word of God...” (1 Thes. 2:13).

The phrase “the word of God” says it all, if we will only cease re-defining it as the meaningless expression, ‘*wordofGod.*’

“Samaria had received the word of God” (Acts 8:14). The Samaritan villagers spoke Samaritan; only a moderate number of those who lived in the cities spoke Greek. Therefore the word of God was given in their vernacular language. (For details, see chapter “The Wobbly Greek...” and “The Scriptures to All Nations”).

The vernacular versions continue to be God’s living spirit communicating to each reader through his own culture, using Biblical language. For example, in the Greek Bible in the book of Acts the heathen were described as worshipping the *Greek* goddess *Artemis*. In the English Bible, she is called ‘Diana’ because that is the name by which she was known to “all Asia and the world” (Acts 19:27). Any witch today in America, France or Germany identifies Diana as her goddess, not the strictly Greek national goddess Artemis.

What is Biblical language? The word ‘holpen,’ for example, is God’s Biblical English word for ‘helped.’ The word was historically used only in the Bible. The word ‘help’ is much more archaic (800 A.D.) than ‘holpen.’ (See the unabridged *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. holpen, s.v. help; See *In Awe of Thy Word* for many more examples).

The Holy Ghost himself could have given *any* gift at Pentecost. The ability to fly would have greatly benefited Paul and the disciples, allowing for quick and safe journeys. Yet he gave the gift of the word of God in the vernacular. Men from “every nation under heaven” heard men speak in their own language (Acts 2). The vernacular word of God would be the vehicle by which they would “go into all the world and preach

the gospel.” Holy Ghost-given languages, other than Greek, were *the power* that the disciples needed and for which they had to wait (Acts 1:8, Heb. 4:12). They were not learned languages and dictionary equivalencies, but words given by the Spirit (inspiration) of God. My book, *In Awe of Thy Word*, traces the words from the Gothic language (extant at Pentecost) which are readable and now found in the King James Bible. The English Bible, as are other Germanic Bibles, is also derived from other Acts 2 languages, such as Latin, Greek, Hebrew and others, just as the Romance language Bibles, such as the Spanish, French, and Italian, came from the Latin, given in Acts 2.

Part 5

Wycliffe & Coverdale Say God Was English Bible's Author

Miles Coverdale was the editor of one of the early English Bibles; the words of the Coverdale Bible are still seen in today's KJB, particularly in the Old Testament. He was intimately involved in the process of the Bible's being “given” (2 Tim. 3:16) and “purified” (Psa. 12:6, 7) in English. He said the English Bible is authored directly by the Holy Ghost. To those who say God did not directly author the English Bible, Coverdale said,

“No, **the Holy Ghost** is as much the **author** of it in Hebrew, Greek, French, Dutch, and **English**, as in Latin” (*In Awe*, p. 846).

Coverdale said in the preface of his Bible that—

“...the **scriptures**...leaveth no poor man unhelped...And why? because it **is given by the inspiration of God**” (*In Awe*, p. 847).

He knew that the poor men who read only English Bibles had the “scriptures” “given by the inspiration of God.” God is not a respecter of persons.

Coverdale was echoing the beliefs of his predecessor, John Wycliffe, who had penned one of the early English Bibles and who believed that the word “scripture” referred to the English as well as other vernacular Bibles. Wycliffe was accused of **heresy** for believing that the English Bible was actually Holy Ghost-given scriptures. He said,

“The clergy cry aloud that it is **heresy** to speak of the Holy **Scriptures** in **English**, and so they would condemn the Holy Ghost, who gave **tongues** to the Apostles of Christ to speak the **word of God in all languages** under heaven. (For these and more such quotes see G.A. Riplinger, *In Awe of Thy Word*, e.g. pp. 846, 847, 757, 758).

“You say it is **heresy** to speak of the Holy **Scriptures** in **English**. You call me a heretic because I have translated the Bible into the common tongue of the people. Do you know whom you blaspheme? Did not the Holy Ghost give the word of God at first in the mother-**tongue** of the **nations** to whom it was **addressed**? Why do you speak against the Holy Ghost? (*In Awe*, p. 758 et al).

Wycliffe said that the word of God was addressed to Romans (Latin), Hebrews (Hebrew) and others besides Greeks. Remember, there were three languages on the cross.

God entrusted Wycliffe and Coverdale with the transmission of the text. He would not trust it to those whose views he did not share. I am a Wycliffite in this regard and so is every one sitting in the pews. It is erring 'clergy' who want to place themselves between man and the Spirit of God. Wycliffe continued his theme of "Scriptures in tongues" in his book *Wycket*, saying,

“...such a charge is condemnation of the Holy Ghost, who first gave **the Scriptures in tongues** to the Apostles of Christ, to speak that **word in all languages that were under heaven**” (*In Awe*, p. 758).

Wycliffe would be burned at the stake in today's colleges for believing in the Dictation Theory of the originals. He said,

“Holy Scripture is the unique word of God and our authors are only God's scribes or heralds charged with the duty of inscribing the law he has **dictated** to them...[H]e himself had **dictated** it within the hearts of the humble scribes, stirring them to follow that form of writing and description which he had chosen...and **not** because it was **their own word**... (*In Awe*, p. 759).

When God said he would “preserve” **his** words “for ever,” what was he preserving (Ps. 12:6, 7)? The inspired word which is “forever settled in heaven” includes, by his will and foreknowledge, the vernacular Holy Bibles, by which each man will be judged on the last day.

Part 6

Word of God Glorified & the Disciples Multiplied

What does the Bible teach that will be the result of an increased focus on the word of God? It gives a very simple formula:

Acts 6:7 says, “And the **word of God increased**; and the **number of the disciples multiplied** in Jerusalem.”

Notice that the increased use of the true word of God resulted in an increased number of converts. The seed planted resulted in fruit (Luke 8:11). Souls were born again, “not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God...” Even corrupt new versions mix their leaven with the real scriptures. New versions always plagiarize the living words of the KJB. I collated the original NASB and found that most of the sentences in much of their book of Romans were taken directly from the KJB. Even the word “Jesus” is a KJB word.

Though some will be saved by using the living KJB words under new version covers, Paul thought it was important to warn people about “many which corrupt the word of God” (2 Cor. 2:17). Warning soldiers of the location of land mines is not a diversionary tactic. Tearfully Paul warned night and day of those who spoke “perverse things.”

“For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, **speaking perverse things**, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and

remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to **warn** every one **night and day** with tears” (Acts 20:29-31).

Such “perverse things” pock the pages of new versions. Warning about the “perverse” places in new versions is a part of Paul’s charge to, “be ye followers of me” (1 Cor. 4:16). The only person such warnings will harm is the devil. The new versions have created such deep craters in the Bible that Ryrie says in his *Basic Theology* that if he had to have Bible “proof” texts, “I could never teach the doctrines of the Trinity or the Deity of Christ or the Deity of the Holy Spirit...” (Chicago: Moody, 1999, pp. 89, 90.). His NIV and NASB omit these vital doctrines as documented in *New Age Bible Versions*.

What was the final bottom line for Paul?

2 Thes. 3:1, 2 “**Finally**, brethren, pray for us, that the **word of the Lord** may have free course, and be **glorified**...for all men have not **faith**...”

Unbelievers and new converts must hear the word “glorified” (2 Thes. 3:1). Certainly God’s living and life-giving words must be free from deadly doubting comments. This is not accomplished when someone says, “That word in Greek *actually* means...” The listener will naturally conclude, ‘I do not have what God *actually* said...’ When the word is not “glorified” it is difficult for unbelievers and new Christians to have “faith” in it.

It is critical in these days of multiplied versions that we sometimes say ‘King James Bible,’ not just ‘Bible.’ Given the fact that he has magnified his word above his “name” and above “all blessing and praise,” the King James Bible can hardly be

“glorified” too much. It alone is the vehicle to communicate the gospel to nearly two billion of the world’s six billion souls.

High ground: We know it is a blessing and praise when someone gets saved.

“...there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth” (Luke 15:10).

Higher ground: But “exalted above” salvation is God’s **name**,

“blessed be thy glorious name, which is **exalted above all blessing and praise**” (Neh. 9:5).

Highest ground: His word is magnified above his name,

“thou hast magnified thy **word above all thy name**” (Ps. 138:2).

The Challenge vs. The Textbooks

Finally, I have a challenge for Bible teachers who do not believe that the KJB “is given” by the Spirit, even while it was being “purified,” and even as it is read today. The Bible says that we are to “set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church” (1 Cor. 6:4). Poll the people in the pews asking, “Please stand up if you believe the Bible in your hands is inspired.” Now count the standing people in front of the pulpit and compare that to the number of people behind the pulpit. Case closed. Even Bible critic and ASV chairman Philip Schaff confessed that —

“...to the great mass of English readers King James’s Version is virtually **the inspired** Word

of God...”(Philip Schaff, *A Companion to the Greek New Testament and the English Version*, 4th ed. rev. NY: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1903, p. 413).

The church members have gotten the impression that the Bible is inspired *from their Bibles*. Could the *whole* body of Christ have gotten such a wrong impression from the Bible? One could write an entire book citing the Bible passages which give this impression. Page after page of the Bible says that it is the word of God. Only theology textbooks could re-define those three simple words. Verses such as 1 Peter 1:25 are characteristic in their personal address:

“But the word of the Lord **endureth** for ever.
And **this** is the word which by the gospel is
preached unto **you**.”

Those who believe the Bible is inspired have only read the Bible. Those who do *not* believe this have read **textbooks** *in addition to the Bible*. Therefore, one can logically conclude that the ideas introduced by Barth and Warfield, under pressure from the higher critics, have now become traditions which tarnish the textbooks and “make the word of God of none effect.” These textbooks are not written by fundamentalists. They already have a textbook — the Bible — and are busy telling others about Jesus Christ. When a Christian college feels a need to teach Systematic Theology or Biblical Introduction, the faculty will use the best textbook they can find. Even the best of them echoes Warfield’s **disjunction** of inspiration and preservation. This disjunction of inspiration and preservation is nowhere given in the scriptures, as it is delineated in textbooks. God said, he would preserve “them.” (Psa. 12:6, 7). What is “them”? What is preserved but the very inspired words of God?

(See *Answers Minton 1 and 2*, available from A.V. Publications, for a discussion of the Hebrew in that verse.)

The problem lies in the fact that the liberal does not know HOW scripture “is given” and “purified” and this *bothers* him. He did not see it and will not believe. The naturalistic empiricism adopted by higher critics and the neo-Orthodox demanded, as did their counterparts in the natural sciences (e.g. evolution), **evidence of linear causation**. God left no such signs of how and where he did his work. He merely said he would “do wonders” to preserve his word (Josh. 3:5-4:7). Today there is no physical proof that the waters of the Jordan opened to allow the passage of the ark containing the word of God, yet we have those words today. Likewise, God has not marked the mileposts along the path of his intervention, yet we have the word of God today.

“As thou knowest not what is the way of the spirit...” (Eccl. 11:5).

If a book was in the library in the morning and was in my office in the evening, could you prove that I did not carry it there? If I said that I did, would you believe me? Why will some not believe that God said, “I speak” “other tongues” to carry the word forward so that it is “nigh unto thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it” (Deut. 30:14)? “[H]ow is it that ye have no faith?” (Mark 4:40).

“[B]lessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed” (John 20:29).

Textbooks further muddy the waters, giving non-scriptural definitions and terms. Many textbook formulas are abstracted from liberal and Calvinist Augustus Strong’s *Systematic*

Theology. He was a higher critic and evolutionist. His discussion of inspiration is echoed in today's textbooks by Herbert Lockyer, Charles Ryrie and all others. (Calvinists spend their time writing theology books, instead of evangelizing. Their prolific views then become integrated into textbooks used by non-Calvinists). Such textbooks contain mounds of pure *speculation* about inspiration. For example, they include the word "illumination," a word which occurs nowhere in the Bible in that form at all (and only once as "illuminated" in Heb. 10:32, where it refers to persons being "illuminated"; the scriptures are not a part of that context.) One verse is hardly a cause to elevate 'illumination' to a doctrine. In fact their textbook definition of "illumination" matches one of the Bible's definitions of "inspiration." Job 32:8 says,

"The **inspiration** of the Almighty **giveth** them understanding."

According to the Bible 'inspiration,' not 'illumination,' gives understanding. That may not be the view of those who have been *reprogrammed* by textbooks, but that is what the Bible *says*. It is interesting that the word 'giveth' [present] and 'is given' [present] are used in the only two verses using the word "inspiration."

All textbook discussions of inspiration and preservation neglect the important concept of "interpretation," which means 'translation' in every usage in the New Testament. In fact, even the Bishops' Bible, which was used before the KJB said, "Emmanuel, which being **translated**, is God with us" (Matt. 1:23). The meaning of "interpretation" effects the understanding of the verse which says that "scripture" is not "of any private interpretation" (2 Peter 1:20). The word "interpretation" is

covered thoroughly in the chapter “Very Wary of George Ricker Berry” which also discusses his questionable *Interlinear Greek-English* New Testament.

Too many are seeing the Bible through the dark lens of groping blind men. The classroom has become a handholding séance with the heretics of generations past, all of whom are somewhat unknown entities to most teachers and certainly to all students. Has the college think-tank become the skeptic tank? The Bible says, “not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual” (1 Cor. 2:13). A humble man of God and a Bible are all that is needed to “commit thou to faithful men” (2 Tim. 2:2).

No textbooks define “scripture” which “**is** given by inspiration” by citing the Bible’s usage of the word “scripture.” Ryrie’s textbook on *Basic Theology* is typical of the double-talk and unscriptural character of textbooks. He says,

“...inspiration can only be predicated of the **original** writings...God breathed it; men wrote it; **we possess it**” (Ryrie, p. 82).

If only the originals were, in his words, “God breathed,” we don’t have “it.” In one sentence he says only the originals “**were** breathed out” [past tense] but scriptures “are” [present tense] without error. (His NIV has removed 64,000 words from the KJV text. Which is “without error”?) He adds,

“...its words **were** [past tense] breathed out from God and **are therefore [present tense]** without errors...” (Ryrie, p. 108).

Either the current copies **are** “breathed out” or Ryrie has the originals in his office and needs to let us see them. He continues his double-talk in his definition of inspiration saying,

“Inspiration concerns the method God employed [past tense] to actually record the content in the Scriptures” (Ryrie, p. 75).

The past tense occurs nowhere in the Bible verse which uses the word “inspiration” It says it “**is given** by inspiration.”

It gets funnier. He adds,

“He allowed the human writers to compose His message using their freedom of expression. But He breathed out the total product” (Ryrie, p. 81).

To Ryrie, they wrote it for him and he breathed it out. It would be humorous, if this NIV and NASB based textbook on ‘Theology’ were not being used in otherwise conservative Christian colleges today. (See his copyright page). **NIV and NASB ‘theology’ is completely different from KJB theology.** Ryrie, knowing less than an elementary school child in a good Christian school, says,

“It is fair to say that the Bible does not clearly teach the doctrine of the Trinity, if by clearly one means there are proof texts for the doctrine. In fact, there is not even one proof text, if by proof text we mean a verse or passage that “clearly” states that there is **one** God who exists in **three** persons” (Ryrie, p. 89).

His corrupt version omits the *entire* Trinitarian proof text verse, 1 John 5:7, which has his required, “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these **three are one.**”

It is difficult for a seminary graduate to unlearn what articulate men taught him when he was an impressionable young student. Unless he has permanently tightened the lid on his jar, he should humble himself, cast off “the traditions of men,” and simply “compare spiritual things with spiritual.”

After Christ’s death, the closed-jar ‘clergy’ were hiding in the upper room. Mary Magdalene, out of whom Christ had cast seven devils, gratefully left the lid off. In Mark we read, “Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.” She does not seem to have been the most credible person to whom THE most important news in history should be given and first spread. Yet she was told to “tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead...bring his disciples word...go tell my brethren” “And she went and told them...that he was alive...” And they “believed not” (16:11).

Likewise, today some of the very closest men to Jesus, the ‘clergy,’ doubt the resurrection of the written word. To them it died only to be entombed on the material on which it was originally written, to rise no more. If the “Word” died and was buried and rose again, would not the “word” also be buried and rise again by “the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead” (Rom. 8:11)?

“After that he appeared in another form” (Mark 16:12). If the living Word could appear in another form, could not his written word do likewise – in Chinese characters, Roman fonts,

or Arabic script? "The Word was made flesh" for many languishing; could not the 'word' be made fluent for many languages?

God promised in Ps. 12:6, 7 to "preserve" his inspired word. In his wisdom he destroyed the originals. If they no longer exist, they are not preserved and are therefore not what he calls his inspired word which "liveth and abideth forever." Did God's spirit evaporate with the originals; is it inspired or did it expire? God's word is the only food that never needs a 'Sell by' date.

Part 7

Christians Must Have Inspired Scriptures

1.) The new birth is given by the incorruptible seed of the word of God. A man-made storybook does not have eternal life, such as the scripture imparts. The "scripture" which "is given by inspiration" is described as "profitable" and that which is "able to make thee wise unto salvation." If only those who had the originals or could read Greek could be made wise unto salvation, few could ever be saved.

Inspired scripture must be something that *all* men must have, not just those who had the originals or can read Greek. The Bible is above all a practical book. "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise..." (1 Cor. 1:26). (Greek verb endings present a challenge even to the wise.)

"...and so the poor of the flock that waited upon me **knew** that it was **the word of the LORD**"
(Zech. 11:11).

- 2.) The pastoral epistles and the book of Acts do not include a charge that men become linguists to be qualified as pastors. God's instructions are given in the Bible and are meant to describe God's qualifications to all generations. There is no mention of being conversant in four languages, (Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, and one's native tongue). This would place Christians in subjection to linguists and contravene the priesthood of the believer. If only Greek and Hebrew communicated God's true intended meaning, linguistics would be given as a qualification for ministry. Or if language study was even deemed useful, it would have been mentioned by Paul as helpful. In the New Testament's instructions to pastors, no admonition to study Hebrew is given. Paul never told Timothy to study it. Timothy may not have been able to read Hebrew. If he needed to learn it to teach, Paul would have said this. When he spoke of the inspiration of the scriptures in 2 Tim. 3:16 he did not mention 'original languages.' When Jesus read from the temple scroll he never said, 'That word in Hebrew means...'

Herbert Lockyer said, "The humblest believer, in simple dependence upon the Holy Spirit, can receive the insight into Holy Scripture that baffles and escapes the scholar who, with all his intellectual endowments, and knowledge of the **original languages** of the Bible, fails to possess..." He adds, "...W. Robertson Nicol expresses the matter thus, "...it seems to us that in these latter days Christians have taken to believing that it is by the use of the **grammar** and commentary that they can understand the New Testament. Nothing is understood in the New Testament without" the spirit of God (Herbert Lockyer, *All the Doctrines of the Bible*, Grand Rapids, MI, Zondervan, 1964, p. 5).

- 3.) The Bible says that our battle requires the “sword **of the Spirit**” (i.e. inspiration).

“For though we walk in the flesh, we do **not** war after the **flesh**: (For the **weapons** of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through **God**...” (2 Cor. 10:3, 4).

Our weapon is “the sword **of the Spirit**, which is the word **of God**” (Eph. 6:17). Our Bible cannot be a product of translators’ carnal minds; “we have the mind **of Christ**” in the Bible (1 Cor. 2:16). Today’s believers certainly need a God-wrought weapon, just as much as those who received the originals or who understood Koine Greek.

“But God hath **revealed** them unto us by his **Spirit**: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God...even so the things of God knoweth no man, but **the Spirit** of God...which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing **spiritual** things with **spiritual**” 1 Cor. 2:10-13

In Closing

The KJB must be the word of God which “liveth and abideth forever,” because the English words of men in critical Greek and Hebrew editions and lexicons are certainly *not* inspired and hardly contain God’s intended meaning. I have written a 1,200 page book, *In Awe of Thy Word: Understanding the King James Bible, Its Mystery and History, Letter By Letter*. It documents that the King James Bible is and has historically been considered “scripture” and therefore is included in the

scripture “given by inspiration of God.” That which is merely touched upon in this chapter is expounded thoroughly in that book. It also gives answers to the myriad of questions which attempt to nudge believers off target and away from the bull’s eye. Inspiration is discussed particularly in Chapters 9, 22, 24 and on pp. 537-563, 751-771, 843-851, and 865-870. (The book is available from A.V. Publications, P.O. Box 280 Ararat, VA, USA, 1-800-435-4535, and <http://www.avpublications.com>.)

The King James Bible is the only book in world history to exceed one billion copies in print. Oh, how our generation pales next to the powerful voices of the past in glorifying the word of the Lord.

- In the 1940s H.W. Robinson’s, *The Bible in Its Ancient and English Versions*, reminds us, “The Authorized Version is a **miracle** and a landmark” (Oxford: Clarendon, 1940, p. 204).
- G. Hammond, in *The Making of the English Bible*, records one historian as saying, “its text acquired a sanctity properly ascribable only to **the unmediated voice of God**; to multitudes of English-speaking Christians it has seemed little less than blasphemy to tamper with its words” (Philadelphia, PA: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1983, p. 263).
- In 1911, W. Muir’s book, *Our Grand Old Bible*, states,
“The Authorized Version...has the **Divine** touch...Like a rare jewel fitly set, the sacred truths of Scripture have found such suitable expression in it, that we can hardly doubt that they filled those who made it with reverence and awe, so that they walked softly in the **Holy Presence**” (second edition; London: Morgan and Scott, Ltd).

Consider the Sparrows

“Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is forgotten before God? But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore: ye are of more value than many sparrows.” Luke 12:6, 7

The following analysis is for your consideration. God tells us that the very hairs of our heads are all numbered. A sparrow does not fall to the ground without his attention. Hairs and sparrows both fall from their place unnoticed by us, but marked by God. How much more would he attend to the most important tangible thing on earth— the Holy Bible, the repository of *his* very words. He has presented it in various letterforms, such as Hebrew, Roman, Greek, Chinese, Arabic, and other alphabets. Even words within our Roman alphabet have been represented by various spellings. Christ can be spelled ‘Christus’ in German and ‘Christo’ in Italian. The English Bible before Wycliffe spelled ‘begotten’ as ‘bigetn’ pronounced ‘begetten.’ The living quality of the word adapts to its living receptors. Even in the midst of this and other varieties, God’s hair-counting care evidences itself.

No doubt myriads of miraculous phenomenon can be observed by someone who will pause and pray. Jesus said that “if thou wouldest believe, thou shouldest see the glory of God” (John 11:40). For example, the word “sin” occurs 447 times in the King James Bible. The word “blood” occurs 477 times in the King James Bible. God’s math is perfect because “without shedding of blood is no remission” of sin (Heb. 9:22).

The following miraculous phenomenon was discovered some years ago by Periander A. Esplana, a Christian from

Camarines Norte, Philippines. It may be, perhaps, God's way of confounding "the wise and prudent," who suggest that the Trinity of 1 John 5:7 does not belong in the Bible. From the following we can draw no other conclusions than that the Holy Bible, even in one of its many forms, reveals the glory of God. There are no books in the world, let alone other English Bible versions, or do-it-yourself translations from Greek and Hebrew lexicons (done by bible schools students), that will exhibit this:

Example I

This example is just for the FIRST VERSE and the LAST VERSE of the King James Bible. (Who knows what lies in between!)

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Gen. 1:1

"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen." Rev. 22:21

Count the number of *letters* in the first verse of the KJB _____ 44 _____

Count the numbers of *letters* in the last verse of the KJB _____ 44 _____

Count the number of *vowels* in the first verse of the KJB _____ 17 _____

Count the number of *vowels* in the last verse of the KJB _____ 17 _____

Count the number of *consonants* in the first verse of the KJB _____ 27 _____

Count the number of *consonants* in the last verse of the KJB _____ 27 _____

Jesus Christ is the Word. He also said, "I am Alpha and Omega (letters), the first and the last: and What thou seest, write in a book..." (Rev. 1:11).

Example II

One of the most important verses in the Holy Bible is 1 John 5:7. It distinguishes the Christian religion from all false

religions (The chapter ends saying, "This is the true God..."). This verse identifies the Trinity and states that Jesus is God.

"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one." 1 John 5:7

Because this verse is so important, it has been removed in new versions and was removed by the Greek Orthodox church from almost all Greek manuscripts. It is in all pure vernacular Bibles.

Jesus is not only "the first and the last," he is "in the midst" of the New Testament in 1 John 5:7 (Matt. 14:24, 25; 18:2; Luke 5:19, 6:8, 9; 24:36 "Jesus himself stood in the midst." John 8:9, 8:59; 18:19 "Jesus in the midst," 20:19; 20:26.

Count the number of <i>letters</i> in the first verse of the KJB	44
Count the numbers of <i>letters</i> in the last verse of the KJB	<u>+44</u>
Count the number of <i>letters</i> in 1 John 5:7 in the KJB	88

When the letters in the first and last verse are totaled, they equal the same number of letters in 1 John 5:7.

Count the number of <i>vowels</i> in the first verse of the KJB	17
Count the number of <i>vowels</i> in the last verse of the KJB	<u>+17</u>
Count the number of <i>vowels</i> in 1 John 5:7 in the KJB	34

When the number of vowels in the first and last verse are totaled, they equal the number of vowels in 1 John 5:7.

Count the number of <i>consonants</i> in the first verse of the KJB	27
Count the number of <i>consonants</i> in the last verse of the KJB	<u>+27</u>
Count the number of <i>consonants</i> in 1 John 5:7 in the KJB	54

The number of consonants in the first and last verse equals the same number of consonants in 1 John 5:7.

Example III

As if the fact that the first and last verses of the Bible match identically were not enough, (and they also match 1 John 5:7), it gets more interesting.

First verse letters = 44	
Last verse letters = 44	Total 88
First verse vowels = 17	
Last verse vowels = 17	Total 34
First verse consonants = 27	
Last verse consonants = 27	Total 54
First verse words = 10	
Last verse words = 12	
Words in 1 John 5:7 = 22	Total 22

Therefore, the total letters, consonants, vowels, and words in 1 John 5:7 equal the total of those in “the first and the last” verses in the Holy Bible.

And some need a man-made lexicon to check *what?*...when Jesus Christ, “the first and the last” is also “in the midst”?

The two verses most often used in a discussion of the Bible’s inspiration are parallel.

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God... (2 Tim. 3:16)

“...holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” (2 Peter 1:21).

The words parallel:

“moved by the **Holy Ghost**”

“given by **inspiration of God.**”

Summary: Seven Proofs of the KJB's Inspiration

- 1.) The Bible teaches the inspiration of vernacular Bibles, as demonstrated in Acts 2 and described in 1 Cor. 14: 21, when God said, "I speak" "other tongues."
- 2.) The Bible teaches it is "purified seven times" in the "earth" by God himself ("Thou shalt"; Psalm 12:6, 7).
- 3.) Even the Greek word underlying "is given by inspiration of God" (*theopneustos*) is translated 322 times as "spirit" (i.e. **inspiration**) and never as the tangible word 'breath,' a word which would require a tangible miracle, rather than the normal leading of the Spirit of God.
- 4.) The Bible's normal usage of each word in 2 Tim. 3:16 must determine its meaning. For example, the verb "is given" is usually used in the scriptures to refer to an ongoing event (e.g. Job 37:10 and 1 Cor. 11:15). The word "scripture" is always used in the Bible to mean accessible and readable editions, not originals (e.g. Rom. 16:26, Acts 8:35).
- 5.) The recent neologisms (new definitions) for the words "Bible" and "word(s) of God" are the product of liberals, such as Barth and Warfield. These words can have no meaning other than their normal dictionary, semantic, and grammatical sense. The Bible (the book used by Christians) is the words of God (his words, not words "chosen by men" (Williams, p. 54). The Holy Bible, in whatever language, has always been regarded as a unique book, in that it is the words of God, and not those of men.
- 6.) The men God entrusted with the scriptures, such as Coverdale and Wycliffe, called it "blaspheme" of the "Holy Ghost" to deny the inspiration of vernacular Bibles.
- 7.) God has covered the earth with his "word" in vernacular Bibles (Col. 1:5, 6; Rom. 10:17, 18); yet he has kept, as generally inaccessible throughout a large part of history, any entirely infallible Greek or Hebrew originals, which, even when found, would be unreadable by most of the people in the world. Their translation into vernacular languages has been almost universally established long ago and is not open to the "private interpretation" of unregenerate translators and authors of lexicons and grammars.