

A Grievous Wolf

“For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock” Acts 20:29.

Introduction

An individual named John Wolf has posed a series of 67* questions which he entitles *QUESTIONS FOR KJV ONLY* on his site www.cerm.info/bible_studies/Exegetical/king_james_onlyism.htm. See below. The questions are clearly aimed at subverting belief in the 1611 Holy Bible as *“the scripture of truth”* Daniel 10:21 and as *“all scripture”* that *“is given by inspiration of God”* 2 Timothy 3:16.

*Question 5 is a statement, not a question. Question 20 is dogma. Questions 8, 13, 14, 16, 19, 24, 26, 27, 31, 36, 38, 41, 44, 55 each consists of 2 questions. Questions 10, 34, 50 each consists of 4 questions. Questions 17, 18, 25, 39, 40 each consists of 3 questions. Question 28 consists of 6 questions. Grievous Wolf therefore has actually posed 103 questions, depending on how some of his other statements in his questions are interpreted. He should at least pay readers the courtesy of getting his arithmetic right.

Wolf’s site indicates that he has obtained his material from another site, jesus-messiah.com/html/kjv-questions.html, also promoted by a further site, www.bible.ca/b-kjv-only.htm#questions, concocted by several Bible critics with no final authority that they can specify between two covers. The three occasions when the expression *“Final Authority”* occurs on this third site, are each only in mockery of Dr Ruckman’s belief in the 1611 Holy Bible as his final authority. It is therefore not surprising that some of the usual notorious anti-Biblical suspects are to be encountered on the site; namely Gary Hudson, Doug Kutilek and Bob Ross.

Wolf is therefore little more than *“the messenger of Satan”* 2 Corinthians 12:7 with respect to the questions that he poses but he nevertheless fully endorses them, so they will be taken as Wolf’s questions in the remarks that follow.

Observe that Wolf introduces his list of 67 questions by lying and then compounding his lying by the sin of presumption, Psalm 19:13. He states *“I’ll conclude this article with questions that most KJVO cannot answer.”*

“Most KJVO” can answer Wolf’s questions, if they are prepared to *“Search the scriptures”* John 5:39 and *“Prove all things”* 1 Thessalonians 5:23 and many have done so, as will be shown. Grievous Wolf can’t answer them because the satanic counterfeits that he follows and recommends on his site; NIV, NASV, NKJV, change the wording of the commands in John 5:39, 1 Thessalonians 5:23 and Grievous Wolf cannot see that he is no more than a pathetic example of Isaiah 44:20.

“He feedeth on ashes: a deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?”

The answer of course is yes, the same satanic lie with three different titles; NIV, NASV, NKJV.

By inspection, with his repeated fixation on ‘the Greek etc.’ and/or ‘the originals’ as his bogus ‘authorities’ throughout his questions, John Wolf has repeatedly violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, insofar as most of the Body of Christ have no knowledge of Koine Greek and no reason for learning it as it is a dead language like Latin. Moreover, no-one on earth has access to the lost ‘originals,’ even though some fundamentalists in the US, particularly the Dean Burgon Society Executive Committee* profess to have the ‘original text’ of scripture except that they will not disclose where it is between two covers.

*See items under www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php.

As one of the *“grievous wolves,”* John Wolf is therefore one of the pack *“by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of”* 2 Peter 2:2, the others including Gary Hudson, Doug Kutilek, Bob Ross etc.

Wolf tries to cover himself with the excuse that he is not *“anti-KJV”* and therefore complains that he is going to be *“misunderstood”* if anyone criticises his article. The truth is otherwise.

Bro. Martin A. Shue, who has this site, www.avdefense.webs.com/, has posted a refutation of John Wolf’s attempt to subvert the 1611 Holy on his site here, www.avdefense.webs.com/response1.html. Bro. Shue’s article is an excellent revelation of John Wolf as one of those that *“resist the truth: men of corrupt minds,*

reprobate concerning the faith” 2 Timothy 3:8. He has not “*misunderstood*” Wolf at all but rightly reprobated him as an unfruitful worker of darkness, Ephesians 5:11.

Bro. Shue has included some questions in his article for Mr Wolf. This writer also has some questions for John Wolf.

1. If all your questions were answered explicitly, would you then be prepared to believe that the 1611 Holy Bible is “*all scripture*” that “*is given by inspiration of God*” 2 Timothy 3:16, because if not, why should anyone bother answering them?
2. If your answer to the last question is no, then what is all scripture that is given by inspiration by God between two covers for today?
3. Do you have a copy?
4. Where can anyone else obtain a copy?

If Mr Wolf can’t answer Questions 1-4 directly, then he has no final authority other than two-and-a-half pints of human brains*, i.e. his, that will die with him.

*See Dr Ruckman’s commentary, *The Book Of Matthew*, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1970, p 30.

1611 Holy Bible believers have a different final authority that will outlast heaven and earth, Matthew 24:35.

“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.”

1611 Holy Bible believers are therefore not *KJV Only*, as Mr Wolf insinuates. They are *KJV AUTHORITY*.

What follows is a detailed response to each of Mr Wolf’s questions, given in italics. The answers are given below each question in regular format.

It should be understood that while the answers given should satisfy “*they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience*” Luke 8:15, nothing short of “*the judgment seat of Christ*” Romans 14:10 will satisfy Bible critics like John Wolf of whose ilk Paul warns in Titus 1:15 “*but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled.*”

QUESTIONS FOR KJV ONLY

1. *Which KJV is inspired, since it was revised ten times, the last being in 1850?*

How does revision cancel out inspiration? Chapter and verse? Check Jeremiah 36:22. Wolf doesn’t know the Bible too well. He appears simply to be repeating only what other critics have told him.

2. *How did people get saved before 1611?*

The same way they got saved after 1611. Check Ephesians 2:8, 9. Wolf again shows that he doesn’t know his Bible very well.

3. *Do you realize that the apostle Paul did not use the KJV?*

Yes, that is realised. So what? Moses didn’t use the Pauline Epistles. Does that eliminate Genesis-Deuteronomy as part of all scripture that is given by inspiration of God?

4. *Why do KJV only people reject the apocrypha, the original 1611 version contained the apocrypha?*

The 1611 Edition of the 1611 Holy Bible contained the Apocrypha between the testaments. It was never part of either the Old or New Testament as the title pages show, which are easy to check. Wolf is either wilfully ignorant or bone idle or both.

5. *If God always gives the world his word in one language (as KJV believers say of English), then the KJV is certainly not that language, for God chose Koine GREEK not ENGLISH to reveal his New Covenant!*

Wolf’s terminology is wrong. The correct expression is the New Testament, as Hebrews 9 shows. Again, Wolf shows that he doesn’t know the Bible very well. With respect to Koine Greek, where is the chapter and verse to show that “*the New Testament*” 2 Corinthians 3:6 must be confined to what is now a dead language like Latin that therefore cannot be a satisfactory vehicle for “*the word of God, which*

liveth and abideth for ever” 1 Peter 1:23? If Wolf can’t produce chapter and verse to support his ‘Koine-Greek-onlyism,’ then yet again, he shows that he has no final authority apart from his own two-and-a-half pints of human brains that will die with him.

Further, to insist, as Wolf does, that knowledge of a dead language that few are able to learn in the present day in order to know what God ‘really’ said, is a violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, a specific doctrine that applies to Christian believers *now*. See **Introduction**.

6. *If God gave us the KJV as the ONLY inspired translation, why could God not repeat the process again in modern English language or in other languages of the world?*

The 1611 Holy Bible isn’t the only Bible translation available today that is all scripture given by inspiration of God. Wolf is showing his wilful ignorance again and he should check *Hazardous Materials* by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger p 115 for information about Bibles in other languages that are all scripture given by inspiration of God. She states “*Yet God’s inspired words can still be found for those who seek them, in Bibles such as the Spanish Valera 1602 Purificada, the Morrison Chinese Bible, Bible King James Française and others.*”

Those Bibles are faithful to the text of the 1611 Holy Bible. God will not repeat the process today for modern versions because a) He has His Book and b) no modern version can be translated under the power and authority of a king, such as James 1st, Ecclesiastes 8:4, so God has ignored them. The RV translators of 1881 twice approached the English crown for backing for their translation. Queen Victoria rightly refused each time. Ditto all subsequent versions with respect to the absence of kingly authority to certify them as **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21. One way and another, all modern versions, even the NKJV, derive from the corrupt Catholic departures of the Westcott-Hort RV from the 1611 Holy Bible. God has therefore ignored them.

7. *If God supervised the translation process so that the KJV would be 100% error free, why did God not extend this supervision to the printers who made and have made many errors in printing the text?*

God put the fear of God into printers who were either careless or, in some cases, deliberately meddling with His Book. The printers who omitted **“not”** from Exodus 20:14 in a 1631 Edition by Robert Barker were severely fined and lost their printer’s licence.

See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wicked_Bible.

Wolf ought to do some checking of authentic historical facts instead of repeatedly displaying wilful ignorance. He should also consider the end warning in 1 Samuel 2:30, as it also applies to him. **“...they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed.”** Finally, it is up to Wolf to show that any printers’ errors persist in the 1611 Holy Bible. If he can’t, then instead of personifying Ecclesiastes 10:3*, he should be prepared to **“Fear God, and give glory to him”** Revelation 14:7 for having completed the purification process for His Book according to Psalm 12:6, 7.

***“Yea also, when he that is a fool walketh by the way, his wisdom faileth him, and he saith to every one that he is a fool.”**

8. *Why did the KJV translators use marginal note [sic] showing other possible translations? If the KJV translation was the inspired translation of God, there could be no alternates! Since there are hundreds of these possible translations in the margin of the KJV, does this mean God could not make up his mind which one was better to put into the translation?*

The translators used marginal notes to show that they were honest translators. Why should the possibility of “alternates” preclude inspiration? Chapter and verse? Note the different ways that the following statement is given that is describing the same event i.e. the crucifixion:

“as a sheep before her shearers is dumb” Isaiah 53:7

“like a lamb dumb before his shearers” Acts 8:32

God can therefore describe the same event in different ways and He guided the King James translators to place His preferred reading in the text.

The fact that one particular reading was entered into the text of the 1611 Holy Bible and “*alternates*” were put into the margin therefore shows that God *could* and *did* make up His mind with respect to the readings that *He* preferred, not the opposite.

9. *If the KJV translators were inspired of God in their work, why did they not know it, since the lives of some of them and some of their sources for translation, were not at all Godly [sic] or would be considered a Minister or a member of their Church or denomination?*

It is “*all scripture*” that “*is given by inspiration of God*” 2 Timothy 3:16, not ‘all translators.’ Wolf can’t read simple English. By his reasoning, neither Moses (a murderer) nor David (an adulterer and murderer) nor Daniel (an idolater, Daniel 2:46) could be writers of ‘inspired’ scripture. Moreover, apart from David, 2 Samuel 23:2 and some of the prophets*, which writers of scripture in either testament actually *professed* to be “*inspired of God in their work*” as Wolf’s question implies for the King James translators?

*The Old Testament records the expression “*Hear the word of the LORD*” 24 times with respect to the *preaching* ministry of the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea but does not mention that they were *aware* of being “*inspired*” with respect to anything that they *wrote*, even though what they wrote did become part of “*all scripture*” that “*is given by inspiration of God.*”

10. *Why were all the marginal notes and alternate readings removed from modern editions of the KJV? Why was the Apocrypha censored out if God preserved it also through their hands? Why has the opening Dedication to James I been censored out? And, why has the lengthy introduction from “The Translators to the Reader” been censored out?*

None of the objections raised has any bearing on inspiration with respect to the texts of the 1611 Holy Bible Old and New Testaments. Wolf is gnat-straining, Matthew 23:24. All marginal notes etc. have not been removed from the standard Cambridge Cameo Edition of the 1611 Holy Bible and neither has the Epistle Dedictory, i.e. Wolf is lying. The Apocrypha was originally inserted in accordance with legal requirements in 1611. These requirements were eventually relaxed, ‘*coincidentally*’ as the influence of the 1611 Holy Bible spread throughout the English-speaking nations, which is evidence of the providence of God purging out old leaven 1 Corinthians 5:7, even if it did not happen overnight. Although the preface to the 1611 Holy Bible is no longer found in today’s editions, it is still readily available, in print and online, e.g. watch.pair.com/thesis.html. Nothing has been “*censored.*” Wolf is lying again.

11. *When there is a difference between the KJV English and the TR Greek, why do you believe that the Greek was wrong and the KJV English is correct?*

The 1611 Holy Bible is itself a variety of the TR, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html, so Question 11 is a non-issue. (Note Dr Hills’s helpful comments on marginal notes etc., see Question 8, even if Dr Hills stops short of ascribing inspiration to the 1611 Holy Bible.) However, in answer to Question 11, if the TR Greek is to be authoritative over the 1611 Holy Bible, which edition of the TR should have this distinction and why? Wolf does not say. “*Great plainness of speech*” 2 Corinthians 3:12 is not his strong point. In sum, see Question 5. TR Greek cannot be authoritative over the 1611 Holy Bible because Koine Greek is a dead language and the 1611 Holy Bible is “*the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever*” 1 Peter 1:23 according to the testimony of the last 400 years with respect to soul winning, church planting, revival and material and spiritual progress in any nation where the 1611 Holy Bible has been believed and faithfully preached. See also Dr Hills’s comments in the link given above on the uniqueness of King James English.

12. *If the KJV-only supporters believe fully in the word-for-word inspiration of the KJV, why would italics be necessary in showing that the translators were guessing at a word or words and palced [sic] them in italics so the reader could accept them or determine if a better word fit [sic] the case at hand?*

The King James translators were not “*guessing*” at anything and the reader does not have the option with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible to “*determine if a better word fit the case at hand.*”

The italics show that the King James translators were honest workers, unlike many modern translators, in that they inserted italics to show where additional words were needed for good style, correct grammar and ease of understanding. The same applies for any translation of one language to another. Wolf is

being wilfully ignorant. See also Dr Gipp's analysis of the God-guided nature of the King James italics, samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=11.htm.

Concerning Wolf's insinuation of "guesswork" on the part of the King's men and his unsubstantiated supposition that an individual reader is free to "determine if a better word fit [sic] the case at hand," Dr Mrs Riplinger states in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 560ff, her emphases "'Seven" times "they purge...and purify it..." (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. The KJV translators did **not** see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations. They wanted their Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, 'It is good, **except** this word or **that** word...' They planned [as stated in the Preface to the 1611 Holy Bible]:

"...to make...out of many good ones [Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops'], one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark."

With respect to having achieved their mark, the translators also stated in their preface, this writer's emphases:

"Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines, neither prefer broken pits before them with the wicked Jews. [Gen 26:15. Jer 2:13.] Others have laboured, and you may enter into their labours; O receive not so great things in vain, O despise not so great salvation! Be not like swine to tread under foot so precious things, **neither yet like dogs to tear and abuse holy things...**"

Or "**grievous wolves.**"

13. *In defending the KJV's use of archaic language, do you really think it is a good thing that a person must use an old English dictionary just to understand the Bible in casual reading to understand such words as "let, suffer, or hinder"; which in today's English often does not mean at all what they meant in 1611? These are only three of many other words?*

Again, Wolf is displaying wilful ignorance. The 1611 Holy Bible defines its own terms e.g. consider Isaiah 32:2 for the definitions of the words "**covert**" and "**tempest**" and Mark 13:11 for the definition of the important word "**premeditate.**" Supposed "archaic language" with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible is therefore another non-issue. See *The Language of the King James Bible* and *In Awe of Thy Word*, both by Dr Mrs Riplinger, for insight into the 1611 Holy Bible's own built-in dictionary. That the 1611 Holy Bible does define its own terms and these definitions are therefore independent of the vicissitudes of secular word usage is one reason why it will not pass away, according to the Lord's words in Matthew 24:35.

Only rarely does the word "**let**" depart from contemporary usage, Romans 1:13 being an example. The context clearly indicates that Paul was hindered i.e. blocked/obstructed from visiting the Romans, according to modern usage and corresponding to 1 Thessalonians 2:18. The location of cross references to define Biblical terms is not a problem to anyone who obeys John 5:39 to "**Search the scriptures.**" "**Suffer**" likewise often retains its contemporary usage and is defined when it has a different connotation e.g. in Matthew 19:14, where it clearly means in essence to "**forbid not.**" The word "**hinder**" can obviously mean the rear part, as the embedded word "**hind**" indicates in the context and as the context also indicates in 2 Samuel 2:23, 1 Kings 7:25. It also means to block or obstruct, as above. These words can take on different meanings according to context, as is the case for many words in English, e.g. bolt, bow, fair, fast, fluke, knot, left, race, stalk etc. Such words are called homonyms, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homonym. Wolf is being stupid.

Wolf should also answer the question why modern "alternates" like "Nephilim," "sheol," "Magi," "hades,"* "demons"* are improvements on "**giants,**" "**grave/hell**" according to context, "**wise men,**" "**hell,**" "**devils**" if he thinks the 1611 Holy Bible is archaic. *Wolf raises these terms in Question 22, where they will be re-addressed in this work.

14. *Is it not ridiculous to suggest that when the Textus Receptus (TR) disagrees with the KJV that Greek TR has errors, but the KJV doesn't? Is this not the ultimate example of "worshiping a translation"?*

Isn't the opposite therefore the ultimate example of worshipping "*that Greek TR*" precisely because it differs from the 1611 Holy Bible?

See Question 11. Which edition of the TR is “*all scripture*” that “*is given by inspiration of God*” and why, if it is to be exalted in authority over the 1611 Holy Bible? Chapter and verse? Wolf does not say. He has failed to “*Provide things honest in the sight of all men*” Romans 12:17. Again, why should a dead language be exalted in authority over “*the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever*” 1 Peter 1:23? Again, see Question 11.

15. Did you know that the *Textus Receptus*, from which the KJV was translated, was based on half a dozen small manuscripts, none earlier than the 10th century and not on ORIGINAL GREEK manuscripts at all, unless you want to say these copies of copies of copies of copies of copies were pure when the evidence now shows us that they were not?

What evidence? Wolf does not say. Moreover, Wolf is lying again and yet again being wilfully ignorant. The editions of the TR drew from many manuscripts, not merely “*half a dozen*” that Wolf does not identify with respect to their contents. See *Early Manuscripts And The Authorized Version A Closer Look!* by J. A. Moorman for the extensive manuscript support for the 1611 Holy Bible, much of it earlier than the 10th century with respect to both Greek manuscripts and ancient versions.

Moreover, where are the “*ORIGINAL GREEK manuscripts*” and what has been translated from them that can be set in authority over the 1611 Holy Bible? In what is by now easily recognizable as his typically cowardly fashion, Wolf ‘pleads the 5th’ in response.

See also *In Awe of Thy Word*, by Gail Riplinger, for the great quantity of manuscripts that Erasmus used for the initial editions of the TR. Concerning the so-called lateness of the Received Text, Dean Burgon decisively established the antiquity of what he termed the Traditional Text that underlies the 1611 Holy Bible in *The Revision Revised*. So did Benjamin Wilkinson in *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*.

See kjv.benabraham.com/html/our_authorized_bible_vindicated.html.

It is up to Wolf to establish how the original Greek manuscripts, so-called, *that he does not identify*, contradict the Traditional Text that underlies the 1611 Holy Bible with supposedly ‘purer’ readings and to show that the early departures from the Traditional Text were not, in fact, deliberate corruptions (which they were, as Dean Burgon showed well over 100 years ago).

If Wolf thinks that ‘older is better,’ he needs to explain why the manuscripts that largely support the 1611 Holy Bible display a considerable uniformity of text even with multiple copying while the old codices that repeatedly depart from the 1611 Holy Bible display a very great non-uniformity, as Dean Burgon also showed. Wolf also needs to explain why, as Pickering found in *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, the very oldest sources, the papyri, while exhibiting a mixed text, nevertheless support the Received Text and in turn the 1611 Holy Bible on the whole, i.e. 50%+, more than departures from it, considering what might be termed ‘unique’ Received Text readings.

Wolf objects to six manuscripts (said to be “*small*” but the contents of which he does not identify) that supposedly are the basis for the Received Text. If he favours the text that repeatedly departs from the Received Text, he should explain how it can derive its authority from a mere two documents, one of which, as Dean Burgon points out, lay for centuries on a forgotten shelf of the Vatican Library and the other was rescued from a trash pile in St Catherine’s Convent at the foot of Mt Sinai by Tischendorf in 1859? The following extract is from *The Revision Revised* p 343.

“*Dr. Hort contends that [the Truth of Scripture] more than half lay perdu on a forgotten shelf in the Vatican Library; - Dr. Tischendorf, that it had been deposited in a waste-paper basket in the convent of S. Catherine at the foot of Mount Sinai, - from which he rescued it on the 4th February 1859: - neither, we venture to think, a very likely circumstance. We incline to believe that the Author of Scripture hath not by any means shown Himself so unmindful of the safety of the Deposit, as those distinguished gentlemen imagine.*

“*Are we asked for the ground of our opinion? We point without hesitation to the 998 Copies which remain: to the many ancient Versions; to the many venerable Fathers, - any one of whom we hold to be a more trustworthy authority for the Text of Scripture, where he speaks out plainly, than either Codex B or Codex Aleph, - aye, or than both of them put together. Behold, (we say,) the abundant provision which the All-wise One hath made for the safety of the Deposit... We hope to be forgiven if we add, (not*

without a little warmth,) that we altogether wonder at the perversity, the infatuation, the blindness, - which is prepared to make light of all these precious helps, in order to magnify two of the most corrupt codices in existence.”

Dean Burgon truthfully studied the manuscript evidence. Grievous Wolf has not.

16. If the *Textus Receptus* is the error free text, then why are the last 6 verses of Revelation absent [sic] from the TR, yet present in the KJV? Did you know that for these verses, the Catholic Latin Vulgate of Jerome was translated into English - a translation of a translation?

Noting Wolf's comments on translation, he is trying to imply that a translation i.e. the 1611 Holy Bible, cannot be *“all scripture”* that *“is given by inspiration of God”* simply because it is a translation.

Wolf is lying again. See samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=29.htm for Dr Gipp's analysis of God's inspiration of several translations.

With respect to the last 6 verses of Revelation, Wolf is lying yet again. The last 6 verses of Revelation were not taken from the Catholic Latin Vulgate, although the Vulgate contains them. The facts with respect to these verses and their manuscripts sources are given on the *Time for Truth* site via the link for *KJO Review Full* pp 113ff.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php.

The following extracts are taken from that work with respect to Revelation 22:16-21.

Dr Ruckman is quoted as follows [from this writer's earlier work “O Biblos” – The Book pp 138-139, p 108 of the uploaded file, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/].

“The Greek text in this passage contains 135 words, of which Nestle (and Aland and Metzger) omits 17 words, adds 5 and alters 13, making a total of 35 words affected. Of these 35 words, 26 make no perceptible difference in an English translation, and most of the remaining 9 are of very small significance... “them” (vs. 18), “paper” (vs. 19), “tree” (vs. 19), “and” (vs. 19), “even so” (vs. 20), “our” (vs. 20), “Christ” (vs. 21), “you” (vs. 21), and “amen” (vs. 9). (Trinitarian Bible Society, Oct.-Dec., 1964, Vol. 449, p. 14, 15)...On each one of those words Erasmus NOW has been supported by recent editors and translators.

“The Trinitarian Bible Society wisely noticed that... “the correctness of a very large proportion of the text of Erasmus is CONFIRMED and in the case of the few exceptions it cannot be shown with CERTAINTY that the modern CRITICS are RIGHT and Erasmus was WRONG”” (Dr Ruckman's emphasis).

The above extracts show the essential fact that the 1611 Holy Bible is correct with respect to Revelation 22:16-21, regardless of Grievous Wolf's insinuations to the contrary.

The following material from the *KJO Review Full* link outlines the manuscript evidence with respect to Revelation 22:16-21.

Dr Moorman gives the details of the support for and against the AV1611 readings for Revelation 22:16-21. It should be noted again that the faithful forerunners of the AV1611, the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops' Bibles, essentially follow the AV1611 readings as do the editions of Stephanus, Beza and Eleziever, indicating that the King James translators did give due consideration to “the great vernacular Bibles,” see Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks above [from In Awe of Thy Word pp 952ff], according to the statement in the Preface to the AV1611 that Dr Moorman has noted, “With the former translations diligently compared and revised”...*

**See When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text – A New Twist in the Continuing Attack on the Authorised Version B.F.T. #1617 by Jack. A. Moorman, The Bible for Today, 1988.*

And Dr Mrs Riplinger adds that “Erasmus wrote in his Preface that he consulted, not the Latin Vulgate, but [the] ancient Italic Bibles...dating back to the time of the apostles, [matching] Erasmus' Greek New Testament and the King James Bible”...

[Dr Mrs Riplinger] continues.

“The Latin readings Erasmus had for the book of Revelation date back to the first and second century, as evidenced by the still extant Old Itala manuscripts of the book of Revelation: c (6), dem (59), g (51), h (55), m (PS-AU spe), reg (T), t (56), and z (65).”

In other words, contrary to Grievous Wolf's disinformation, the Received Text does not rely on the Vulgate for the any part of the Book of Revelation, given that Erasmus did not use it even for the initial editions of the Received Text.

Will Kinney's article on Revelation 22:19 is also most informative with respect to the last 6 verses of Revelation, revealing that John Wolf's *Question 16* comes originally from the 1611 Holy Bible arch-subversive Doug Kutilek. See **Introduction**. Note this writer's emphases in the following extracts.

See brandplucked.webs.com/rev2219bookoflife.htm and the following extracts.

...Mr. Kutilek says there are no Greek manuscripts that read “book of life”. He is flat out wrong about this. Dr. Thomas Holland, Jack Moorman, Dr. H.C. Hoskier and many others have documented the textual evidence that exists for the reading of “book of life” as found in Revelation 22:19.

*Dr. Holland responds to this charge. You can see an excerpt from his book *Crowned with Glory* here:*

http://av1611.com/kjbp/faq/holland_re22_19.html

There this question is posed and Dr. Holland responds:

Question: “If the Textus Receptus is the error free text, then why are the last six verses of Revelation absent from the TR, yet present in the KJV? Did you know that for these verses, the Latin Vulgate was translated into English - a translation of a translation?”

Dr. Holland replies: “The “TR” has the last six verses of Revelation in it. It is found in the editions of Erasmus, Beza, Stephanus, and the Elzevir brothers.

Codex 1r, which was used by Erasmus, was missing Revelation 22:16-21. The standard teaching is that Erasmus went back to the Latin Vulgate for these verses and re-translated them into Greek. However, Dr. H. C. Hoskier disagreed by demonstrating that Erasmus used the Greek manuscript 141 which contained the verses. (Concerning The Text Of The Apocalypse, London: Quaritch, 1929, vol. 1, pp. 474-77, vol. 2, pp. 454,635.)

Regardless, the textual support for these verses is not limited to the Latin Vulgate. They are also found in the Old Latin manuscripts, additional early translations such as the Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic, and some later Greek manuscripts.

Regarding the Greek, it should be pointed out that even today there is not a great deal of textual support for the verses in question. For example, of the early papyri there are no manuscripts of Revelation 22, or for that matter of Revelation chapters 18-22. Further, among the uncials, only five have Revelation chapter 22, and only four of these contain the last six verses (Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, 046, and 051). There are several minuscules which have been discovered which contain these verses (94, 1611, 1854, 1859, 2042, and 2138 to name a few).

Of course, the biggest “change” comes in verse 19. Dr. Hoskier has shown that Greek manuscripts 57 and 141 read with the Latin in stating “book of life” and not “tree of life” as found in Sinaiticus and most other Greek mss. There are, of course, other witnesses to the reading found in the KJV here. For example, the Old Bohairic Coptic version also reads “book of life.” Additionally, we have patristic citations from Ambrose (340-397 AD), Bachiarius (late fourth century), and Primasius in his commentary on Revelation in 552 AD. Thus, we have evidence of the KJV reading dating from before the Vulgate and maintained throughout Church history in a variety of geographical locations and various languages.

Will Kinney has these further important observations about Revelation 22:19 and by extension to the 1611 Holy Bible text for Revelation 22:16-21.

Mr. Jack Moorman, in his book “When the KJV Departs from the ‘Majority’ Text”, says the reading of “book of life” is also found in the Coptic Bohairic, the Arabic, the Speculum, Pseudo-Augustine and

written as such in the Latin of Adrumentum 552, *Andreas of Cappadocia*, 614 Haaymo, Halberstadt, Latin 841. "Book of life" is found in the Greek manuscripts of # 296, 2049, and in the margin of 2067.

Libro (book) is the reading of the Latin mss. Codex Fuldensis (sixth century); Codex Karolinus (ninth century); Codex Oxoniensis (twelfth to thirteenth century); Codex Ulmensis (ninth century); Codex Uallicellanus (ninth century); Codex Sarisburiensis (thirteenth century); and the corrector of Codex Parisinus (ninth century)."

Andreas of Caesarea in Cappadocia (5th or 6th century) was a Greek theological writer and bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. His principal work is a commentary on the Book of Revelation (Patrologia Graeca CVI, 215-458, 1387-94). It is the oldest surviving commentary on that book of the Bible, and a primary source, from which most of its later commentators have drawn. Andreas stands out from the majority of Byzantine commentators by his extensive acquaintance with early patristic literature.

We do have an Andreas reference given in *Horae Apocalypticae*, by Edward Bishop Elliott. Vol.4 (1852)

<http://www.historicism.com/Elliott/Appendix1-3.htm>

In his concluding summary Andreas states very distinctly his view of the Apocalypse being a prophecy of the things that were to happen from Christ's first coming even to the consummation. In the section of Revelation 22:18-19 Andreas comments on the sin of adding to, or taking from divine Scripture, and he understands the passage as referring not only to the book of Apocalypse but to the whole revealed counsel of God.

Notice how he quotes Revelation 22:18-19. "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: (19) And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part OUT OF **THE BOOK** OF LIFE (not "tree of life"), and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

Grievous Wolf is being wilfully ignorant, again.

17. Why do KJV only advocates believe that the English of the KJV is clearer and more precise than the original Greek language manuscripts? Why should Bible students throw out their Greek dictionaries and buy an "archaic English" dictionary? Are there not word pictures in the original Greek words that the English cannot easily convey? (Jas 2:19 "tremble"; Greek: *PHRISSO*, indicates to be rough, to bristle: is a powerful word picture of how the demons are in such terror that they bristle (shiver) and shake.

Yet again, Grievous Wolf is being evasive. He fails to identify either "the original Greek language manuscripts" or the "Greek dictionaries" to which he refers. How does he know if these dictionaries actually give the correct meaning for the Greek word to which he refers? Is he trying to imply that these dictionaries are 'inspired' in some way if they are to be taken as authoritative and how would he justify that notion?

Grievous Wolf should consult *Hazardous Materials* by Dr Mrs Riplinger in order to learn just how "clearer and more precise" these dictionaries actually are.

They actually misled Wolf with respect to the word "tremble."

The word bristle can be associated with fear, with respect to hair standing on end with fear but it does not mean to shiver.

Grievous Wolf is being stupid again.

He should check a contemporary English dictionary. See www.thefreedictionary.com/bristle.

However, if "the demons are in such terror that they bristle" Grievous Wolf must produce chapter and verse to show that unclean spirits have hair in order to bristle. Revelation 18:1-2 indicates otherwise for actual unclean spirits, which are typically likened to birds. See also Matthew 13:4, 19, Mark 4:4, 15, 32, Luke 8:5, 8:12, 13:19.

“And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird.”

The scriptural meaning of “*tremble*” that Grievous Wolf gets wrong by rummaging through Greek dictionaries is found in Exodus 19:16 together with the parallel passage in Hebrews 12:20-21. See remarks under Question 13 with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible’s own built-in dictionary.

“And it came to pass on the third day in the morning, that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that was in the camp trembled.”

“(For they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart: And so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake;)”

See also Deuteronomy 2:25, 20:3.

“This day will I begin to put the dread of thee and the fear of thee upon the nations that are under the whole heaven, who shall hear report of thee, and shall tremble, and be in anguish because of thee.”

“And shall say unto them, Hear, O Israel, ye approach this day unto battle against your enemies: let not your hearts faint, fear not, and do not tremble, neither be ye terrified because of them;”

By inspection, the meaning of the word “*tremble*” in the scripture with respect to an individual response (as distinct from a physical sensation, which is another meaning of the word in scripture, see Ezra 10:9, where both senses of the word occur), is to quake with great fear to the point of passing out.

That is the kind of fear that Isaac experienced in abundance in Genesis 27:33, which is the first mention in scripture of the word “*tremble*,” upon realising that he had bestowed God’s blessing on the wrong man and explains why God is called “*the fear of Isaac*” Genesis 31:42, 53.

Greek dictionaries are not necessary. Neither is Grievous Wolf.

18. *Why did the translators make mistakes in the chapter summaries in the 1611 version? Wouldn’t God have inspired this as well? Why would God inspire the English providentially accurate, but then allow misleading chapter headings?*

Which mistakes and misleading chapter headings is Grievous Wolf referring to? He doesn’t say and therefore his question could reasonably be ignored. It would appear that since he can only find pretend errors in the 1611 Holy Bible, he is desperately scratching around for any kind of ostensibly real errors that might somehow be associated with the Book.

Wolf’s search in that respect is of course futile because it amounts to nothing more than a feeble attempt at guilt by association.. His objections to the inspiration of the 1611 Holy Bible on the basis of inaccuracies in man-made notes that are in the Book but not in its text are equivalent to insisting that the King James Text must contain errors because the translators’ preface states that the Apostles used the Septuagint, which they did not. See *The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* by Dr Ruckman, Chapter 5.

Some editions of the 1611 Holy Bible such as the Cambridge Cameo Edition have page headings above Isaiah 43, 44, 45 to the effect that *God comforteth the church with his promises*, *The church comforted* and *God calleth Cyrus for his church’s sake*. The 1611 Editions of the 1611 Holy Bible have *The Lord comforteth the Church with his promises*, *God comforteth the Church with his promises*, *God calleth Cyrus for his churches sake* as the opening statements for the chapter summaries for Isaiah 43, 44, 45.

Inspection of Isaiah 43, 44, 45 show that those chapters refer specifically to God’s comfort of the nation of Israel, not the New Testament church as such. However, the accuracy or otherwise of any man-made notes with respect to any passage in the 1611 Holy Bible can readily be appreciated *by reading the passage*.

Wolf forgot to apply 1 Thessalonians 5:21, which reads the same in any edition of the 1611 Holy Bible, showing yet again that he doesn't know the Bible very well.

“Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.”

Other editions of the 1611 Holy Bible, e.g. the Cambridge Concord Edition, do not make any reference to the church in the page headings for Isaiah 43, 44, 45. By Grievous Wolf's reasoning, therefore, God must have inspired corrections to the page headings, *if such were in fact needed*.

Note Acts 7:38.

“This is he, that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us:”

Note further the correspondence between Exodus 19:6 addressed to Israel and 1 Peter 2:9 addressed to the church, called *“the strangers”* but also *“Elect”* 1 Peter 2:1, 2.

“And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.”

“But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light:”

The King's men may have thought that they were referring directly to *“the church of God”* 1 Corinthians 1:2, 10:32, 11:22, 15:9, 2 Corinthians 1:1, Galatians 1:13, 1 Timothy 3:5 but inspection of Acts 7:38, Exodus 19:6, 1 Peter 2:9 suggests that they were considerably more God-guided in their man-made chapter summaries for Isaiah 43, 44, 45 than they are usually given credit for.

19. Why would the translators use book headings like *“The Gospel According to Saint Luke”* since the Greek merely says *“The Gospel According to Luke”*? The Catholic canonizes Luke as a Saint and that becomes inspired by God to be in the KJV?

Question 19 is yet another feeble attempt by Wolf at guilt by association. Aside from the fact that, regardless of any Catholic practice, New Testament Christians, including the writers of the Gospels, are **“called to be saints”** 1 Corinthians 1:1 i.e. in perpetuity, it is Wolf's responsibility to disclose any association between the 1611 Holy Bible and Catholicism, which he does not do. That aspect of Wolf's innuendo can therefore be ignored.

He should, however, read *Did the Catholic Church Give Us the Bible?* by David W. Daniels, www.chick.com/catalog/books/1252.asp, for some enlightenment on Rome's attitude to the 1611 Holy Bible.

Grievous Wolf states that *“the Greek merely says “The Gospel According to Luke”*” again without identifying to which ‘Greek’ that he is referring so that aspect of his innuendo against the 1611 Holy Bible may reasonably be ignored as well. However, a book title that states *““The Gospel According to Luke”*” immediately begs the question, who is Luke? Designation of the Gospel writers as Saint Matthew, Saint Mark, Saint Luke and Saint John has the advantage of identifying them as the Lord's immediate followers who are therefore the first individuals with those particular names **“called to be saints”** in the New Testament sense. The designation Paul the Apostle as the writer of the Pauline Epistles serves the same purpose of identification. Grievous Wolf forgot to check the later epistles where the writers are mentioned explicitly and where they are simply referred to as James, Peter and John. The designation Saint has been dropped because the Gospels have already identified **“Peter, James, and John”** Matthew 17:1 as **“the first three”** 2 Samuel 23:19, 23, 1 Chronicles 11:21, 25 of the Lord's disciples who later became apostles. See Mark 5:37, 9:2, 13:3, 14:33, Luke 6:14, 8:21, 9:28.

The Book of Revelation is exceptional in that its writer is designated Saint John the Divine because identification of apostolic authorship is especially vital for this Book that closes the canon and because John was at the time of writing the last survivor of **“the apostles of the Lord”** 2 Peter 3:2.

The above information emerges by simply obeying the Lord's command to **“Search the scriptures”** John 5:39.

“Being disobedient” 1 Peter 2:8 in that respect, Wolf continues to abide by 1 Corinthians 14:38.

“But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant.”

20. *Do KJV only advocates realize that, to point out that all modern translations have the same kinds of mistakes we are accusing of the KJV, is irrelevant, because we maintain that all translations have errors and no translation is the 100% pure unadulterated Word of God.*

Question 20 is not really a question. It is a piece of unsubstantiated dogma ‘from the wolf’s mouth’ as even Wolf himself appears to have realised because, like Question 5 and the second part of Question 17, Wolf does not see fit to include a question mark.

Question 20 does, however, provoke some questions itself. Who is “we” to whom Wolf is referring, what errors other than pretend or guilt-by-association errors do “we” suppose that “we” have found in the 1611 Holy Bible and by what final authority between two covers do “we” declare such supposed errors to be errors and why?

Any answer that Grievous Wolf gives to the above questions will be addressed when that part of this response is reached. For now, nothing further need be said with respect to Question 20, except that Wolf is using the incorrect term “*Word of God*” for the scripture, which is “*thy word*” John 17:17, small w. The expression “*Word of God*” in scripture, capital W, applies exclusively to the Lord Jesus Christ, Revelation 19:13. See also John 1:1, 14, 1 John 1:1, 5:7.

21. *Why would the Holy Spirit misguide the translators to employ the use of mythical creatures like “unicorn” for wild ox, “satyr” for “wild goat”, “cockatrice” for common viper, when in 1611 and today we know what the real names of these creatures are?*

The Holy Spirit did not misguide the translators at all. By what authority does Grievous Wolf determine that the creatures that he lists are mythical and again, who is “we” to whom he is referring? Again, Grievous Wolf does not say. In spite of posing Question 21, he clearly expects that his dogma and that of his unidentified cohorts should be accepted *without* question.

Job 12:2 comes to mind.

“No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you.”

Concerning the creatures mentioned, Grievous Wolf appears unable to appreciate that they may be both natural and supernatural.

The word “*cockatrice*” or one of its derivatives occur a total of four times in scripture.

“And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice’ den” Isaiah 11:8.

“Rejoice not thou, whole Palestina, because the rod of him that smote thee is broken: for out of the serpent’s root shall come forth a cockatrice, and his fruit shall be a fiery flying serpent” Isaiah 14:29.

“They hatch cockatrice’ eggs, and weave the spider’s web: he that eateth of their eggs dieth, and that which is crushed breaketh out into a viper” Isaiah 59:5.

“For, behold, I will send serpents, cockatrices, among you, which will not be charmed, and they shall bite you, saith the LORD” Jeremiah 8:17.

Each of the above verses gives the meaning of the word “*cockatrice*” as any venomous snake such as an “*asp*,” a “*serpent*” or a “*viper*,” which is of course the word that Wolf complains should have been used instead of “*cockatrice*.” However, Wolf limits the term to the common European viper, or adder, whereas the word “*viper*,” being associated with the word “*asp*,” can therefore apply to any poisonous snake in Biblical lands, such as the Egyptian cobra, which is much more venomous than the European adder. See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Asp_%28reptile%29.

Note that in Jeremiah 8:17, the meaning of the word “*cockatrice*” is given *next to the word itself*. Wolf isn’t very observant. He should make sure that he is accompanied by an experienced tour guide, if he ever sets foot in Egypt. See remarks above on the Egyptian cobra.

By inspection, Isaiah 14:29 extends the meaning of the word “*cockatrice*” to a *supernatural* serpent that is described as “*a fiery flying serpent*” that may well be associated with the “*fiery serpents*” of Num-

bers 21:6 that ***“bit the people; and much people of Israel died.”*** Actual flying serpents do exist in parts of India, Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia but are said to be harmless to humans and of course are not ***“fiery.”***

See news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2002/08/0807_020807_flyingsnake.html.

Those flying serpents obviously cannot be cockatrices, which clearly have a supernatural counterpart to their natural species.

Grievous Wolf should take careful note that the fiery and most likely flying cockatrices ***“bit the people”*** that ***“spake against God, and against Moses”*** Numbers 21:5, 6, both of whom are inextricably associated with ***“the book of the law of God”*** Joshua 24:26, which today cannot be any non-extant Hebrew ‘original.’

Concerning the term ***“satyr,”*** it occurs twice in the 1611 Holy Bible, each time in the plural.

“But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there” Isaiah 13:21.

“The wild beasts of the desert shall also meet with the wild beasts of the island, and the satyr shall cry to his fellow; the screech owl also shall rest there, and find for herself a place of rest” Isaiah 34:14.

If the King’s men had wanted to use the term ***“wild goat”*** instead of ***“satyr,”*** they could have done so. See Deuteronomy 14:5, 1 Samuel 24:2, Job 39:1, Psalm 104:18. Note in passing that Deuteronomy 14:5 includes the only reference in scripture to ***“the wild ox.”*** This reference is significant with respect to the term ***“unicorn”*** that will be discussed below.

That the King’s men did not substitute the term ***“wild goat”*** for ***“satyr”*** indicates that God guided them to bring forth more revelation about ***“satyrs.”***

Isaiah 13:21, 34:14 indicate that satyrs are associated with owls, which are unclean birds and therefore satyrs are associated with ***“devils”*** Revelation 18:1-2. See *Question 17*.

Satyrs are also associated with ***“wild beasts,”*** in particular ***“wild beasts of the desert”*** that are mentioned in both Isaiah 13:21 and Isaiah 34:14.

Note also Isaiah 13:22, showing that satyrs are associated with ***“dragons.”***

“And the wild beasts of the islands shall cry in their desolate houses, and dragons in their pleasant palaces; and her time is near to come, and her days shall not be prolonged.”

Five creatures are said to be ***“wild”*** in scripture; ***“the wild goat...the wild ox”*** Deuteronomy 14:5, the ***“wild roe”*** 2 Samuel 2:18, ***“the wild ass”*** Job 6:5, the ***“wild bull”*** Isaiah 51:20. As indicated above, ***“the wild goat”*** is mentioned a total of 4 times in scripture, Deuteronomy 14:5, 1 Samuel 24:2, Job 39:1, Psalm 104:18. The wild ox, roe, bull are each mentioned only once.

“The wild ass” in either the singular or plural form, with or without the definite article, is mentioned 11 times in scripture; Job 6:5, 11:2, 24:5, 39:5 twice, Psalm 104:11, Isaiah 32:14, Jeremiah 2:24, 14:6, Daniel 5:21, Hosea 8:9.

Note in particular the following references.

“Doth the wild ass bray when he hath grass? or loweth the ox over his fodder?” Job 6:5. ***“The wild ass”*** is said to ***“bray,”*** which is to cry. Of ***“the wild beasts”*** identified in scripture, only the noise of ***“the wild ass”*** is mentioned explicitly.

“For vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass’s colt” Job 11:12. Man is likened to ***“a wild ass’s colt.”***

“Behold, as wild asses in the desert, go they forth to their work; rising betimes for a prey: the wilderness yieldeth food for them and for their children” Job 24:5. The reference is to men, who are likened to wild asses.

“Because the palaces shall be forsaken; the multitude of the city shall be left; the forts and towers shall be for dens for ever, a joy of wild asses, a pasture of flocks;” Isaiah 32:14. Note the similarity with Isaiah 13:21, 22.

“And the wild asses did stand in the high places, they snuffed up the wind like dragons; their eyes did fail, because there was no grass” Jeremiah 14:6. Wild asses are likened to dragons. See again Isaiah 13:21, 22.

“And he was driven from the sons of men; and his heart was made like the beasts, and his dwelling was with the wild asses; they fed him with grass like oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven; till he knew that the most high God ruled in the kingdom of men, and that he appointeth over it whomsoever he will” Daniel 5:21. A man is associated with ***“the wild asses.”***

“For they are gone up to Assyria, a wild ass alone by himself: Ephraim hath hired lovers” Hosea 8:9. Men are associated with ***“a wild ass.”***

Satyrs also dance. The word ***“dance”*** and its derivatives i.e. ***“dances,” “dancing”*** occur a total of 21 times in scripture. Inspection of the references shows that apart from satyrs in Isaiah 13:21, only humans dance in scripture.

The above scriptures show that satyrs are associated with ***“devils,” “dragons”*** and ***“wild beasts,”*** in particular ***“wild beasts of the desert.”*** Satyrs ***“cry”*** as ***“wild beasts”*** do, ***“dance”*** as humans do and inhabit ***“desolate places”*** Job 3:14, Isaiah 13:21, 22.

Of the wild creatures identified in scripture, ***“the wild ass”*** is mentioned 11 times, more than all the other wild creatures combined. ***“The wild ass”*** is said to ***“bray”*** or cry and no other wild creature specified in scripture is identified by the sound that it makes. ***“The wild ass”*** is associated with ***“dragons,” “the desert,” “desolate places”*** and with men in 4 verses; Job 11:12, 24:5, Daniel 5:21, Hosea 8:9. The wild bull and the wild roe are each associated with men but only once, in the one reference in scripture where each of them occurs.

“Comparing spiritual things with spiritual” 1 Corinthians 2:13 therefore, the conclusion must be that ***“satyrs”*** are satanic monstrosities with attributes of both asses and humans and are therefore most likely the product of bestiality* practised by ***“the angels that sinned”*** 2 Peter 2:4 following the invasion by ***“the sons of God”*** Genesis 6:2 the result of which was that by the time of the flood, ***“all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth”*** Genesis 6:12. *See Exodus 22:19, Leviticus 18:23, 20:15, 16, Deuteronomy 27:21.

The King’s men were clearly ***“warned of God”*** Matthew 2:12 with respect to ***“satyrs”*** and rightly used the term in their work, especially as ***“the days of Noe”*** Luke 17:26 approach.

“Wild goat” is clearly not a proper translation for ***“satyr.”*** Grievous Wolf is being wilfully ignorant, again.

Concerning the term ***“unicorn,”*** it occurs 9 times in scripture in both the singular and plural forms, Numbers 23:22, 24:8, Deuteronomy 33:17, Job 39:9, 10, Psalm 22:21, 29:6, 92:10, Isaiah 34:17.

The unicorn may typify an ox in some respects, as Numbers 22:4, 24:8 indicate.

“And Moab said unto the elders of Midian, Now shall this company lick up all that are round about us, as the ox licketh up the grass of the field. And Balak the son of Zippor was king of the Moabites at that time.”

“God brought him forth out of Egypt; he hath as it were the strength of an unicorn: he shall eat up the nations his enemies, and shall break their bones, and pierce them through with his arrows.”

Moreover, the unicorn is associated with bulls, bullocks and calves in scripture i.e. bovine creatures that illustrate the strength and agility of the unicorn.

“His glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns are like the horns of unicorns: with them he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth: and they are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and they are the thousands of Manasseh” Deuteronomy 33:17.

“He maketh them also to skip like a calf; Lebanon and Sirion like a young unicorn” Psalm 29:6.

The unicorn is associated with strength in scripture, like the ox.

“God brought them out of Egypt; he hath as it were the strength of an unicorn” Numbers 23:22. Note again that Numbers 23:22 is the first mention of the unicorn in scripture and see also Numbers 24:8 above.

“That our oxen may be strong to labour; that there be no breaking in, nor going out; that there be no complaining in our streets” Psalm 144:14.

“Where no oxen are, the crib is clean: but much increase is by the strength of the ox” Proverbs 14:4.

However, the unicorn is not an ox, nor is it a wild ox.

As indicated above, Deuteronomy 14:5 shows that the King’s men were aware of the expression ***“wild ox”*** but it is clearly not a substitute for ***“unicorn”*** because Deuteronomy 14:4 states that wild oxen can be eaten. Unicorns are never said to be available as human food.

Dr Gerardus D. Bouw states in *The Book of Bible Problems** p 238, that wild oxen can be tamed to serve human masters, for example by ploughing and harrowing fields. By contrast, Job 39:9-10 show that unicorns cannot be so tamed.

*Publisher: Association for Biblical Astronomy, 4527 Wetzel Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, 44109, USA.

“Will the unicorn be willing to serve thee, or abide by thy crib? Canst thou bind the unicorn with his band in the furrow? or will he harrow the valleys after thee?”

The questions clearly imply negative answers, showing again that unicorns are not wild oxen.

As Dr Bouw also points out, Psalm 92:10 shows that a unicorn definitely has only one horn, unlike a wild ox.

“But my horn shalt thou exalt like the horn of an unicorn: I shall be anointed with fresh oil.”

The strength of the unicorn Numbers 23:22, 24:8 may also be likened to ***“the strength of the horse”*** Psalm 147:10. The context of some of the verses that follow is a warning against trusting in chariots and horses instead of in ***“the name of the LORD our God”*** Psalm 20:7 for deliverance but they still emphasise the horse’s strength, nevertheless.

“Hast thou given the horse strength? hast thou clothed his neck with thunder?” Job 39:19.

“An horse is a vain thing for safety: neither shall he deliver any by his great strength” Psalm 33:17.

“He delighteth not in the strength of the horse: he taketh not pleasure in the legs of a man” Psalm 147:10.

“Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help; and stay on horses, and trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen, because they are very strong; but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the LORD!” Isaiah 31:1.

“The snorting of his horses was heard from Dan: the whole land trembled at the sound of the neighing of his strong ones; for they are come, and have devoured the land, and all that is in it; the city, and those that dwell therein” Jeremiah 8:16. Note the resemblance of Jeremiah 8:16 with Numbers 24:8.

“At the noise of the stamping of the hoofs of his strong horses, at the rushing of his chariots, and at the rumbling of his wheels, the fathers shall not look back to their children for feebleness of hands;” Jeremiah 47:10.

God has clearly alluded to oxen, calves and horses to depict unicorns but unicorns themselves are none of these creatures. Dr Bouw has this compelling observation, this writer’s emphases.

“Sightings of unicorns date as recently as the eighteenth century. Recorded unicorn sightings come from India, Ethiopia, Abyssinia, Mecca, China, Persia, and even Canada. The description does not fit any animal alive today, especially given that the horn is reported to be from two to three feet long.

There is plenty of anecdotal evidence that these were real creatures. Sixteenth century accounts from Europe tell of unicorns in private zoos (there were no public zoos back then). There is no reason to doubt the reading in the Authorized Bible, especially given that the unicorn will return to earth when Christ comes from heaven (Is. 34:7). The implication is that they are extinct on earth at the time."

As Dr Bouw notes, Psalm 22:21 and Isaiah 34:7 indicate that God has unicorns in heaven. Note again the association with cattle in Isaiah 34:7.

"Save me from the lion's mouth: for thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns."

"And the unicorns shall come down with them, and the bullocks with the bulls; and their land shall be soaked with blood, and their dust made fat with fatness."

Dr Ruckman notes in his commentary *Volume 1 of the Book of Psalms* p 136 on Psalm 22:21 that God's horses are **"horses of fire"** 2 Kings 2:11, 6:17. He adds that God heard the prayer of His Son in Psalm 22 **"from the horns of the unicorns"** indicating that those unicorns must be in heaven. They must therefore be the unicorns that come down from heaven in Isaiah 34:7. Note that according to the context, Isaiah 34:5 reveals that the coming down is from heaven to *inflict judgement on sinners who appear to be likened to cattle for the slaughter in Isaiah 34:6*. See Jeremiah 12:3, 50:27, 51:40, Zechariah 11:4, 7.

"For my sword shall be bathed in heaven: behold, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment."

Yet the animals that are explicitly mentioned as coming down from heaven at the Second Advent are horses, i.e. **"horses of fire,"** as Revelation 19:14 states.

"And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean."

2 Kings 2:11, 6:17, Psalm 22:21, Isaiah 34:7, Revelation 19:14 therefore identify God's unicorns as **"horses of fire"** with horns.

The **"them"** in Isaiah 34:7 would appear to be identified in Jude 14 in addition to Revelation 19:14.

"And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints,"

It would also appear that the strength of the unicorns in Isaiah 34:7 overcomes that of **"the bullocks with the bulls"** which are also part of the **"great slaughter in the land of Idumea"** Isaiah 34:6.

The above revelations from **"comparing spiritual things with spiritual"** 1 Corinthians 2:13 with respect to the term **"unicorn"** show that the modern alternative **"wild ox"** is a wholly inadequate substitute, like everything that Grievous Wolf has put forward so far.

Will Kinney has an informative article entitled *Satyrs, Dragons, Unicorns and Cockatrices* that is available at brandplucked.webs.com/satdragunicorns.htm. Bro. Kinney comes to a different conclusion about satyrs from that arrived at by this writer, which may be a useful brain-teaser for Mr Wolf.

22. *If the KJV is error free in the English, then why did they fail to correctly distinguish between "Devil and Demons" (Mat 4:1-DIABOLOS and Jn 13:2-DAIMONIZOMAI); and "hades and hell" (see Lk 16:23-HADES and Mt 5:22-GEENNA; Note: Hades is a place of torment in the grave and a distinct hell which is the lake of fire into which sinners are thrown after the judgement: Rev 20:14).*

The King's men did not fail at all. It is Grievous Wolf who has failed to see that **"Demons"** and **"Hades"** are merely transliterations from Koine Greek that don't inform the reader of anything. The King's men correctly translated the words as **"devils"** and **"hell,"** words which immediately signify evil, note the embedded word *evil* in *d-evil-s* and *fire* and *torment* respectively.

John 13:2 states **"And supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him;"**

Grievous Wolf forgot Psalm 109:6 that John 13:2 fulfils*, showing that the King's men were right in their choice of wording. *Psalm 109:6 has of course a future fulfilment during the reign of the final antichrist, Revelation 13:4-7. See Dr Ruckman's commentary *Volume II of the Book of Psalms* p 868.

“Set thou a wicked man over him: and let Satan stand at his right hand.”

Grievous Wolf also forgot Luke 22:3 that further supports the wording that the King's men chose for John 13:2. Wolf reveals yet again that he doesn't know the Bible very well.

“Then entered Satan into Judas surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve.”

Wolf should note further John 6:70, which reveals that more than one devil exists. See also the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1396.

“Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?”

Judas was not *the* Devil and he was not said to be *possessed* of the Devil but he was *a* devil, as even the modern counterfeit bibles, NIV, TNIV, NKJV are forced to acknowledge.

Just in case Wolf or any other Bible rejecter was to think that the Lord was speaking figuratively in John 6:70, the expression ***“a devil”*** is never used figuratively in scripture. See the additional 13 references to the term ***“a devil”*** in Matthew 9:32, 11:18, 12:22, 15:22, Luke 7:33, 11:14, John 7:20, 8:48, 49, 52, 10:20, 21 twice.

Wolf's fixation with 'the Greek' has therefore led him into doctrinal error. Dr Bouw in *The Book of Bible Problems* pp 207-208 has these instructive comments.

“Devils are bad, even to the Greeks, but this is not so for the demons. Socrates saw some demons as bad and others as good. The “good” demons taught men and made geniuses on them.”

The scripture warns emphatically against these *““good” demons”* 15 times as ***“familiar spirits”*** Leviticus 19:31, 20:6, 27, Deuteronomy 18:11, 1 Samuel 28:3, 7, 8, 9, 2 Kings 21:6, 23:24, 1 Chronicles 10:13, 2 Chronicles 33:6, Isaiah 8:19, 19:3, 29:4. The King's men were therefore entirely correct to translate *daimonion* as ***“devil(s)”*** and not to transliterate the word as *“demon(s)”*. Dr Bouw continues.

“Not until the eighteenth century did the word demon enter common English. This was only through pastors who liked to strut their knowledge of Greek [like Grievous Wolf] to their congregations. In the course of that prideful show, the derivation of devil (“d’evil,” that is, “doer of evil”) was lost to the clergy and laity alike, and the evil inherent in the devils was watered down since demon, by virtue of its meaning as “people,” [Dr Bouw shows that the root word of “demon” is demo, referring to the human spirit or “people” as in democracy, demography, demonstrate] humanized devils and made them seem kinder and more humane. Devil, on the other hand, communicates inhumanity and evil. The King James translating committee was right not to transliterate the Greek word demon but to translate it into the perfectly good English word, devil.”

Will Kinney has this informative article *Devils or Demons?*

See brandplucked.webs.com/devilsordemons.htm.

Bro. Kinney shows how pervasive demonic influence is today.

New Agers today refer to daemons as good spirits who guide us in this life. I have heard some of the lectures on the Power of Myth by the late Joseph Campbell. He frequently used the word “daemon” in a positive way as some sort of spiritual guide. I’m sure he now knows how wrong he was during his lifetime.

Bro. Kinney shows further how, in addition to spreading worldwide heresy such as the New Age movement, *demonic* influence has entered the church where it has leavened the modern versions in Acts 17:22. The 1611 Holy Bible has ***“too superstitious.”*** The NIV, TNIV, NKJV all have *“very religious.”* Bro. Kinney writes as follows.

The word translated as “too superstitious” in the King James Bible is composed of two elements - Deisi and daimonesterous. The first part is the verb deido which means to fear, and the second part is an adjective from the noun daimon, which means devils or demons.

What we see here in the Greek language is that the words *daimon*, and *daimonion* can both carry the idea of a positive and beneficial spiritual entity [as seen in the NIV, TNIV, NKJV]. The King James translators were aware of this, and correctly translated these words as “devils” rather than as “demons”. The word “devils” is directly related to the Devil and we are in no doubt as to which side they are on.

Bro. Kinney has this incisive conclusion to his article.

Those who criticize the King James Bible for using the word devils instead of demons apparently do not understand either the Greek or the English language very well. They are like those described in 1 Timothy 1:7 “Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.”

At the beginning of this little study we [Bro. Kinney guided by “*the Spirit of truth*” John 16:13] quoted 1 Timothy 4:1 where the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils.

Without exception, I have found that those who criticize our beloved King James Bible do not believe that any single text or Bible version, be it in Hebrew, Greek, English, Swahili or whatever, is the complete, inerrant, inspired, and pure words of God [see Question 20]. In regards to the Bible version issue, the modern version scholars have adopted the methods and beliefs of liberal apostates who tell us the Hebrew Masoretic texts have been corrupted and the Greek texts are uncertain and in need of constant research and updating. They have no infallible Holy Bible to give us and they ridicule those of us who believe God has preserved His pure words and that today and for almost 400 years they are found in the King James Holy Bible.

I have personally been called an ignorant fool, a false teacher, an apostate, and even demon possessed because I believe God meant what He said about heaven and earth shall pass away but His words would not pass away.

There are two basic views hotly debated among Christians today concerning the Bible version issue. You are on one side or the other.

#1. Believing God has kept His promises to preserve His words and has given us an inerrant Holy Bible or #2. Believing there is no such thing as a complete, inerrant, and perfect Bible on the face of this earth.

Now which of these two views do you think is a doctrine of devils?

See also *New Age Versions* by Gail Riplinger, Chapter 12 entitled *Finally They Worshipped Devils*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly states with respect to the new versions’ use of the term “*demon(s)*” “By switching to the globally acceptable ‘demons’, new ‘International’ versions follow their admitted philosophy of choosing words which “allow each reader to decide for himself” [from *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation* p 58] what a verse means. God, however, has already decided.”

Concerning Wolf’s reference to the words “*hades*” and “*geena*,” this writer has an article entitled *Peter Amue the Bible Corrector Part 1*. See pp 9ff.

The article may be accessed at www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1309647082.pdf.

The following extract has been taken from that article, this writer’s emphases unless otherwise stated.

That term Gehenna had some relevance when koine Greek was a spoken and written language as a depiction of hell in the 1st century AD when the Valley of Hinnom to the south of Jerusalem, to which Gehenna also refers, was an open-air incinerator. That incinerator no longer exists as such and has not existed for centuries.

*The King’s men therefore correctly translated the word Gehenna as “**hell**” interchangeably with Hades. It is the literal hell “**in the heart of the earth**,” Jonah 2:2, Matthew 12:40, that is of relevance today. The historical rubbish dump outside ancient Jerusalem, where of course the fires **have** been quenched, Mark 9:44, 46, 48, no longer bears any relevance for today’s bible believer even as an illustration and therefore neither does any distinction in English between the words Gehenna and Hades.*

That Gehenna and Hades should be translated interchangeably as **“hell”** may easily be demonstrated.

Compare Mark 9:43, 44, where **“hell”** is Gehenna or geena and Luke 16:22b, 23, where **“hell”** is hades.

“And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched” Mark 9:43, 44.

“The rich man also died, and was buried; And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame” Luke 16:22b-24.

Does anyone seriously suppose that the rich man could tell the difference between Gehenna and Hades?

Furthermore, explicit use of the words Gehenna, Hades and Tartarus in an English bible incurs a serious problem with respect to the quality of translation.

Dr. Ruckman states [*The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* pp 147-148], his emphases, “It is objected that **“Hell”** (for “hades” and “gehenna”) is improper. To correct this “error,” the new bibles read “Hades” for “Hell” in (ten) places, and the guileless Christian is told this is a better “translation.” But Hades is not a translation; it is a TRANSLITERATION. By the use of this transliteration, the word “HELL” has been all but taken out of the Bible, much to the delight of Christ-rejecting, self-righteous “Christians.” If the revisers had been honest men would they not have transliterated “Heaven” as well and called it “Ouranos” instead of “Heaven?” Again, if they wanted to put the Bible “in the language of 20th century people,” why did they not invent a NEW word for “hades”? **HADES IS NOT AN ENGLISH WORD.**”

Gehenna and Tartarus are likewise **transliterations** and, like Hades, **cannot** be superior to an actual **translation**.

Grievous Wolf makes the heretical statement extracted from Question 22 as follows. By inspection it is self-contradictory.

“Hades is a place of torment in the grave and a distinct hell which is the lake of fire into which sinners are thrown after the judgement: Rev 20:14.”

The rich man’s **“torments”** Luke 16:23 are clearly not **“the grave.”** No-one could experience what the rich man experienced in Luke 16:22-24 in **“the grave.”**

Wolf is delusional. See Ecclesiastes 9:10. The rich man **“was buried”** in a grave but he certainly had **“knowledge”** that he had **“come into this place of torment”** Luke 16:28, which wasn’t **“the grave.”**

“Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest.”

Finally, it is Grievous Wolf who has failed to read Revelation 20:14 correctly.

“And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.”

Revelation 20:14 clearly shows that Hades is not **“a distinct hell which is the lake of fire.”** **“The lake of fire”** is that which **“death and hell”** are cast into. Grievous Wolf cannot read simple English.

23. Why would KJV translators render Gen 15:6 which is quoted in identical Greek form by Paul in Rom 4:3, 9, 22; Gal 3:6, in FOUR DIFFERENT WAYS? Why are they creating distinctions were none exist?

Wolf fails to mention any problems that arise as a result of the differences about which he complains. He is gnat-straining again, Matthew 23:24. See Question 10.

The general answer to Wolf’s complaint is given by the King James translators themselves, in *The Translators to the Reader*. See watch.pair.com/thesis.html.

“Another things we think good to admonish thee of (gentle Reader) that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done,

because they observe, that some learned men somewhere, have been as exact as they could that way. Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified that same in both places (for there be some words that be not the same sense everywhere) we were especially careful, and made a conscience, according to our duty. But, that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as for example, if we translate the Hebrew or Greek word once by PURPOSE, never to call it INTENT; if one where JOURNEYING, never TRAVELING; if one where THINK, never SUPPOSE; if one where PAIN, never ACHE; if one where JOY, never GLADNESS, etc. Thus to mince the matter, we thought to savour more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorn in the Atheist, than bring profit to the godly Reader. For is the kingdom of God to become words or syllables? why should we be in bondage to them if we may be free, use one precisely when we may use another no less fit, as commodiously?"

Again, it is up to Wolf to show that the King's men were either imprecise or incommensurable in their choice of words for Romans 4:3, 9, 22, Galatians 3:6. He fails totally in that respect.

The wording that the King's men chose for Romans 4:3, 9, 22, Galatians 3:6 is actually beneficial to the reader, regardless of 'the Greek.'

Genesis 15:6 states ***"And he believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness."***

Romans 4:3 states ***"For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness."***

Romans 4:9 states ***"Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness."***

Romans 4:22 states ***"And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness."***

Galatians 3:6 states ***"Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness."***

Grievous Wolf's self-imposed perplexity appears to centre on the expressions "counted unto," "reckoned to," "imputed to" and "accounted to." Wolf seems to think that the expressions should all be the same, e.g. "credited to" NIV, TNIV or "accounted to" NKJV.

By contrast, the Bible believer consults his final authority and asks ***"For what saith the scripture?"*** Romans 4:3.

Taking the expressions in turn, therefore, ***"the scripture"*** reveals the expression ***"counted unto"*** is found twice more in scripture, besides in Romans 4:3, in Numbers 18:30 and Psalm 106:31. Note the under-linings.

"Therefore thou shalt say unto them, When ye have heaved the best thereof from it, then it shall be counted unto the Levites as the increase of the threshingfloor, and as the increase of the winepress" Numbers 18:30. See also Numbers 18:29.

"Out of all your gifts ye shall offer every heave offering of the LORD, of all the best thereof, even the hallowed part thereof out of it."

"And that was counted unto him for righteousness unto all generations for evermore" Psalm 106:31. See also Psalm 106:30.

"Then stood up Phinehas, and executed judgment: and so the plague was stayed."

See Numbers 25:7-11, where in Numbers 25:11 the Lord testifies that ***"Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest, hath turned my wrath away from the children of Israel."***

That ***"righteousness"*** which is ***"counted unto"*** the individual from the Lord is ***"all the best thereof, even the hallowed part thereof."*** It is ***"everlasting righteousness"*** Daniel 9:24 ***"unto all generations for evermore"*** that ***"hath turned my wrath away from"*** the individual through God having ***"executed judgment"*** on the Lord Jesus Christ, 2 Corinthians 5:19-21. See especially 2 Corinthians 5:21.

"For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

“Reckoned to” is an unusual expression in the scripture in that it occurs only in one other verse and in an apparently unusual context by comparison with Romans 4:9.

“And Saul’s son had two men that were captains of bands: the name of the one was Baanah, and the name of the other Rechab, the sons of Rimmon a Beerothite, of the children of Benjamin: (for Beeroth also was reckoned to Benjamin.” 2 Samuel 4:2.

The next verse is significant.

“And the Beerothites fled to Gittaim, and were sojourners there until this day.” 2 Samuel 4:3.

“Gittaim” is **“Gath”** 2 Samuel 15:18. Although many men of Gath eventually sided with David 2 Samuel 15:18-22, Gath was enemy territory, 1 Samuel 5:8, from which came **“Goliath, of Gath”** 1 Samuel 17:4 aka **“Goliath the Gittite”** 2 Samuel 21:15, 1 Chronicles 20:5.

“Beeroth” is mentioned twice more in scripture after 2 Samuel 4:3.

“The children of Kirjatharim, Chephirah, and Beeroth, seven hundred and forty and three” Ezra 2:25.

“The men of Kirjathjearim, Chephirah, and Beeroth, seven hundred forty and three” Nehemiah 7:29.

The double mention of **“Beeroth”** by means of Ezra 2:25, Nehemiah 7:29, without alteration of the numbers, brings to mind Genesis 41:32.

“And for that the dream was doubled unto Pharaoh twice; it is because the thing is established by God, and God will shortly bring it to pass.”

The picture that emerges therefore with respect to the expression **“reckoned to”** in 2 Samuel 4:2 is that **“the men of...Beeroth”** were among those who **“dwelt in their own land”** Ezekiel 36:17, 37:21, 39:28 but became **“fugitives that fell away”** 2 Kings 25:11 to the enemy but then God restored them in Ezra 2:25, Nehemiah 7:29 after the manner of Ezekiel 39:28.

“Then shall they know that I am the LORD their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen: but I have gathered them unto their own land, and have left none of them any more there.”

Spiritually it is the same with respect to the individual to whom **“faith was reckoned to...for righteousness”** as Paul explains in Romans 7:9, 8:2-4.

“For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.”

“For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.”

Even though **“shapen in iniquity”** Psalm 51:5 like all men through Adam, Romans 5:12, Paul was nevertheless once innocent and in a sense righteous e.g. as a child, like **“the children of Beeroth”** had **“their own land”** but knowledge of sin brought Paul **“into captivity to the law of sin”** Romans 7:23 and death, like **“the men of Beeroth”** fled to enemy territory and lost **“their own land.”** However, when Paul became one of those that **“believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead;”** Romans 4:24 then just as **“faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness”** then Paul was restored positionally to innocence and righteousness i.e. **“the righteousness through faith”** Romans 4:13 and **“made free from the law of sin and death”** just as God brought back **“the men of Beeroth”** from captivity and restored them to **“their own land.”**

The expression **“reckoned to”** in 2 Samuel 4:2 and Romans 4:9 signifies that **“the thing is established by God”** and the expression therefore imparts great assurance, not only to **“the men of Beeroth”** and Paul but to every believer today.

The expression **“imputed to”** occurs only one other time in scripture apart from Romans 4:22, in the very next verse.

“Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him;” Romans 4:23.

However, the following verses in Romans 4 are essential for understanding the term *“imputed to”* and its implications for the believer.

“But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness” Romans 4:5.

“Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, Saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered” Romans 4:6-7.

“Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin” Romans 4:8.

“And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also:” Romans 4:11.

“But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead;” Romans 4:24.

“Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification” Romans 4:25.

The explanation of the expression *“imputed to”* is as follows.

Apart from *“Jesus Christ the righteous”* 1 John 2:1, *“There is none righteous, no, not one:”* Romans 3:10. However *“to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly”* i.e. anyone among those of whom Paul says *“by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ”* Galatians 2:16, *“his faith is counted for righteousness.”*

That faith is *“the faith of Jesus Christ”* Galatians 2:16, 20 and *“it is the gift of God”* Ephesians 2:8 for *“him that...believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly.”* That faith, within the believer, is *“counted for”* or made identical to *“the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ:”* 2 Peter 1:1 for the believer positionally for *“any man...in Christ”* 2 Corinthians 5:17, which is the position, spiritually, for *“him that...believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly.”*

That position of righteousness identical to *“the faith of Jesus Christ,”* which is *“the gift of God,”* is *“the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works.”* *“The gift of God”* therefore equates to imputed righteousness for the believer. It is a blessed gift.

“The gift of God” as imputed righteousness is therefore the expression used in Romans 4:11 with respect to *“all them that believe...that righteousness might be imputed unto them also:”*

That gift is a doubly blessed gift because as Romans 4:8 states **“Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin”** with respect to *“the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works.”* That man is doubly blessed because God imputed or ‘gifted’ that man’s sin to the Lord Jesus Christ. See 2 Corinthians 5:21 again.

“For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.”

In anticipation of the reader’s thought with respect to belief, Paul therefore concludes the chapter with a full statement of what constitutes belief to receive *“the gift of God”* of *“righteousness...imputed”* in Romans 4:24-25.

With reference to believers, Paul states **“to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.”**

The expression *“imputed to”* with respect to righteousness is therefore equivalent to *gifted to* with respect to God’s righteousness, with the sin of the recipient at the same time ‘gifted’ or imputed to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The expression *“accounted to”* occurs twice in scripture apart from Galatians 3:6.

“A seed shall serve him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation” Psalm 22:30.

“But Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them”
Mark 10:42.

A helpful parallel passage is Philemon 18.

***“If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account;*”**

The expression “*accounted to*” in Psalm 22:30, Mark 10:42 refers to rulership each time. Philemon 18 shows *in type* that the Lord has an account. In association with Psalm 22:30, Mark 10:42, it could be described as “*his royal bounty*” 1 Kings 10:13 such as Solomon had. Note how Solomon’s Gentile visitor was gifted over and in abundance of “*his royal bounty*.”

“And king Solomon gave unto the queen of Sheba all her desire, whatsoever she asked, beside that which Solomon gave her of his royal bounty...”

Note therefore the association with “*abundance*” and “*righteousness*” in Romans 5:17.

“For if by one man’s offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.”

The saved sinner draws on *God’s account* with respect to “*the gift of God*” that is “*accounted to him for righteousness*” being among “*they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness*” because they “*believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead;*” Romans 4:24
“*Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification*” Romans 4:25.

Therefore, in sum, “*the gift of God*” that is identical to “*righteousness...imputed*” to the believer is:

- “*counted unto*” the believer as *the best gift, the hallowed gift and the everlasting gift* of God’s righteousness that turns away God’s wrath from the believer.
- “*reckoned to*” the believer as *the restorative gift* that returns him to a lost former state of innocence and bestows even more upon him by means of a new standing in God’s righteousness and as *the established gift* underwritten by God Himself.
- “*imputed to*” the believer as *the doubly blessed gift* for him that bestows God’s righteousness on the recipient and his sin on the Lord Jesus Christ.
- “*accounted to*” the believer as *the royal gift and the abundant gift* by which the recipient of God’s righteousness thereby draws from an inexhaustible and ever-current account of God’s righteousness.

“Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift” 2 Corinthians 9:15.

Grievous Wolf’s obsession with ‘the Greek’ denied him both the additional revelation in English and in turn the attendant blessing.

24. Why did the KJV translators have no consistent rule for differentiating between the use of definite and indefinite articles? (Dan 3:25 we have one “like ‘the’ Son of God” instead of “like ‘a’ son of God”, even though in verse 28 Nebuchadnezzar states God sent “His angel” to deliver the men. This change was made to insert the trinity doctrine. Was this interpolation inspired by God?

Question 24 reveals Grievous Wolf’s wilful ignorance of “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21 to an extent unsurpassed in any of his preceding 23 questions.

He clearly does not know about the principles of translation with respect to articles.

He clearly does not know what an angel is according to scripture and he is less well-informed about the Son of God than a 6th century BC oligarch with no New Testament.

Question 24 is answered by the following extract from this writer’s earlier work “*O Biblios*” – *The Book*, Section 10.11, pp 193-195.

See p 148 of the uploaded file, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.

“Defects Caused by Wrong Use of the Article or Else its Omission”

Our critic states at the end of this sub-section that ***“Clearly doctrine is affected by the wrong use or omission of the article.”*** However, he does not explain anywhere in this sub-section just HOW any doctrine was “affected” by any of these supposed “defects” in the AV1611, or even what that doctrine was.

His objections here are not new. Robert Young has a list of “injurious” additions and omissions of the definite article in the AV1611 Text in his Concordance. Like our critic, Young does NOT say WHY these additions or omissions are injurious.

Dr. Ruckman has some detailed comments about “articles”. He states [The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence p 118] “For the gnat-strainers who worry about Greek “articles,” the Lord has placed the definite “o” before the name of Jesus, about 40 times (Matthew 18:22, 19:1, 14, 18, 23, 26 etc.) Not ONE OF THE NEW TRANSLATIONS translates it.”

He also states [The Bible Babel p 61] “The NASV and ASV (and NIV) certainly do NOT translate the Greek articles in Luke 1:8, 20, John 2:1, 9:16, Acts 1:14, 10:2, 3, Rom. 1:9, etc., and they certainly do ADD them in Luke 1:25, 32, Acts 7:35, 10:1, Heb. 1:10, 2:4. Fundamentalists who complain about the “translation of the article in the AV”...stimulate, propagate, and increase false impressions in the mind of the public.”

Dr. Ruckman adds [Problem Texts p 404] “Places in the grossly corrupt NASV (and old ASV) where the translators refused to translate the articles in their own corrupt Greek text which they used:”

I have listed the places in the “grossly corrupt” NIV where this occurs, together with the NIV readings:

“Matthew 18:17: THE pagan and THE tax collector; 1 Corinthians 16:12: THE brother; John 16:21: THE joy; Titus 1:9: THE sound doctrine; James 1:15: THE desire, THE sin; James 3:11: THE fresh and THE salt; Hebrews 12:9: THE human fathers plus...Matthew 17:1, 16:13, 15:29, 12:28, 18, 1:2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8; Romans 11:2; Philippians 1:5, 7...”

Dr. Ruckman then lists “Places in the grossly corrupt NASV (and old ASV) where the translators have added articles to suit themselves without regard for any Greek text.”

I have listed the places in the “grossly corrupt” NIV where this occurs:

“Luke 1:17; Acts 10:6 (twice); 1 Corinthians 2:16 (three times); Hebrews 2:12 (twice).”

*The first of our critic’s “wrong inclusions” is in **Daniel 3:25**, where the AV1611 has **“the Son of God”**, in contrast to “a son of the gods”, NIV, JB, NWT. Our critic has ignored the discussion of this verse in Chapter 7, Section 7.2 [...the AV1611 always exalts the Lord Jesus Christ. The modern reading cannot be correct because “a son of the gods” would be a GIANT, Genesis 6:4...]. He has also ignored Proverbs 30:4, which revealed that God had a Son with a special name Genesis 32:29, Judges 13:18, 400 years before the incident in Daniel 3.*

*Our critic attempts to justify the modern perversion by reference to Daniel 3:28. He infers, without saying so, that the reading **“his angel”** in verse 28 refutes the reading **“the Son of God”** in verse 25.*

*Of course it does nothing of the kind but actually reinforces the AV1611 reading. Dr. Ruckman states in his Commentary on Matthew, p 17-18 “The Angel of the Lord occupies a unique position...for the term is found in both Testaments as applying to the Lord Jesus Himself (note Gal. 4:14, Acts 27:23, Gen. 32:27, Jud. 13:18). The word “angelos” is used in classical Greek, as meaning “messenger”; however...In the Bible, it has a definite meaning of “an appearance,” or “apparition,”...Christ Jesus, as a Spirit, has a bodily shape (Gal. 4:19, Phil. 3:10, 1 Cor. 4:15), and this bodily shape is the bodily shape ascribed to HIM; and He is **“the Angel of the Lord.”** An angel is an “appearance,” not merely a “messenger,” as we find it in classical Greek.”*

Dr. Ruckman further states in his Theological Study Book 18, on Angelology p 3: “There are many angels who bring no message at all...You will notice the children’s angels in heaven are not messengers. They are appearances of the children. You will notice the famous angels or powers that represent

Greece and Persia, with whom Michael and Gabriel fought in the Book of Daniel, are not messengers. They are appearances."

In his Commentary on Revelation p 33-34, Dr. Ruckman states: "The meaning that confines the word "angel" to messenger will NOT meet about twenty verses; therefore it should be discarded immediately and ignored...Revelation 2:1 is written to the appearance (angel) of this church; that is, God has before His face (in Heaven) a representative spiritual condition of every local church on the face of this earth."

Obviously then, "his angel" in Daniel 3:28 is an APPEARANCE of the Lord and matches the term "Son of God" in verse 25."

Grievous Wolf could benefit greatly by searching the scriptures, John 5:39, instead of questioning them.

25. *How can anyone accept that the Textus Receptus is perfect and error free when Acts 9:6 is found only in the Latin Vulgate but in absolutely no other Greek manuscript known to man? So, to claim the KJV was translated only from the TR Greek is in itself a lie. Further, how come in Rev 22:19 the phrase "book of life" is used in the KJV when absolutely ALL known Greek manuscripts read "tree of life"? Was this change inspired by God?*

See Question 16 with respect to Grievous Wolf's false dealing and lying Leviticus 19:11 about Revelation 22:19.

Concerning Acts 9:6, Wolf is again manifesting wilful ignorance or he is lying about the sources for Acts 9:6, or both. The following citations reveal that some Greek sources do contain Acts 9:6 as found in the 1611 Holy Bible and that many other sources exist as testimony to Acts 9:6 as found in the 1611 Holy Bible besides Jerome's Vulgate.

Note in passing that Grievous Wolf has failed utterly to produce any authority from scripture in the form of chapter and verse to prove that only Greek witnesses are valid with respect to scriptural texts. Wolf's persistent failure in that respect should be kept in mind when studying all of his 67 questions against the 1611 Holy Bible.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1302983577.pdf for summary information that vindicates the inclusion of Acts 9:6 in the 1611 Holy Bible.

*Dr Thomas Holland has this analysis of Acts 9:6 from His book *Crowned With Glory* pp 159-160.*

See also sovereignword.org/?series=dr-thomas-holland-crowned-with-glory Chapter 8 Textual Considerations.

The passage from verse six that reads, "And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him" is in the Old Latin, the Latin Vulgate, and some of the Old Syrian and Coptic versions. These phrases, however, are not found in the vast majority of Greek manuscripts and therefore do not appear in either the Critical Text or the Majority Text. Yet, they are included in the Textus Receptus. On the surface the textual evidence looks weak. Why, then, should the Textus Receptus be accepted over the majority of Greek witnesses at this point? Because the phrases are preserved in other languages, and the internal evidence establishes that Christ in fact spoke these words at the time of Paul's conversion and are therefore authentic.

Acts chapter nine is not the only place in Scripture where the conversion of Paul is established. In Acts 22:10 and 26:14 we have the testimony of the Apostle himself. There, in all Greek texts, the phrases in question appear.

Acts 22:10 - "And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do."

Acts 26:14 - "And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying in the Hebrew tongue, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks."

When the apostle Paul recounts his conversion he cites the words in question. It is certain that the Holy Spirit inspired these words which should be included at Acts 9:5-6. We must conclude that these words were spoken when the event originally occurred. Although they have not been preserved in the Greek

manuscripts at Acts 9:6, they have been preserved in the Latin manuscripts (ar, c, h, l, p, ph, t) as well as other translations (Georgian, Slavonic, Ethiopic). The greatest textual critic of all, the Holy Spirit, bears witness to their authenticity by including them in Acts 22:10 and 26:14.

Will Kinney has these comments with respect to the witnesses in favour of the inclusion of Acts 9:6 in both the 1611 Holy Bible and editions of the Received Text.

See brandplucked.webs.com/acts957hear720excee.htm.

Regarding the second longer part of this verse, according to Jack Moorman's book When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text, all these words are found in the Textus Receptus, the Old Latin translation dating from 150 AD (ar, c, h, l, p, ph, t), the Clementine Vulgate, one Arabic version, the Ethiopic version, Armenian, Slavonic, and the ancient Georgian version of the 5th century. It is also quoted by the church Fathers of Hilary 367, Ambrose 397, Ephraem 373, and Lucifer in 370.

...The Greek manuscripts of the uncial E and the cursive of 431 contain all these words as found in the KJB but they are placed at the end of verse 4 instead of in verse 6, and so read the Syriac Peshitta translations of Lamsa 1936 and James Murdock 1858.

The verses stand as they are in the King James Bible, Wycliffe 1395, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, the Great Bible, Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599...

The Greek text of Stephanus in 1550 as well as the Spanish Sagradas Escrituras Versión Antigua of 1569 both read exactly as the text of the King James Bible. These men obviously had access in their day to underlying Greek texts which we no longer possess. Stephanus amassed a good number of manuscripts to compile his Greek edition. He makes reference to Greek manuscripts that we no longer possess today...

In summary, the words in question by many modern versionists are found among a cluster of divergent readings (as is very often the case). They are found in a few remaining Greek manuscripts, many compiled Greek texts (Ten listed), several ancient versions (the Old Latin existed long before Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were penned), quoted by several early church fathers, and are found in many different Bible translations, both old and new, throughout the entire world, including the Modern Greek version used in all Greek Orthodox churches today.

See also *Hazardous Materials* by Dr Mrs Riplinger, Chapter 20 and p 760 on Acts 9:5, 6, with respect to her revelations on how what is now the Greek Orthodox Church, steeped in heresy, cut out numerous important readings from what is now the majority of Greek manuscripts, of which it is the main custodian. God nevertheless preserved those readings elsewhere. In particular, see below with respect to Question 26 and 1 John 5:7 that Wolf ignorantly refers to as "the second half of 1 Jn 5:8."

It is of course significant that among the witnesses in favour of Acts 9:6 are the faithful pre-1611 Bibles that God used to bring in the 16th century English Protestant Reformation, the crowning achievement of which was and is the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible.

Grievous Wolf appears to be as clueless about God's hand in history as he is about God's Book in the hands of His servants.

26. *How can we trust the TR to be 100% error free when the second half of 1 Jn 5:8 are [sic] found only in the Latin Vulgate and a Greek manuscript written in Oxford about 1520 by a Catholic Franciscan friar named Froy (or Roy), who took the disputed words from the Latin Vulgate and inserted the trinity again into the KJV. Once again, a text that did not come from the Greek TR at all. Was this interpolation inspired by God?*

Wolf is lying again. For example, Berry's Edition of Stephanus's 1550 Received Text Edition contains 1 John 5:7, 8 as found in the 1611 Holy Bible. 1 John 5:7, 8 as found in the 1611 Holy Bible appears in all editions of the Received Text since Erasmus inserted it into his 3rd Edition in 1522. See *The King James Version Defended* by Dr Edward F. Hills p 209.

See also wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html.

No Franciscan friar worked on the 1611 Holy Bible. In *The Men Behind the KJV*, p 29, Gustavus Paine states:

“There were among [the translators] no Roman Catholics, Jews or women. They were male Protestants, roughly or smoothly within the Church of England...”

Paine lists the 47 translators assigned to the translating committees for the 1611 Holy Bible plus 10 others who contributed to the work, such as Thomas Bilson, editor, in Appendix 1 of his book, pp 184-185. No-one named Froy, or Roy, appears among them or in the index to Paine’s book.

Moreover, Wolf has given a wrong reference. The second half of 1 John 5:8 is not the main disputed passage, as the following comparison shows. The underlined words are either cut out, NIV/TNIV, or disputed, NKJV, by the modern versions.

The 1611 Holy Bible states:

“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.

“And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one” 1 John 5:8.

The NIV states:

“For there are three that testify:” 1 John 5:7.

“the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement” 1 John 5:8.

By inspection, it is the second half of 1 John 5:7 that contains most, i.e. 15, of the 19 words in dispute, not that of 1 John 5:8. Grievous Wolf did not check the reference.

The validity of 1 John 5:7, 8 as found in the 1611 Holy Bible is described in detail in the article *James White’s 7 Errors* pp 10-17. See www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1309647419.pdf.

A further summary of the validity of 1 John 5:7, 8 as found in the 1611 Holy Bible may be found in *Curley the Bible Corrector, Part 3*, www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1302983577.pdf.

Both the above references contain a summary explanation of why the disputed words are missing from most Greek manuscripts that contain 1 John. Dr Mrs Riplinger’s succinct explanation contains the essential points and reads as follows, from *Hazardous Materials* p 750, noting that it was those that are now known as Greek Orthodox monks who refused to copy 1 John 5:7, 8 into their manuscripts.

“Controversies about the nature of the Godhead have abounded throughout history. The Greeks who worshipped the gods of mythology and the “UNKNOWN” God, recoiled at a verse which describes the Godhead, then concludes, “This is the true God...” (Acts 17:23, 1 John 5:20). The weak Greek monks caved in and simply omitted the verse which stirred the antagonism of unbelievers.”

Two other most informative sites are:

And These Three Are One by Will Kinney, brandplucked.webs.com/1john57.htm

The Johannine Comma (1 John 5:7) by Martin A. Shue, www.avdefense.webs.com/1John5-7.html

The following material is from Bro. Kinney’s site, his emphases, showing in detail that Wolf is lying about the witnesses for 1 John 5:7, 8.

Concerning the supposed origin of 1 John 5:7, 8 in the Vulgate that Wolf, implies, Bro. Kinney has this statement from his colleague, researcher Tim Dunkin.

“...we see that Jerome specifically mentioned that this verse was being removed from Greek manuscripts in his day. Logically, we can suppose that for him to recognize the absence of this verse as an omission from the Greek texts, he must have been aware of Greek manuscripts which contained the Comma in the time of his preparation of the Vulgate for the general epistles (395-400 AD), a time much earlier than is suggested by the dating of currently known Comma-containing Greek mss...”

Bro. Kinney continues with respect to early witnesses for 1 John 5:7, 8, several of which by inspection pre-date Jerome's *Vulgate*.

It is sometimes erroneously asserted [e.g. by the likes of Grievous Wolf] that this text originated close to the time of Erasmus. However, even the UBS Greek NT (4th ed.) notes that the "comma" is attested by the Latin church fathers (**Cyprian**) (d. 258), (**Pseudo-Cyprian**) (4th century), (**Priscillian**) (d. 385), the **Speculum** (5th century), **Varimadum** (UBS date "445/480"), **Pseudo-Vigilius** (4th or 5th century), and **Fulgentius** (d. 533), as well as a few manuscripts. And these notes are found in the very Greek editions of those who oppose its inclusion in the New Testament!

Bro. Kinney states further, with respect to the manuscript that Erasmus is supposed to have used for 1 John 5:7, 8, to which Wolf indirectly refers and a summary of the manuscript evidence for 1 John 5:7, 8.

Another very common objection to 1 John 5:7 is the allegation that Erasmus said he would include the verse if he found a Greek manuscript that contained it. Then almost made to order, hot off the presses, one appeared.

Bruce Metzger who was partly responsible for propagating this urban myth at least had the integrity to retract this false accusation in the 3rd edition of his book. Here is the exact quote from Mr. Metzger himself.

"What is said on p. 101 above about Erasmus' promise to include the Comma Johanneum if one Greek manuscript were found that contained it, and his subsequent suspicion that MS 61 was written expressly to force him to do so, needs to be corrected in the light of the research of H. J. DeJonge, a specialist in Erasmusian studies who finds no explicit evidence that supports this frequently made assertion." Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of The New Testament*, 3rd Edition, p 291 fn 2.

What then is the evidence for 1 John 5:7? It is found in several Greek texts; it is quoted by several church fathers and is found in many ancient versions of the Bible. Although not found in most Greek manuscripts, the Johannine Comma is found in several. It is contained in 629 (fourteenth century), 61 (sixteenth century), 918 (sixteenth century), 2473 (seventeenth century), and 2318 (eighteenth century). It is also in the margins of 221 (tenth century), 635 (eleventh century), 88 (twelfth century), 429 (fourteenth century), and 636 (fifteenth century). It was part of the text of the Old Latin Bible that was translated in the second century, as it witnessed by some remaining copies that we have today. It is found in "r", a 5th century Old Latin manuscript, "q", a 5th to 7th century O.L. mss, and "l" another 5th century O.L. mss. and in a confession of faith drawn up by Eusebius, Bishop of Carthage, in 415.

Note that Bro. Kinney lists 6 Greek manuscripts that bear witness to 1 John 5:7, 8 as found in the 1611 Holy Bible that pre-date the 16th century copy to which Grievous Wolf refers. The Old Latin witnesses to 1 John 5:7, 8 are particularly significant because they faithfully preserve a very ancient text, as Bro. Kinney also notes.

Now the "Waldensian," or "Vaudois" Bibles stretch from about 157 to the 1400s A.D. The fact is, according to John Calvin's successor Theodore Beza, that the Vaudois received the Scriptures from missionaries of Antioch of Syria in the 120s A.D. and finished translating it into their Latin language by 157 AD. This Bible was passed down from generation, until the Reformation of the 1500s, when the Protestants translated the Vaudois Bible into French, Italian, etc. This Bible carries heavy weight when finding out what God really said. Theodore Beza, John Wesley and Jonathan Edwards believed, as most of the Reformers, that the Vaudois were the descendants of the true Christians, and that they preserved the Christian faith for the Bible-believing Christians today.

Concerning the manuscript to which Wolf refers but doesn't identify, Dr Ruckman has this insightful comment cited in this writer's earlier work, *"O Biblios"* – The Book p 321, from Dr Ruckman's booklet 1 John 5:7. See p 250 of the uploaded file, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.

See also James White's 7 Errors p 16.

"How about that Manuscript 61 at Dublin?"

"Well, according to Professor Michaelis (cited in Prof. Armin Panning's "New Testament Criticism"), Manuscript 61 has four chapters in Mark that possess three coincidences with Old Syriac, two of which

also agree with the Old Itala: ALL READINGS DIFFER FROM EVERY GREEK MANUSCRIPT EX-TANT IN ANY FAMILY. The Old Itala was written long before 200 A.D., and the Old Syriac dates from before 170 (Tatian's Diatessaron).

"Manuscript 61 was supposed to have been written between 1519 and 1522; the question becomes us, "FROM WHAT?" Not from Ximenes's Polyglot - his wasn't out yet. Not from Erasmus, for it doesn't match his "Greek" in many places. The literal affinities of Manuscript 61 are with the SYRIAC (Acts 11:26), and that version WAS NOT KNOWN IN EUROPE UNTIL 1552 (Moses Mardin)."

The manuscript to which Grievous Wolf refers clearly cannot have been the forgery that he tries to imply that it is. He himself is the forger, like the **"many, which corrupt the word of God:"** 2 Corinthians 2:17, from Paul's day down to this.

27. How can anyone explain the grammatical error in the original 1611 KJV in Isa 6:2 where the translators made a rare grammatical error by using the incorrect plural form of "seraphims" rather than "seraphim"? Was this error inspired by God?

Wolf's question is quite simply answered on this site, www.kjvtoday.com/home/seraphims-or-seraphim-in-isaiah-62-et-al, showing yet again that it is not the 1611 Holy Bible but Grievous Wolf that is in error.

Critics claim that "Seraphim" is already plural in Hebrew and that adding an "s" at the end is grammatically incorrect. However, "Seraphim" is a foreign word that was imported into English. Foreign rules of grammar do not apply to words that are imported into English. For example, the Latin plural form of "factum" is "facta." However, an appropriate plural form of "factum" in English is "factums" (Oxford English Dictionary). Chinese and Japanese nouns do not have plural forms. Thus a Chinese word such as "wonton" and the Japanese word "ninja" do not need suffixes to become plural in their respective languages. However, it is common and acceptable for English speakers to add the "s" after these words to make them plural. Creating a plural form that ends with an "s" for an imported word may be preferable since English readers may not be familiar with foreign grammar.

28. Must we possess a perfectly flawless bible translation in order to call it "the word of God"? If so, how do we know "it" is perfect? If not, why do some "limit" "the word of God" to only ONE "17th Century English" translation? Where was "the word of God" prior to 1611? Did our Pilgrim Fathers have "the word of God" when they brought the GENEVA BIBLE translation with them to North America? Was this not the Word of God to them?

Note again Wolf's incorrect use of the term "Word" instead of "word." See Question 20.

Re: "Must we possess a perfectly flawless bible translation in order to call it "the word of God"?"

Yes, even if it takes seven purifications, Psalm 12:6, 7. Paul gives the reason in Ephesians 4:14 **"That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive;"** like Grievous Wolf.

As David emphasises in Psalm 19:7 **"The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple"** in order to head off **"the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness"** of the likes of Grievous Wolf.

Re: "how do we know "it" is perfect?"

The 1611 Holy Bible is known to be perfect because God has not convened another English Bible translation committee since the year 1611. The 1611 Authorized Bible was the last English Bible to be translated under the direct authority of a king, according to God's perfection principle as set out in Ecclesiastes 8:4.

"Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou?"

Benjamin Wilkinson states that the committee that produced the Revised Version of 1881 appealed twice to the Crown in order to get royal approval for their new version, as for the 1611 Bible.

Queen Victoria refused each time.

See *Which Bible?* edited by Dr David Otis Fuller, 5th Edition, Grand Rapids International Publications, p 286, kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-10.html.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 560ff, her emphases ““Seven” times “they purge...and purify it...” (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. The KJV translators did **not** see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations. They wanted their Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, ‘It is good, **except** this word or **that** word...’ They planned [as stated in *The Translators to The Reader*, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm]:

““...to make...out of many good ones [Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’], one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark.”

“The “mark” to which the KJV translators strove was to retain and polish the “perfection of the scriptures” seen in earlier editions. Tyndale himself said of his own edition... “count it as a thing not having his full shape...a thing begun rather than finished...to seek in certain places more proper English” ...

“The KJV translators wrote of their final “perfected” work [The Translators to The Reader],

““Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and perfited [perfected] at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser: so, if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, do endeavor to make that better which they left so good; no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike us; they, we persuade ourselves, if they were alive, would thank us...the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished...””

The King James translators wrote in conclusion to their work:

“Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines [Genesis 26:15], neither prefer broken pits before them with the wicked Jews [Jeremiah 2:13]. Others have laboured, and you may enter into their labours; O receive not so great things in vain, O despise not so great salvation!...a blessed thing it is, and will bring us to everlasting blessedness in the end, when God speaketh unto us, to hearken; when he setteth his word before us, to read it; when he stretcheth out his hand and calleth, to answer, Here am I, here we are to do thy will, O God. The Lord work a care and conscience in us to know him and serve him, that we may be acknowledged of him at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom with the holy Ghost, be all praise and thanksgiving. Amen.”

That is how “we know” that the 1611 Holy Bible is perfect, even if no ‘originals-onlyist’ like Grievous Wolf ever would.

- It was the last stage of purification for “**the scripture of truth**” Daniel 10:21 in English.
- It was the last English Bible to be translated under a king, Ecclesiastes 8:4.
- It was the last English Bible to be authorized by the universal acceptance of the English-speaking peoples across the world.

In that last respect, Gustavus Paine writes in *The Men Behind the KJV* p 163, “*The Puritans fought their way forward. The 1611 Bible by its own worth was making itself welcome throughout the country, for those on both sides needed the best modern texts with which to fight their doctrinal skirmishes. High churchmen in greater numbers began to use the 1611 version, which in centuries to come would be the sole bond uniting the countless English-speaking Protestant sects.*

“In 1629 the Bible was again revised, but only in small ways, and once more in minor respects in 1638. The last issue of the Geneva Bible was in 1644. By then the King James Version was ahead of all others, and now the strife over forms and doctrine helped it on.”

Alexander McClure in *Translators Revived* writes, p 60, “It (the AV1611) speedily came into general use as the standard version, by the common consent of the English people; and required no act of parliament nor royal proclamation to establish its authority. Some of the older versions continued to be reprinted for forty years; but no long time elapsed ere the common version quietly and exclusively occupied the field.”

In answer to Grievous Wolf's question "*why do some "limit" "the word of God" to only ONE "17th Century English" translation?*" it should be emphasised that God and "*the common consent of the English people*" authorized the 1611 Holy Bible as "*the standard version*" such that "*no long time elapsed ere the common version quietly and exclusively occupied the field.*" It remains "*the standard version*" as Pastor J. A. Moorman's comment in *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text* p 28 shows. Dr Moorman is addressing 'minority' readings in the AV1611 but his comments apply to *all* AV1611* readings. *The 2011 AV1611 readings that God continues to honour.

"When a version has been the standard as long as the Authorized Version, and when that version has demonstrated its power in the conversion of sinners, building up of believers, sending forth of preachers and missionaries on a scale not achieved by all other versions and foreign language editions combined; the hand of God is at work. Such a version must not be tampered with. And in those comparatively few places where it seems to depart from the majority reading [or from however many supposedly 'improved' readings], it would be far more honouring toward God's promises of preservation to believe that the Greek and not the English had strayed from the original!"

Grievous Wolf complains about what he terms "*ONE "17th Century English" translation.*"

Would Wolf prefer more than one Saviour? God says no.

"I, even I, am the LORD; and beside me there is no saviour" Isaiah 43:11.

Would Wolf prefer more than one God? God says no.

"Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me," Isaiah 46:9.

Would Wolf prefer more than one Mediator? God says no.

"For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;" 1 Timothy 2:5.

Would Wolf prefer more than one sacrifice for sins forever? God says no.

"But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God;" Hebrews 10:12.

Would Wolf prefer more than one body, one Spirit, one hope 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17, one Lord, one faith, one baptism into Jesus Christ, Romans 6:3, one God and Father of all? God says no.

"There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; One Lord, one faith, one baptism, One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all" Ephesians 4:4-6. Note the seven-fold aspects of God's manifold blessing in Ephesians 4:4-6, like "*the seven spirits of God*" Revelation 3:1, 4:5, 5:6. See also Isaiah 11:2.

It should also be noted that the 1611 Holy Bible is not a "*"17th Century English" translation*" i.e. limited to 17th century English as Wolf tries to imply. Dr Hills's remarks on the supposed "*"17th Century English" translation*" are informative. See *The King James Version Defended* p 218, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html.

"The English of the King James Version is not the English of the early 17th century. To be exact, it is not a type of English that was ever spoken anywhere. It is biblical English, which was not used on ordinary occasions even by the translators who produced the King James Version. As H. Wheeler Robinson (1940) pointed out, one need only compare the preface written by the translators with the text of their translation to feel the difference in style. And the observations of W. A. Irwin (1952) are to the same purport. The King James Version, he reminds us, owes its merit, not to 17th-century English — which was very different — but to its faithful translation of the original. Its style is that of the Hebrew and of the New Testament Greek. Even in their use of thee and thou the translators were not following 17th-century English usage but biblical usage, for at the time these translators were doing their work these singular forms had already been replaced by the plural you in polite conversation."

Concerning "*"the word of God" prior to 1611,*" see Question 6 with reference to "*the Spanish Valera 1602 Purificada*" that Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions. See also Dr Ruckman's summary in *The Christian's*

Handbook of Biblical Scholarship pp 110-117, with respect to 16th century bibles beginning with Luther's Bible that were followed by translations from Luther's text into Dutch, Danish, Icelandic, Slavic, Croatian, Hungarian, Polish, Finnish, Lithuanian etc. To those may be added the Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Taverner, Great, Geneva and Bishops' Bibles. Whatever refinements those texts were in need of according to Psalm 12:6, 7 and which would be addressed by the King James translators for the 1611 Holy Bible, God used the pre-1611 Bibles to bring in the Protestant Reformation, including the 16th century English Protestant Reformation. God's use of the 16th century Bibles was at least as outstanding in church history as His direct use of the originals and Grievous Wolf cannot show otherwise.

Dr Ruckman succinctly answers the question "*Where was 'the word of God' prior to 1611?*" as follows: "*All over the continent!*"

See also Dr Mrs Riplinger's extremely detailed Parts 5, 6 of *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 523-919 inclusive i.e. almost 400 pages, on the history of the pre-1611 bibles and the 1611 Holy Bible itself, with respect to its faithful forebears that display many of its readings from which modern versions depart. Dr Mrs Riplinger documents scores of such readings.

She also lists on p 33 of *In Awe of Thy Word*, in the preview of Part 5 of her book "*the English Bible's seven purifications*" and documents *why* the pre-1611 bibles were the faithful precursors to the 1611 Holy Bible and how God used them but also how and why the 1611 Holy Bible is the *final* stage of God's purification of "*the words of the LORD*" Psalm 12:6. See Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks above from *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 560ff.

- The Gothic
- The Anglo-Saxon
- The Pre-Wycliffe
- The Wycliffe
- The Tyndale/Coverdale/Great/Geneva
- The Bishops'
- The King James Bible

Will Kinney's article *Where was the word of God before 1611 and where is it today?* is also extremely informative and detailed. See brandplucked.webs.com/wordofgodbefore1611.htm.

Concerning the Geneva Bible and the Pilgrim Fathers, see the remarks by Paine and McClure above and note also from the remarks above that the Geneva Bible was a genuine stage in the purification of "*the words of the LORD*" that was brought to perfection by means of the 1611 Holy Bible that superseded the Geneva Bible. Dr William P. Grady explains in his informative book *Given By Inspiration* p 17, his emphases, that "...*the KEY which opened the door to America's unparalleled religious liberty was a JEWISH KEY. Though Plymouth Rock may have been built on a Geneva Bible, it was a King James Bible that [President] Andy Jackson pointed to when he exclaimed from his death bed – "That Book, Sir, is 'The Rock' upon which our Republic rests."* The English name "James" is a transliteration of the Greek name Jacobos, which in turn is a transliteration of the Hebrew name Yaakov for "Jacob."

Anyone who has any knowledge of the processing and manufacturing industries understands that finished products, e.g. premium grade petrol, are brought forth by means of successive stages with an intermediate product emerging from each stage such that it is 'perfect' in order to proceed to the next stage of processing or manufacturing. Many household commodities and consumables are produced in that fashion. Grievous Wolf is evidently not very domesticated.

Contrary to Grievous Wolf's insinuation, the demand in the early American colonies was not for the Geneva Bible but for the 1611 Holy Bible.

This site, www.greatsite.com/timeline-english-bible-history/colonial-bibles.html states that "*In the early 1600's, the Geneva Bible became the first Bible to be taken across the Atlantic to America. It was, however, never printed in America.*"

The site goes on to explain that *“It was quite late in Colonial American history when the first English language Bible was printed in America, 1782 to be exact. Prior to this, English language Bibles were often available in the colonies, but they had to be imported from England. Not only was it financially more feasible to import English language Bibles rather than produce them, but there was also the legal issue of the fact that the “King James Version” of the Bible was still arguably the “copyright” of the English Crown, since “public domain” laws were not yet commonplace. Still, demand for Bibles was exceeding supply, particularly since England was keeping an import-export embargo against the rebellious colonists due to the Revolutionary War. American pride and independence was also on the line.”*

Although about 500 Catholic Bibles were printed in the US in 1790, very little demand for them existed. The demand was overwhelmingly for the 1611 Holy Bible, as the site shows. It lists the early King James Bible publishers in the US; Robert Aitken, William Young, Isaac Collins, Isaiah Thomas, Jacob Berriman and John Thompson, who sought to meet the public demand for Bibles in the years of the English embargo after the Revolutionary War.

“On January 21, 1781, Robert Aitken petitioned the United States Congress to authorize, and if possible even fund, the printing of a complete Bible in the English language of the King James Version. On September 10, 1782, Aitken received authorization from the United States Congress to commence his American printing of the Bible in English. This is the only instance in history of the U.S. Congress authorizing the printing of a Bible. In subsequent years, that session was often mockingly referred to as “The Bible Congress.” Thus, in 1782, Robert Aitken produced the first English language Bible printed in America. In 1783, George Washington wrote a letter commending Robert Aitken for his Bible. The Robert Aitken Bible is known as the “Bible of the American Revolution” and it remains the most rare and valuable of early American English Bibles.

“...in 1790, Philadelphia printer William Young produced a press-run of likely not more than a few hundred copies of a very small coat-pocket sized King James Version Bible. This was the first American Bible to be printed together with a Psalter. It was marketed as a “school edition” for students. William Young’s Bible is also unspeakably rare today.

“In 1789, Collins announced his proposal to publish the entire Bible (KJV) if he could obtain a 25% deposit from at least 3,000 subscribers. By 1791, he had produced 5,000 copies of the first Bible printed in New Jersey. Due to its fairly large size and clear type, unlike all the small coat-pocket American Bibles and New Testaments that had come before it, the 1791 Isaac Collins Bible became known as the first “Family Bible” printed in America...The 1791 Isaac Collins Bible served as the standard of excellence and the prototype for many American Bibles for the next 110 years. Though 5,000 copies were originally printed, fewer than 100 are known to exist today.

“Isaiah Thomas was one of the most successful printers in Colonial America. He published a newspaper called “The Massachusetts Spy” in which he supported the cause of the colonists. During the Revolutionary War, Thomas moved his presses to Worcester, Massachusetts. There, in 1791, Isaiah Thomas published the first illustrated Bibles printed in America. (Many historians believe that his production was completed just days after Isaac Collins completed his Bibles that same year). Thomas produced his 1791 Bibles (KJV) in two forms: a large folio of two volumes, and a smaller but still quite large, royal quarto of one volume.

“In 1796, Jacob Berriman of Philadelphia published what may be called the first “single volume illustrated tall folio” (KJV) Bible printed in America. Long prized by collectors of Colonial American Bibles, this printing features excellent examples of the work done by several American engravers of the 1700’s. It is a work of exceptional beauty.

“In November of 1798, John Thompson, also of Philadelphia, produced the first Bible ever to be “hot-pressed” in America (KJV). This printing technique helped to sear the ink clearly into the paper with heat. It was a huge pulpit folio, printed in two volumes...the largest Bible printed in America up until that time. The Thompson Hot-Press Bible remains an extremely rare collectors’ item.”

Melvyn Bragg in *The Book of Books* pp 53-54, 142 says of the Pilgrim Fathers that *“It is likely that most of them took the Geneva Bible...[but] the King James Version took over...The Geneva Bible was the Bible first taken to America, and...it soon became supplanted by the King James Version.”*

Gordon Campbell in *Bible* p 152 states that when the import-export embargo was eventually lifted, “*Thereafter KJVs imported from England dominated the market*” such that American Bible publishers suffered, Robert Aitkin, for example, going bankrupt. In 1816, the American Bible Society decided to publish its own standard text (“*American pride and independence*” possibly still “*on the line*”) which after a lengthy hiatus it did in 1856 but this text did not displace other editions such as the Cambridge Standard Text, as found in the Cambridge Cameo Edition. However, these editions were still *the same Book*, such that Campbell states, p 170, that “*the KJV remains...the most widely owned and used translation in the United States, and the same may be true in Britain.*”

Professor Campbell’s view may be optimistic with respect to the UK but it is clear from his researches and those of the other authors cited above that the Geneva Bible was rapidly and totally eclipsed by the 1611 Holy Bible in the United States, which became central to the nation’s life even in, or indeed especially in, the new nation’s greatest time of trial. Melvyn Bragg has two extensive chapters on the profound influence of the 1611 Holy Bible on both sides of the conflict during the American Civil War 1861-1865, during which, according to Derek Wilson in *The People’s Bible* p 149 “*1.5 million copies of the King James Version were given to Unionist soldiers and 300,000 to Confederate troops.*”

American Bible believers clearly knew what “*“the word of God”*” was for those “*troubled times*” Daniel 9:25 and they know what it is today, even if Grievous Wolf does not.

Finally, observe God’s instructions to Noah to “**make thee an ark of gopher wood**” Genesis 6:14, His instructions to Moses to “**make me a sanctuary**” Exodus 25:8, His instructions to Paul “**to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee;**” Acts 26:16 and God’s steps in creation according to Exodus 20:11.

“For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.”

Note further 1 Kings 6:37-38.

“In the fourth year was the foundation of the house of the LORD laid, in the month Zif: And in the eleventh year, in the month Bul, which is the eighth month, was the house finished throughout all the parts thereof, and according to all the fashion of it. So was he seven years in building it.”

Solomon took a total of eleven years to complete “*the house of the LORD*” of which four years were occupied in laying the foundations. Completion of “*the house of the LORD*” was itself clearly a stage-wise process.

Observe the Lord’s steps in the establishment of the church “**built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone;**” Ephesians 2:20.

Observe the Lord’s steps in the writing of the scriptures themselves, with respect to “**all things...which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms**” Luke 24:44 that became “*the old testament*” 2 Corinthians 3:14 that was followed by “*the new testament*” 2 Corinthians 3:6, including that which “**Paul hath written unto you; As also in all his epistles**” 2 Peter 3:15-16.

Each one of the projects cited above was accomplished in stages and the King James translators said of their work in *The Translators to the Reader* that, this writer’s emphases, “*Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and perfected at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser: so, if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, do endeavor to make that better which they left so good; no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike us; they, we persuade ourselves, if they were alive, would thank us.*”

If thus “*saith the scripture*” Romans 4:3, Galatians 4:30 about God’s stage-wise processes with respect to the creation, the ark, the tabernacle, Solomon’s temple, the apostolic ministry, the church and the scriptures themselves, including the *English Bible*, just who is Grievous Wolf to question God’s stage-wise process with respect to “*the book of life*” Revelation 3:5?

Grievous Wolf should give careful consideration to 1 Samuel 2:3.

“Talk no more so exceeding proudly; let not arrogancy come out of your mouth: for the LORD is a God of knowledge, and by him actions are weighed.”

29. *Were the KJV translators inspired by God when they admitted themselves that other preceding translations were still to be considered “the word of God”, they were just working on an English translation of those other versions and translations?*

2 Timothy 3:16 states “**all scripture is given by inspiration of God**” not “all translators.” Grievous Wolf can’t read simple English. For the remainder of Question 29, see in answer Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement under Question 28 from *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 560ff, her emphases ““Seven” times “they purge...and purify it...” (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. The KJV translators did **not** see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations.”

See also the detailed remarks under Question 28 with respect to the seven-fold purification of the scriptures, including the contribution to that purification process of the pre-1611 English Bibles, as for example Dr Mrs Riplinger sets out on p 33 and in Parts 5, 6 of *In Awe of Thy Word*.

See also the scriptural examples listed under Question 28 with respect to “**What God hath wrought!**” Number 23:23 but “**in process of time**” Exodus 2:23, not like that “**which came up in a night**” Jonah 4:10.

30. *Do you believe that the Hebrew and Greek used for the KJV are “the word of God”?*

Dr Laurence Vance has shown in *The Bible Believer’s Bulletin*, February 2003, June 2006 how Psalm 12:6, 7 was fulfilled in the broad sweep of history by means of:

- A received Hebrew text, 1800 BC to 389 BC
- A received Aramaic text at the same time (Genesis, Daniel, etc.)
- A received Greek text from AD 40 to AD 90
- A received Syrian text from AD 120 to AD 200
- A received Latin text from AD 150 to AD 1500
- A received German text from AD 1500 to AD 2006
- A received English text from AD 1611 to AD 2006 (2011+)

That analysis would satisfy a genuine Bible believer, although it may not satisfy Grievous Wolf.

31. *Are you aware that the Hebrew and Greek texts themselves are not pure and errors have been found in both the Hebrew texts and the Septuagint Greek version? How then can underlying the KJV with the errors in these texts be considered inspired by God?*

It is up to Grievous Wolf to point out these errors and to show where they occur in the 1611 Holy Bible, if he thinks he can do so. He has failed to do so for Question 31.

Dr Laurence Vance in *King James His Bible and Its Translators* pp 40-41 identifies the published Hebrew and Greek source materials that the King James translators used. They included the Soncino, Bomberg, Pratensis, ben Chayim and Stephanus Hebrew Old Testaments together with the Complutensian, Antwerp and Nuremberg Polyglot Bibles containing all or part of the Hebrew Old Testament* and the Greek New Testament Editions of Erasmus, Colinaeus, Stephanus and Beza.

*The Nuremberg Polyglot contains only the Books of Genesis to Ruth plus the Psalms. See www.ccel.org/s/schaff/encyc/encyc02/htm/iv.v.lxix.htm.

Those are the published sources that Grievous Wolf must access in order to identify the errors that he thinks they contain that were carried over into the 1611 Holy Bible. He has not done so. On his site he charges the 1611 Holy Bible with error in Exodus 20:13, 32:14, Leviticus 6:21, 8:28, 17:6, 23:18, 1 Samuel 10:24, 2 Samuel 16:16, 1 Kings 1:25, 20:38, Isaiah 14:12, Jeremiah 18:8, 10, Amos 7:6, Jonah 3:10, Luke 18:12, Acts 2:38, 12:4, 19:37, 22:16, Romans 3:4, 6, 31, 6:2, 15, 7:7, 13, 9:14, 11:1, 13, 1 Corinthians 6:15, Galatians 2:17, 3:21, 24, 6:14, James 2:3, 36 verses in all*.

*Grievous Wolf’s so-called errors in the 1611 Holy Bible will be answered in a later compilation, D.V.

However, he does not state how any of those verses are in error in the published Hebrew and Greek sources listed above such that those errors were then carried over into the 1611 Holy Bible. That is a

most slovenly oversight on Grievous Wolf's part, considering the gravity of the accusation that he has, in effect, made against the King's men and their work. As Solomon rightly states in Proverbs 26:16:

"The sluggard is wiser in his own conceit than seven men that can render a reason."

If Wolf is genuinely interested in identifying the errors in *currently* available Greek and Hebrew texts that are being touted as 'the' Greek texts that either underlie or 'improve' the wording of the 1611 Holy Bible or both, he should check *Hazardous Materials* by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger, one that can ***"render a reason,"*** Chapter 18 *"The Trinitarian Bible Society's Little Leaven: Scrivener's Greek Textus Receptus,"* Chapter 19 *"Very Wary of George Ricker Berry,"* Chapter 20 *"The Wobbly Unorthodox Greek Orthodox Crutch,"* Chapter 27 *"Hebrew Old Testament Critical Texts,"* Chapter 28 *"Hebrew Masoretic Old Testament Non-Authoritative Texts."*

Note that Sister Riplinger and her research have been viciously attacked by the 'originals-onlyists' of the Dean Burgon Society. Their attack is in the process of being answered separately.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has documented 54 verses in Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* with readings that depart from the KJB New Testament in Scrivener's text that show that it is *not* ***"The exact Greek text underlying the King James Bible,"*** although it is claimed to be. Bro. Peter Heisey, missionary to Romanian Gypsies, has studied many of these 54 departures and documented a further 10, making 64 verses in all where Scrivener departs from the KJB New Testament. Dr Mrs Riplinger has stressed that a full collation of Scrivener's text against the KJB New Testament has yet to be carried out. See *Hazardous Materials* pp 654-677.

It should be noted in passing that Dr Mrs Riplinger's list includes 24 verses, noted with an asterisk * in *Hazardous Materials*, which Scrivener claimed came from Latin sources but for which Greek textual evidence is readily available. Dr Mrs Riplinger explains on p 653 of *Hazardous Materials* that these 24 verses are among 59 verses where Scrivener followed Beza's final edition of 1598 against the King James New Testament.

*"Scrivener pretends that the KJB readings in the following verses are not 'the' original. Therefore Scrivener's is not the "exact" "Originall Greeke" text that underlies the KJB in the following verses. The following analysis of 52 verses from Scrivener's list of 59 so-called Latin-based KJB readings, including 24 instances (noted with a *) where Greek textual evidence was easily available, even in my office, to contravene Scrivener's list. His text is no more valid than any other Greek edition of the Textus Receptus which misrepresents these 24 verses. Most are not debatable at all..."*

The 64 verses are as follows, in order as they are found in *Hazardous Materials* for Dr Mrs Riplinger's list, followed by Bro. Heisey's references that are in addition to those in Dr Mrs Riplinger's list, an asterisk * denoting a verse included in both collations.

Matthew 12:24*, 27*, Mark 3:22*, Luke 11:15*, 18*, 19*, Mark 13:37, 14:43*, Luke 1:35, 49, 23:34, 46, John 7:9, 10:16*, 12:26, 18:1, Acts 2:22, 4:32, 6:3*, 7:26*, 44, 10:20, 13:1, 15, 17:30, 19:20*, 23:15, 24:25, Romans 16:4, 1 Corinthians 13:1, Colossians 1:4, 1 Thessalonians 2:16, Acts 26:6*, 1 Corinthians 16:23, Galatians 4:15*, Ephesians 6:24*, Philippians 2:21, Colossians 1:24, 1 Thessalonians 2:12*, 13, 1 Timothy 1:17, 3:15, 4:15*, 2 Timothy 1:18*, James 3:14, 1 Peter 2:13, 1 John 3:20*, 5:8, 2 John 3*, Revelation 13:10, 16:11, 17:9, 18:23, Mark 2:15

Acts 27:12, 17, Revelation 6:14, 9:16, 19, 10:7, 8, 11:8, 13:8, 21:8

Dr Mrs Riplinger states in Chapter 27 of *Hazardous Materials* p 983, her emphases *"The following is a very partial list of verses in critical Hebrew editions which contain corruptions of words..."*

"Material Textual Differences: Joshua 8:22, 1 Kings 8:31, Isaiah 8:11, 10:15, 15:2, 21:5, 31:1; Jeremiah 5:7, 14:14, 18:4, 25:23, 34:5, 50:9; Ezekiel 31:11, 36:23, Zephaniah 3:15, Zechariah 1:8, Proverbs 8:16, 10:3; Ruth 2:6; Esther 8:11, 9:2; Ezra 8:14; Nehemiah 7:62; 1 Chronicles 15:2; 2 Chronicles 3:5, 9:18, 22:8, 28:18, 29:18, 34:8."

Dr Mrs Riplinger states in Chapter 28 of *Hazardous Materials* p 1006, her emphasis, that *"All currently printed, facsimile, software, and online editions of the Hebrew Massoretic Text fail to reflect the pure*

historic Massoretic Text in toto (e.g. Numbers 33:8, 2 Sam. 8:3, 2 Sam. 16:23, Ruth 3:5, Ruth 3:17, Judges 20:13 et al.)...” She adds on p 1007 that “...the Ginsburg and Green editions, the only currently printed editions of the ben Chayim-type Hebrew Bible, do not precisely represent the “Original” used by the KJB translators...”

The above examples from Dr Mrs Riplinger’s research have been given to show that Bible believers are well aware of errors in *current* Greek and Hebrew sources, which are the only ones that Grievous Wolf will have access to. Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown in considerable detail that the King James translators did not succumb to those errors.

In spite of his superficial charges of errors in the 1611 Holy Bible, see the 36 verses listed above, Grievous Wolf has *not* shown that the King James translators perpetrated any errors in their Hebrew and Greek sources. As indicated, neither has he identified any such errors in their Hebrew and Greek sources.

The King James translators had the Septuagint and it is remarked upon in *The Translators to the Reader*, indeed favourably. The King James translators were nevertheless aware of its deficiencies in spite of Grievous Wolf’s insinuation to the contrary.

“Yet for all that, as the Egyptians are said of the Prophet to be men and not God, and their horses flesh and not spirit [Isa 31:3]; so it is evident, (and Saint Jerome affirmeth as much) [S. Jerome. de optimo genere interpret.] that the Seventy were Interpreters, they were not Prophets; they did many things well, as learned men; but yet as men they stumbled and fell, one while through oversight, another while through ignorance, yea, sometimes they may be noted to add to the Original, and sometimes to take from it; which made the Apostles to leave them many times, when they left the Hebrew, and to deliver the sense thereof according to the truth of the word, as the spirit gave them utterance. This may suffice touching the Greek Translations of the Old Testament.”

The King James translators wrongly believed in a B.C. Septuagint. However, their statement is clear that when the apostles gave free quotations from the Old Testament as in Acts 2, it was **“as the Spirit gave them utterance”** Acts 2:4, not by means of any Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament.

Grievous Wolf is unable to prove otherwise. Neither is he able to prove that the King James translators carried over into their work any errors from the Greek Septuagint.

See *The Mythological Septuagint* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman and Dr Gipp’s analysis, Question #9: *What is the LXX?* Answer: *A figment of someone’s imagination*, samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=09.htm for the refutation of the so-called B.C. Septuagint. Will Kinney also has an informative article entitled *No LXX – The Fictitious Use of the so-called Greek Septuagint*, brandplucked.webs.com/nolxx.htm.

His question is merely aimed at sowing doubt in the mind of the reader about the 1611 Holy Bible. Grievous Wolf’s deceptive tactic in that respect is an ancient device, well worn with satanic use.

“Yea, hath God said...?” Genesis 3:1.

32. *Do you believe that God inspired the English version of the KJV to correct the Hebrew and Greek texts from which it was translated?*

See Question 30 with respect to Dr Vance’s analysis of how Psalm 12:6, 7 was fulfilled in the broad sweep of history. See also the remainder of 2 Timothy 3:16, followed by 2 Timothy 3:17 *explicitly* with respect to why **“All scripture is given by inspiration of God,”** including the 1611 Holy Bible:

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

That is the main reason why **“All scripture is given by inspiration of God,”** in contrast to that proffered by Grievous Wolf.

“The English version of the KJV” is, as Dr Vance’s analysis indicates, an improvement on *“the Hebrew and Greek texts from which it was translated.”*

The following material is from this writer's earlier work "*O Biblios*" – *The Book* pp 37-38, with some edits and updates. It shows the superiority of the 1611 Holy Bible over "*the Hebrew and Greek texts from which it was translated.*"

See p 28 of the uploaded file, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.

There are at least 8 reasons why the AV1611 is in fact superior to 'the Greek' - and to 'the Hebrew.' See *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* pp 332-343:

1. The AV1611 uses "**synagogues**" in Psalm 74:8, instead of the Hebrew "*meeting places,*" showing that the reference is yet future, to the great tribulation.
2. The Pre-millennial order of the books from 2 Chronicles to Psalms in the AV1611 preserves the order of events in the history of Israel from the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 AD, to the Second Advent. This order is superior to that of the Hebrew Bible.
3. In an age ruled by the television, "**pictures**" in Numbers 33:52 is far superior to the original Hebrew of "*carved stones.*"
4. The AV1611 alone uses "**forces**" in Daniel 11:38 instead of the literal Hebrew "*fortresses.*" The AV1611 reading is superior because it is a reference to the use of electricity, Luke 10:18, the highest form of energy, especially in the tribulation. See Revelation 13:13.
5. The AV1611 has "**churches**" in Acts 19:37, showing where pagans devoted to the "**Queen of heaven,**" Jeremiah 44:19, actually WORSHIP. This is far superior to the 'original Greek', which gives "*temples.*"
6. The AV1611 has "**Easter**" in Acts 12:4 instead of the literal Greek equivalent "*Passover.*" Herod was an Edomite and would therefore observe Easter, not the Passover. See also Dr. Gipp's comments, Question #2: *Isn't "Easter" in Acts 12:4 a mistranslation of the word "pascha" and should it be translated as "passover"?* Answer: No, "*pascha*" is properly translated "*Easter*" in Acts 12:4 as the following explanation will show, samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=02.htm.
7. The tense of the Greek in Galatians 2:20 is "*I have been crucified*" but Luke 9:23 shows that a man is to take up the cross DAILY. The AV1611 reading, "**I am crucified**" is therefore both correct and superior to 'the Greek'.
8. The AV1611 alone has "**corrupt**" in 2 Corinthians 2:17, where the 'original Greek' is "*peddle,*" according to the modern revisers *who thereby condemn themselves because they all support publishing houses that "peddle" or sell their versions.* There is no danger in selling the AV1611, because it isn't corrupt. However, there could be a great danger in the selling of CORRUPT 'bibles'. It would be rather like selling contaminated milk, 1 Peter 2:2!

Acts 12:4, 19:37 are among the verses that Grievous Wolf disputes with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible. See *Question 31*. The explanations given above show that the 1611 Holy Bible is correct and Wolf and the rest of the pack, Hudson, Kutilek, Ross etc. are wrong. See **Introduction**.

For detailed discussions of the superiority of the AV1611 to 'the Hebrew' and 'the Greek', with numerous examples, see *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* Appendix 7.

Grievous Wolf will get further enlightenment of the superiority of the 1611 Holy Bible over 'the Hebrew' and 'the Greek' if he is able to check the following issues of the *Bible Believers' Bulletin*; November 1991, November 1995, January 1999, February 1999, November 2001, April 2004, November 2005, December 2005, January 2006, February 2006, March 2006, April 2006, May 2006, June 2006, February 2007, March 2007.

The issues of December 2005 and earlier may be difficult to obtain but issues of the bulletin from January 2006 onward may be downloaded for personal use at www.kjv1611.org/downloadsbbb.html.

33. Is ANY translation totally and fully "*inspired*" to be the one and only Word of God?

Note again Wolf's incorrect use of the term "*Word*" instead of "*word.*" See *Questions 28, 29, 30* with respect to what is "**all scripture**" that "**is given by inspiration of God**" 2 Timothy 3:16.

34. *Is the KJV the only Bible we can call “scripture”? Is IT the only translation “given by inspiration of God”? [2 Tim. 3:16], or was it not in existence when Paul write this to Timothy and he was speaking of another version or translation? Should we not then get that translation Paul was speaking about and use it even if we cannot read it?*

For the answer to the first and second of Wolf’s questions under Question 34, see again Questions 28, 29, 30 with respect to what is **“all scripture”** that **“is given by inspiration of God”** 2 Timothy 3:16.

The King James translators themselves from *The Translators to the Reader* sufficiently answer Grievous Wolf’s third question under Question 34 in this writer’s view, though probably not in that of Grievous Wolf and his pack – see **Introduction**.

“But how shall men meditate in that, which they cannot understand? How shall they understand that which is kept close in an unknown tongue? as it is written, “Except I know the power of the voice, I shall be to him that speaketh, a Barbarian, and he that speaketh, shall be a Barbarian to me.” [1 Cor 14]. The Apostle excepteth no tongue; not Hebrew the ancientest, not Greek the most copious, not Latin the finest. Nature taught a natural man to confess, that all of us in those tongues which we do not understand, are plainly deaf; we may turn the deaf ear unto them. The Scythian counted the Athenian, whom he did not understand, barbarous; [Clem. Alex. 1 Strom.] so the Roman did the Syrian, and the Jew (even S. Jerome himself called the Hebrew tongue barbarous, belike because it was strange to so many) [S. Jerome. Damaso.] so the Emperor of Constantinople [Michael, Theophili fil.] calleth the Latin tongue, barbarous, though Pope Nicolas do storm at it: [2::Tom. Concil. ex edit. Petri Crab] so the Jews long before Christ called all other nations, Lognazim, which is little better than barbarous. Therefore as one complaineth, that always in the Senate of Rome, there was one or other that called for an interpreter: [Cicero 5::de finibus.] so lest the Church be driven to the like exigent, it is necessary to have translations in a readiness. Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtain, that we may look into the most Holy place; that removeth the cover of the well, that we may come by the water, even as Jacob rolled away the stone from the mouth of the well, by which means the flocks of Laban were watered [Gen 29:10]. Indeed without translation into the vulgar tongue, the unlearned are but like children at Jacob’s well (which is deep) [John 4:11] without a bucket or something to draw with; or as that person mentioned by Isaiah, to whom when a sealed book was delivered, with this motion, “Read this, I pray thee,” he was fain to make this answer, “I cannot, for it is sealed.” [Isa 29:11].”

If Grievous Wolf thinks that he should “get that translation Paul was speaking about,” he must first identify its whereabouts between two covers. So far, he has failed to do so.

35. *WHEN was the KJV “given by inspiration of God” – 1611, or any of the KJV major revisions in 1613, 1629, 1638, 1644, 1664, 1701, 1744, 1762, 1769, and the last one in 1850 (ten in all)?*

Grievous Wolf doesn’t understand the purification process of Psalm 12:6, 7 that could apply even to the 1611 Holy Bible. See again Question 28. It appears to this writer that the 1611 Holy Bible has itself been through seven purifications. Dr Ruckman in *Differences in the King James Version Editions* p 3, interestingly, lists seven editions; 1611, 1613, 1644, 1676, 1680, 1701, 1769.

The main editions where the actual text of the AV1611 was amended appear to have been those of 1611, two, see en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Authorized_King_James_Version, 1613, 1629, 1638, 1701, 1769, a total of seven again – or the main editions may possibly be counted as 1611, 1612, 1613, 1629, 1638, 1701, 1769. The actual breakdown of the purification stages of the 1611 Holy Bible may, of course, be among **“The secret things”** that **“belong unto the LORD our God”** Deuteronomy 29:29 but it appears certain to this writer that the number of stages will be seven.

Grievous Wolf appears to be flummoxed by the number ten, with respect to the editions of the 1611 Holy Bible that he lists and it is possible that even the number seven may be a daunting prospect for him. It is therefore reassuring that Sister Riplinger has made the matter of AV1611 inspiration and editions easier for him to comprehend. She states on p 600 of *In Awe of Thy Word*, her emphases, that *“The only changes to the KJV since 1611 are of three types:*

1. **1612:** *Typography (from **Gothic** to **Roman** type).*
2. **1629 & 1638:** *Correction of typographical errors*
3. **1762 & 1769:** *Standardization of spelling”*

Those changes were the major changes to the 1611 Holy Bible between 1611 and 1769. Some textual changes were carried out in the early editions, as Frederick Scrivener notes in *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611) Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*, Appendices A, C, the words “**of God**” first being added to 1 John 5:12 in 1638 and established in all editions after 1682, pp 193-194. Dr William P. Grady in *Final Authority* pp 168-170 states that after having personally reviewed Scrivener’s Appendices A, C, his conclusion with respect to the differences between editions that Scrivener identified is that “*less than two hundred [are] noteworthy of mention.*” None of these differences amount to textual discrepancies. Certainly Wolf is unable to identify any.

Moreover, none of the changes mentioned above had any detrimental effect on the *inspiration* of the 1611 Holy Bible during the transitional period of its purification, as Dr Grady shows in *Given By Inspiration* p 103. Dr Grady alludes to George Whitfield, who preached with Spirit-filled power to over 100,000 people on a mountainside in Cambuslang, Scotland in 1742, unconcerned about “*any remaining errata in his King James Bible*” that would later be rectified by Dr Blayney in his edition of 1769.

Grievous Wolf should be able to cope with Dr Mrs Riplinger’s simplified explanation of the major changes in the various editions of the 1611 Holy Bible. However, “*the inspiration of the Almighty*” Job 32:8, though intended to “*giveth them understanding*” as described by Dr Grady above, clearly “*passeth all understanding*” Philippians 4:7 for Grievous Wolf and the rest of the pack.

36. *In what language did Jesus Christ in Matthew 5:18 [not Peter Ruckman and others], teach that not one jot or tittle would pass from the Law until all was fulfilled? If it is not the KJV, then what version is it that is the inspired Word of God, if only one version is the inspired Bible?*

The answer to Wolf’s first question under Question 36 is in a language in “*words easy to be understood*” 1 Corinthians 14:9 by the listeners. That is the reason for Bible translations e.g. the 1611 Holy Bible that is to this writer “*all scripture*” that “*is given by inspiration of God*” 2 Timothy 3:16 and what Wolf terms “*the Bible*,” see Question 37, not simply a Bible translation. See Question 28 for the most detail in this write-up of why this writer believes that the 1611 Holy Bible is “*all scripture*” that “*is given by inspiration of God.*”

See Question 16 with respect to Dr Gipp’s analysis of God’s inspiration of several translations and the statement by the King James translators under Question 34. Those references render the remainder of Question 36 irrelevant.

37. *Where does the Bible teach that God will someday perfectly preserve His Word a non-Hebrew language in the form of one seventeenth-century English translation?*

It should first be noted that Grievous Wolf has failed to identify “*the Bible*” to which he refers. Note that on his site he refers only to “*the most common Bible Translations*,” none of which in Wolf’s terminology is “*the Bible.*” “*The Bible*” in Wolf’s futile terminology is limited to “*the originals*” that no one possesses or has ever seen in 19 centuries*, including Grievous Wolf. See Question 38.

*Some diehard ‘originals-onlyist’ fundamentalists in the US, namely the Dean Burgon Society Executive Committee, maintain that “*the originals*” refers to the original words, or text of scripture, in Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek, which they claim they have, not to the original documents, which they admit no one has. See *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials* by Dr Kirk DiVietro p xi. *Cleaning-Up* is a vicious, unwarranted and unscholarly attack on Sister Riplinger and her work. It is in the process of being answered. See Question 31.

Note that on his site, Wolf is lying about the readability of the 1611 Holy Bible. He has actually reversed the order of readability, making the 1611 Holy Bible the most difficult to read and the NIV among the easiest. Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown in *New Age Versions* Chapter 11 that the reverse is true, according to the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Indicator, application of which reveals that the 1611 Holy Bible is the *easiest* bible to read and the NIV *among the most difficult*. Dr Mrs Riplinger shows

with numerous examples that the new versions' use of complex multi-syllable words and phrases instead the AV1611's simple one or two syllable words, in the main, make the new versions more difficult both to read and to memorize.

Wolf is also lying on his site about Wycliffe's Bible being the earliest English Bible and that it was translated from the Latin Vulgate. In Chapters 21, 22 of *In Awe of Thy Word*, Dr Mrs Riplinger gives several examples of pre-Wycliffe scriptures in English, where she also shows that Wycliffe used Old Latin and even Hebrew manuscripts for his bible, not Jerome's Vulgate. Efforts were made after Wycliffe's death to change his bible to follow Jerome's Vulgate more closely, one of the revisers being Nicholas Hereford, who had been one of Wycliffe's helpers. See *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 873-874.

Note again Wolf's incorrect use of the term "Word." See Question 20. Note again Wolf's error in referring to the 1611 Holy Bible as "one seventeenth-century English translation." The time of the translation is clearly not the intent of Wolf's disparaging remark. See Question 28 and Dr Hills's statement with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible.

"The English of the King James Version is not the English of the early 17th century."

Question 37 could reasonably be answered with another question, once "the Bible" has been identified between two covers.

Where does the Bible teach that God will limit the perfect preservation of His word in the Old Testament to the Hebrew language, which for the vast majority of individuals in the world today would result in a sealed book according to Isaiah 29:11, even for learned individuals?

"And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I cannot; for it is sealed:"

As the King James translators pointed out, see Question 34, the sealed Book has to be *unsealed* for "every man to profit withal" 1 Corinthians 12:7.

"And one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof" Revelation 5:5.

The restriction that Grievous Wolf seeks to impose by means of Question 37 in turn violates the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, most of whom today, as indicated, have not and in this life will never master Hebrew. Yet Malachi 2:7, the last word on priests in the Old Testament, shows that today's "royal priesthood" can nevertheless bring forth "the law of the LORD" Psalm 19:7.

"For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the LORD of hosts."

Note how Philippians 2:15-16 confirms the priesthood of all believers with respect to ordinary believers, who could not have obeyed Paul's exhortation with "a book that is sealed."

"Do all things without murmurings and disputings: That ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world; Holding forth the word of life; that I may rejoice in the day of Christ, that I have not run in vain, neither laboured in vain."

The Lord's rebuke to lawyers in Luke 11:52 applies equally to Grievous Wolf and his entire 'originals-onlyist' wolf pack, whose aim is to keep the sealed Book sealed. See **Introduction**.

"Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered."

38. Did God lose the words of the originals when the "autographs" were destroyed? How come God did not preserve them if he was intent on the actual inspired word as given to be preserved?

God has preserved His words. See the answers to the last ten questions. Wolf is being wilfully ignorant, again, 1 Corinthians 14:38. See also Question 19.

"But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant."

39. *Did the KJV translators mislead their readers by saying that their New Testament was “translated out of the original Greek”? [title page of KJV N.T.]. Were they “liars” for claiming to have “the original Greek” to translate from when they did not? Did God inspire them to lie?*

The King James translators did translate the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament out of “*the Originall Greeke*” as Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals on p 645 of *Hazardous Materials*. In addition to their published sources for “*the Original Sacred Tongues*” as stated in *The Epistle Dedicatory* and as summarised under Question 31, Dr Mrs Riplinger states that “*The KJB translators had a wealth of hand-written manuscripts, compiled for 1500 years before the printing press was widely used. Perusal of the catalogue of the libraries in England before and during the KJB translation reveals many, many of these. The royal library and British Universities were storehouses of Bible manuscripts.*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger adds in *The Hidden History of The English Scriptures* pp 43-44 “*The translators of the King James Bible stated on the title page that the New Testament was also “translated out of the Originall Greeke.” The translators would not have made this claim if they had not had documentary proof. Time and recent discoveries have verified this. The most recent discovery of the Magdalene papyrus, the oldest Greek New Testament fragment, matches the KJB and none of the new versions.*”

Note that certain Bible critics, e.g. Dr James Price, deny that the Magdalene papyrus is a witness to the text of the 1611 Holy Bible, www.kjvonly.org/jamesp/jdprice_magdalen.htm.

However, Dr Thomas Holland has a most searching analysis that explains not only how P64, the Magdalene papyrus, does match the 1611 Holy Bible specifically in Matthew 26:22 but also how the other old papyri, although displaying what is termed a mixed text, repeatedly match the 1611 Holy Bible against the modern versions. The issue is not that an old source such as P64 has readings that match the modern versions, because Paul describes how Bible corruption began even in the apostolic age in 2 Corinthians 2:17.

“For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.”

The issue is that *any* readings matching the 1611 Holy Bible against the modern versions exist at all in the oldest sources. Bible critics typically subscribe to the so-called Lucian Recension theory of Westcott and Hort. The Lucian Recension theory attempts to explain away the Traditional Text i.e. that of the 1611 Holy Bible, as a 4th-century edited amalgam of extant texts the oldest and best of which Westcott and Hort claimed only matched the text of their Revised Version, RV, where differences arose with respect to the Traditional Text. Dean John Burgon exploded the so-called Lucian Recension theory in *The Revision Revised*. See this writer’s summary in “*O Biblos*” – *The Book*, Section 1.3, p 10, Sections 9.4, 9.5, pp 120ff.

See pp 7, 96ff of the uploaded files, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.

Dr Holland’s analysis is as follows, www.kingjamesbiblebelievers.com/depositary/?p=2187. See also his book *Crowned With Glory*, pp 198-202 and Dr Mrs Riplinger’s analysis of Matthew 26:22 and the Magdalene papyrus in *The Language of the King James Bible* pp xv-xvi, where she notes that the papyri discoveries compelled the editors of the Nestle’s 26th Edition to restore almost 500 readings that had been deleted for 80 years, *readings that matched the Traditional Text and in turn the 1611 Holy Bible*. See “*O Biblos*” – *The Book*, Section 5.7.8, p 37. Observe that in the percentage figures given below, some overlap can occur between the various texts, which is why the percentages may exceed 100% e.g. with P75. See p 27 of the uploaded file, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.

Dr. Gordon D. Fee, a noted and respected textual scholar, produced a comparison study of early manuscripts with various text types. [*Epp and Fee, 221-243.*] It yielded some very interesting results. In his study, Dr. Fee notes several passages in the Gospel of John where Codex Sinaiticus agrees or disagrees with P66, P75, the Textus Receptus, and some other witnesses. In John chapter four, Fee notes that out of sixty-one possible textual variations P66 produced the following statistics:

Textus Receptus = thirty-seven times or 60.6% in agreement with P66.

Sinaiticus = twenty-one times or 34.4% in agreement with P66.

Likewise, P75 showed a stronger relationship with the Traditional Text than it did with Codex Sinaiticus; however, its strongest relationship is clearly with Codex Vaticanus. The agreement with P75 among these texts is as follows:

Textus Receptus = thirty-two times or 52.5% in agreement with P75.

Sinaiticus = nineteen times or 31.5% in agreement with P75.

Vaticanus = fifty-two times or 85.2% in agreement with P75. *[Ibid., 228.]*

Dr. Fee then broadened the study to cover John 1-8, with a total of three hundred twenty possible textual variations. The statistics show a strong relation between the Traditional Text and P66, agreeing 50.9% of the time when there are textual variations. P66 and Sinaiticus agreed only 43.7% of the time. *[Ibid., 233.]* Although Dr. Fee maintains that the pro-Traditional Text readings are “of little consequence,” he does concede that the early papyrus have produced evidence away from the Alexandrian textual line. *[Ibid., 201.]* Further, the point is not that the earliest existing manuscripts are Byzantine in nature, just that they are mixed and are not pure Alexandrian. Therefore, the modern Critical Text does not always follow the oldest existing manuscripts.

We should also consider the recent evidence produced by Dr. Carsten Thiede regarding P64. If he is correct in redating this manuscript to 66 AD, we not only have the earliest known manuscript of the New Testament, we have one that supports the textual reading found in the Traditional Text. In [Matthew 26:22](#) the Critical Text reads, *legein auto eis ekastos* while the Traditional Text reads, *legein auto ekastos auton*. The difference is reflected in the Revised Standard Version when compared with the King James Version. “And they were very sorrowful, and began to say to him one after another, ‘Is it I, Lord?’” (RSV). “And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I?” (KJV). While the difference is minor and does not affect doctrine, this is still a reflection of the type of textual variants common between the Alexandrian and Byzantine textual lines. If the oldest manuscript is to be considered more original, a change must occur in the Critical Text because P64 has the same reading found in the Traditional Text and the King James Version. Although the papyrus fragment is worn, Dr. Thiede was able to determine the original reading using an extremely powerful device known as an epifluorescent confocal laser scanning microscope. *[Thiede and D’Ancona, 60.]* Here is another example where the oldest reading that agrees with the Traditional Text is rejected in favor of the later Alexandrian reading.

Note Dr Holland’s informative remarks in the same source about the supposed Lucian Recension and his essential conclusion as follows:

Apart from the promise of Scripture, we simply do not know which text is original and which one is corrupt. It is valid to argue that despite the absence of early Byzantine [Traditional Text, 1611 Holy Bible] manuscripts, the traditional textual line reflects the original autographs better than the Alexandrian line. Since the Scriptures are to be used and read we would expect these texts to wear sooner than texts that were considered corrupt and therefore not used by the majority of Christians during the first three hundred years of the church. This would explain the absence of Byzantine manuscripts until later in the church’s history. However, the Byzantine textual line has early witnesses. We have Byzantine readings in the oldest existing manuscripts; we also have Byzantine readings in ancient versions and the citations of the church fathers. What scholars classify as better manuscripts may therefore rest more on subjectivity than is usually admitted.

Dr Mrs Riplinger continues in *The Hidden History of The English Scriptures* with respect to the early witnesses for the 1611 Holy Bible showing that it was “‘translated out of the Originall Greeke.’”

“The King James Bible mirrors the manuscripts and printed Bibles which for millennia were the mainstay of Europe: the Old Itala, the Italian, the Gothic, the Anglo-Saxon, the Dutch, the German, the French, the Greek, and the Hebrew. These ancient and medieval vernacular Bibles can provide evidence for the readings in the KJB, particularly wrongly disputed ones in the book of Revelation. Hands-on access to these ancient Bibles makes the KJB unsurpassable by today’s critical ‘scholars.’ The translators’ use of vernacular Bibles follows the pattern of Coverdale (German, Swiss, et al.), Rogers (German), and Theodore Beza, whose Greek New Testament was compiled using a collation of

Greek and vernacular editions, particularly Latin editions of the Syriac and Aramaic. In countries where paper was precious, people were poor, and persecution was plenty, the scriptures had been preserved by Christian who memorized huge portions of the Bible. The translators easily reproduced the type of Holy Bible the world had had since “the scriptures” were given to “all nations.””

Dr Mrs Riplinger has outlined how the text of the 1611 Holy Bible follows an unbroken testimony to the Traditional Text from apostolic times via vernacular Bible versions in addition to Greek manuscripts. That is why the King James translators could say “*that the New Testament was also “translated out of the Originall Greeke,”*” as indeed the full title of the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament that Grievous Wolf does not mention, actually specifies, this writer’s emphases.

The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ

Translated out of the Original Greek:

And with the Former Translations

Diligently Compared and Revised,

By His Majesty’s Special Command

The Former Translations refer to those that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists above, not simply the pre-1611 English translations. When added to the hand-written manuscripts that the King’s men consulted, *The Former Translations* form a vital second witness, 2 Corinthians 13:1, to “*“the Originall Greeke”*” that is repeatedly reflected in the early papyri that Dr Holland and Dr Mrs Riplinger allude to above as the King James New Testament Text, even though these sources were subject to early corruption, as Paul warns in 2 Corinthians 2:17. See remarks above.

The only individuals that God inspires to lie are false prophets, as in 1 Kings 22:23, 2 Chronicles 18:22:

“Now therefore, behold, *the LORD hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the LORD hath spoken evil concerning thee.*”

Note that false prophets are to be found “*in kings’ houses*” 1 Kings 18:19, 22:6, 2 Chronicles 18:5, Matthew 11:8 and “*in kings’ courts*” Luke 7:25 i.e. they enjoy favored status with the rich and powerful, are ‘yes men’ in the majority, 1 Kings 22:6, 2 Chronicles 18:5, are big talkers, 1 Kings 22:11, 2 Chronicles 18:10, are united in error, 1 Kings 22:12, 13, 2 Chronicles 18:11, 12, are cleverly persuasive with “*good words and fair speeches*” 1 Kings 22:13, 2 Chronicles 18:12, Romans 16:18 and blatantly aggressive towards Bible believers, 1 Kings 22:24, 2 Chronicles 18:23.

They are also full of the Devil, 1 Kings 22:21, 22, 23, 2 Chronicles 18:20, 21, 22. Each and every one of them is “*the messenger of Satan*” 2 Chronicles 12:7.

Though he may not visit the corridors of power, Grievous Wolf is otherwise in suitable company with Ahab’s four hundred, 1 Kings 22:6, 2 Chronicles 18:5.

40. Was “the original Greek” lost after 1611? Will someone please tell me where I can find the Textus Receptus version of the Bible, the one the KJV translators supposedly used? Will someone please tell me where I can purchase all of the ten versions of the KJV so I can determine myself how many places God was wrong in the first translation and needed to correct himself?

““The original Greek”” has been preserved in the 1611 Holy Bible. See Question 39. See Question 31 for the Received Text editions that the King James translators used. It is up to Grievous Wolf to research library copies of them if he so desires. Currently available editions of the Received Text that may be purchased have been shown to contain deficiencies. See Question 31. See Question 35 with respect to Frederick Scrivener’s lists in *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611) Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*, Appendices A, C with respect to differences between editions of the 1611 Holy Bible and Dr Grady’s comments about such differences that are worthy of mention. It is not necessary to obtain multiple editions of the 1611 Holy Bible. See again Question 35.

Grievous Wolf’s concluding comment under Question 40 indicates that he should carefully consider Galatians 6:7.

“Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.”

If he is saved, Grievous Wolf stands to reap the ashes of **“wood, hay, stubble”** 1 Corinthians 3:12, 13 at **“the judgment seat of Christ”** Romans 14:10, according to Proverbs 13:13. Wolf should be thankful he doesn’t live in Old Testament times in that only his works will burn up, not his person.

“Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed: but he that feareth the commandment shall be rewarded.”

Grievous Wolf also fails to appreciate that God can edit His Book in just the same way that any human author can. See Dr Ruckman’s comments in the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1238 with respect to Matthew 2:18, which is one of numerous New Testament quotations from the Old Testament that don’t precisely match their Old Testament counterparts. Note also Jeremiah 36:32.

“Then took Jeremiah another roll, and gave it to Baruch the scribe, the son of Neriah; who wrote therein from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the book which Jehoiakim king of Judah had burned in the fire: and there were added besides unto them many like words.”

41. *Did the great Protestant Reformation (1517-1603) take place without “the word of God” since the KJV was not in existence? Did Martin Luther need the KJV to get a revelation of grace salvation and that the Papacy was in error on at least 95 doctrinal points?*

See Questions 28, 30, with respect to the purification process of Psalm 12:6, 7 that Grievous Wolf still doesn’t understand.

42. *What copy or translations of “the Word of God,” used by the Reformers, was absolutely the infallible and inerrant Word? [their main Bibles are well-known and copies still exist but they are not the KJV].*

See Questions 28, 30, with respect to the purification process of Psalm 12:6, 7 that Grievous Wolf still doesn’t understand.

43. *If the KJV is “God’s only infallible and preserved word to the English-speaking people,” did the “English-speaking people” have “the word of God” at all in the other English versions before 1611?*

See Questions 28, 30, with respect to the purification process of Psalm 12:6, 7 that Grievous Wolf still doesn’t understand.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states that the Bible translators of the English Reformation *“described their vernacular translations as “scripture,” whose author was God.”* She adds that *“Martyr and Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, wrote in his Prologue to the Great Bible that it was “given” by the “holy spirit.””* See *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 757-759, 805, 846-847.

Cranmer (martyred), Tyndale (martyred), Coverdale, Rogers (martyred) and the other Bible translators of the English Reformation, plus Wycliffe before them believed that they had in their hands **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”** in English. In contrast to the apostates described in Romans 1:18, like Grievous Wolf, they believed that they held the truth in *righteousness*. This inspired English scripture reached its final purified stage with the Holy Bible of 1611, Psalm 12:6, 7, thereby superseding in both inspiration and authority the earlier English versions. See also *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1165-1167.

44. *Were the English versions of Tyndale’s [1525], or Coverdale’s [1535], or Matthew’s [1537], or the Great [1539], or the Geneva [1560], absolutely infallible? Would God not inspire them to be error free as well as with the KJV or does God pick and choose which version he will preserve and “allow” the others to have errors?*

See Questions 28, 30, with respect to the purification process of Psalm 12:6, 7 that Grievous Wolf still doesn’t understand. See additional remarks under Questions 43.

45. *If neither the KJV nor any other one version were absolutely 100% without error, could a lost sinner still find salvation and be “born again” by the “incorruptible word of God” [Acts 2:38, 1 Peter 1:23]? The answer is YES!*

So why bother asking the question?

It should first be noted that the 1611 Holy Bible is perfect and without error, in spite of Grievous Wolf's insinuation to the contrary. See *Questions 28, 30*, with respect to the purification process of Psalm 12:6, 7 that Grievous Wolf still doesn't understand and the additional remarks under *Questions 43*.

Grievous Wolf has conflated two separate issues, namely that of individual salvation and that of ***“the scripture of truth”*** Daniel 10:21. Individual salvation is a step of faith that can be taken by means of a simple prayer, as illustrated by Peter in Matthew 14:30.

“But when he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried, saying, Lord, save me.”

Matthew 14:31 shows that the Lord did answer Peter's simple prayer of faith. The same applies now spiritually for anyone who asks for salvation by means of a simple prayer such as ***“Lord, save me.”***

A simple prayer of faith for salvation, though resting on the faithfulness of God in keeping His promises for its answer, John 1:12, 6:37, is nevertheless a personal decision on the part of the individual asking for salvation. Such a prayer is not *in itself* ***“all the counsel of God”*** Acts 20:27 and neither is it ***“a book written within and on the backside, sealed with seven seals”*** Revelation 5:1 that is in written form ***“all the counsel of God.”***

Grievous Wolf is clearly unable to ***“Provide things honest in the sight of all men”*** Romans 12:17 in order to know the difference.

On two further points, if Grievous Wolf is going to give quotations ostensibly from scripture, he should at least do the reader the courtesy of getting the quotation correct. 1 Peter 1:23 actually says ***“Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.”***

Grievous Wolf has no business conflating different phrases in 1 Peter 1:23, any more than he has conflating the separate issues of personal salvation by means of an individual's prayer and the *written* record that is ***“the volume of the book”*** Psalm 40:7, Hebrews 10:7.

Moreover, Acts 2:38 is not an expression of individual salvation as it applies now according to John 1:12. It is a specific exhortation uttered during the early transitional period of the church to Jews and proselytes to receive ***“the gift of the Holy Ghost”*** by *water baptism*. That is not how an individual receives the Holy Ghost today. Note Acts 8:37, which shows that the individual believed on the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation and therefore received ***“the gift of the Holy Ghost”*** before he was baptized. That is the manner of salvation for every individual since then until the Lord's Return. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* pp 1432, 1446 and Dr Ruckman's commentary *The Book of Acts* pp 115ff, 291ff for a *scriptural* study on Acts 2:38, 8:37.

46. *The translators of the KJV disagreed with the Greek in several places and so changed the wording, allegedly correcting the Greek inspired originals. Did the Hebrew and Greek copies originally “breathed out by God” have errors that the KJV translators would need to correct or improve?*

Which Greek did the King James translators disagree with? Grievous Wolf cites no references. The aim of the question is simply that of his mentor in Genesis 3:1 ***“Yea, hath God said...?”***

Note remarks under *Question 31* with respect to Wolf's supposed errors in the 1611 Holy Bible that he fails to compare with readings in any identifiable Greek and Hebrew sources. His question is therefore one of insinuation.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has extensive chapters in *Hazardous Materials*, namely Chapters 18, 19, in which she lists the readings in published Greek texts such as those of Stephanus and Beza that were available to the King James translators. She cites many of the instances where the King James translators departed from these published Greek texts and, together with Bro. Heisey, see *Question 31*, explains *why* those departures were necessary *but she also makes clear that the King's men were not departing from ““the Originall Greeke”” in so doing.*

Far from departing from ***““the Originall Greeke,””*** the King James translators were actually *restoring* it, *in English*, with the help of the faithful vernacular Bibles, the importance of which Grievous Wolf has consistently underestimated or overlooked throughout his questions.

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes, for example, on p 647 of *Hazardous Materials* that “*God has preserved several original readings in the Old Itala, which were removed by unbelieving Jews from the Hebrew Old Testament and by the apostate Greek Orthodox church from the Greek New Testament.*” These deletions include Acts 8:37 and 1 John 5:7, for which verse see Question 26. See *Hazardous Materials* Chapters 20, 27 for further examples of Greek and Hebrew tampering with their own manuscripts.

She states on pp 690-691 of *Hazardous Materials* with respect to the work of the King’s men, her emphases:

“Theirs was not a brand new translation from Greek and Hebrew with no recourse to previous [vernacular] editions. In fact they were following the logical rule given them by King James, that is, that ‘the Bishops’ Bible [is] to be followed, and as little altered as the truth of the original will permit.’ Their prime authority was the Bishops’ Bible which carried forth the words of the English Bible since its genesis in Acts 2. The words of the 1611 English Bible (KJB) had their origin in languages and words which were given through the Holy Ghost’s gift of tongues in Acts 2. The precursors of the English language were the then extant languages of Gothic, early Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, and Latin. These were included among ‘every nation under heaven’ which ‘heard them speak in their own language’...

*“By following the already existing English Bibles the translators were, by proxy, accessing the readings which God had preserved since their **origin**. God was attentive to preserve those readings in Holy Bibles; he has not been actively involved in creating and preserving one-man critical Greek editions, intellectual exercise, which popped up **for the first time** 1500 years after the originals... Consequently, Holy Bibles, such as the KJB, contain time-pressed diamonds, where the one-man modern Greek editions (A.D. 1500-2000) still have coal.”*

See also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements in Question 39 and note her remarks on pp 734-735 of *Hazardous Materials* with respect to God’s preservation of “*the Originall Greeke*” by means of early vernacular Holy Bibles, her emphases.

*“Even Scrivener admits that versions make ‘known to us the contents of manuscripts of the original older than any at present existing’ (Scrivener, Six Lectures, p. 106). The KJB translators would agree. The recently discovered notes of the King James translation committee by KJB translator John Bois notes in two places (Romans 12:10 and James 2:22) where the KJB translators said the Greek should be interpreted ‘as if it had been written in Greek **another way**.’ There were originally Greek codices that were correct in James 2:22, for example, but many Greek codices are not (Ward Allen, Translating For King James, Vanderbilt University Press, 1969, pp. 43, 89, In Awe of Thy Word, p. 538, Berry’s Interlinear Greek-English, Baker Books, 1985, p. 588 footnote for James 2:22). The Encyclopedia Britannica affirms, ‘The English of the New Testament actually turned out to be superior to its Greek original’ because they accessed and confirmed the Received Text in Holy Bibles in other languages. The EB is of course referring to the edition of the Textus Receptus in hand, not the originals (‘Biblical literature: The King James and subsequent versions’; this citation is from the contemporary EB, all other citations in this book are to the 1910-11 edition.)*

“Two hundred years later, in 1838, the Jews’ Society followed the KJB [translators’] method of accessing a pure vernacular Bible, when creating an edition of the Hebrew New Testament. They made changes to the Greek, ‘following in most dubious cases the reading of the English version’ (see the chapter ‘The Scriptures to All Nations’ [Hazardous Materials Chapter 30], for many more such examples; John McClintock and James Strong, Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, vol. 12, p 535.)”

Dr Mrs Riplinger has put the departures of the King James New Testament from “*the one-man modern Greek editions (A.D. 1500-2000)*” that Wolf calls “*the Greek*” in correct perspective. They are the only Greek sources to which Grievous Wolf can realistically allude, though he does not specify any. It appears therefore from the nature of Question 46, like that all his earlier questions concerning ‘the Greek,’ that Grievous Wolf continues to be wilfully ignorant, 1 Corinthians 14:38. See Questions 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 25, 38.

Noting Grievous Wolf's fixation with 'the Greek,' see Questions 5, 11, 15, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, 38, 39, 40, 46, Dr Mrs Riplinger's summary from *In Awe of Thy Word* p 956 bears careful reflection.

"Authority must remain with the Bible in use, not with the critical edition of one man or one ecclesiastical tradition. Scrivener's [based on Beza's 1598 Edition] and Berry's [based on Stephanus' 1550 Edition] printed editions are not 'authoritative' or to be regarded as 'the Original Greek' "in microscopic points of detail," where they differ from the manuscript tradition or the King James Bible and other great vernacular Bibles (Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 2, p 499)...These particular editions were never read and used by the masses of Greek-speaking true Christians.

*"It must be remembered that even the 5200 existing handwritten Greek manuscripts were the product of the **Greek Orthodox Church**. Its membership has never been made up of true believers. The scriptures have been entrusted to the priesthood of true believers, just as they were entrusted to the Hebrew priests in the Old Testament. Unbelievers, Greek speaking or otherwise, cannot discern spiritual things...*

"The desire to appear intelligent or superior by referring to 'the Greek' and downplaying the common man's Bible, exposes a naivety concerning textual history and those documents which today's pseudo-intellectuals call 'the critical text,' 'the original Greek,' the 'Majority Text,' or the 'Textus Receptus.' There existed a true original Greek (i.e. Majority Text, Textus Receptus). It is not in print and never will be, because it is unnecessary. No one on the planet speaks first century Koine Greek, so God is finished with it. He needs no 'Dead Bible Society' to translate it into "everyday English," using the same corrupt secularised lexicons used by the TNIV, NIV, NASB and HCSB [Holman Christian Standard Bible]. God has not called readers to check his Holy Bible for errors. He has called his Holy Bible to check us for errors.

"What Would Jesus Do?"

- ☒ Inspire a Bible people can read?
- ☐ Inspire conflicting Greek editions which few can read?
- ☐ Inspire unsaved liberals to write conflicting Greek lexicons to translate conflicting one-man Greek editions?
- ☐ Inspire originals then lose them?" (author's emphasis)

Those are salutary remarks for all serious students of the bible translation issue. What Grievous Wolf would make of them, though, is anybody's guess.

47. Which reading is the verbally (word-for-word) inspired word of God to be the inerrant scripture – "whom ye" [Cambridge KJV's] or, "whom he" [Oxford KJV's] at Jeremiah 34:16?

Jeremiah 34:16 is a verse that arch-Bible critic James White put forward as one of seven 'errors' in the 1611 Holy Bible and which Dr Ruckman answered in successive issues of the Bible Believers Bulletin. See *Bible Believers Bulletin*, September 1995-March 1996. The September and December 1995 issues carried the details of Dr Ruckman's response to White's challenge.

The following explanation is from the *Time for Truth* site, with respect to James White's contempt for the 1611 Holy Bible that matches that of his fellow blind guide, Grievous Wolf. It is entitled *James White's 7 "Errors."*

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1309647419.pdf.

Dr Ruckman has some explanatory comments about Jeremiah 34:16. See below. They are sufficient for a bible believer - though not for James White. He insists that because the different readings are still found in different editions of the AV1611, *"The person who does not make the KJV the absolute authority...has an easy answer; look at the Hebrew text and find out...[and] the Hebrew is plural here...the correct translation is the plural "you," i.e. "ye," which is, in fact, the reading found in the AV 1611."*

But only because *"the Hebrew is plural here"* [i.e. White insists that only *"the Hebrew"* is trustworthy, not the 1611 Holy Bible as such, because two different editions have different readings]. According to

White “if we make the KJV the starting point (and this is exactly what radical KJV Onlyism does) there is simply no way of determining the correct text of Jeremiah 34:16.” He declares [in his book *The King James Only Controversy* p 81] the reading “**he**” to be the error of “a later English stylist [that]...somehow got past the final editing process and into print” but expresses his dismay on discovering that the NKJV also says “he” in Jeremiah 34:16. However, after consultation with Dr James Price of the NKJV committee, White [in *The King James Only Controversy* p 89] assures his readers that “Future editions of the NKJV will change the pronoun back to “you.””

Dr Ruckman responds as follows, his emphasis.

“White is worried about the fact that the Cambridge and Oxford editions of the AV don’t match word for word...[White] even consulted Dr James Price (on the NKJV committee...) to get back to the “original text”...They both agreed the text should say “ye” instead of “he””...

“Both apostates (Price and White) insisted that the plural “ye” should be maintained because “he,” being singular, was false. Whereupon they change the “ye”...to “you.” But “you” in [modern] English, is not plural necessarily...[Greek and Hebrew] both have a plural form of “you” [but] Modern English does not preserve this distinction...

“BOTH variants in the AV (Jer. 34:16) were correct grammatically, if one deals with the English text or the Hebrew text. They (“ye” in the Cambridge) were being addressed as a group (plural, Jer. 34:13; as in Deut. 29), but the address was aimed at individual men (“he” in the Oxford edition), within the group. Either word would have been absolutely correct according to that great critic of critics, the word of God (Heb. 4:12-13)...

“No “editor” let anything slip by. White and Price think they are careful “editors.” The translators chose two different ways of saying the same thing, and both of them accorded with the context of the verse, and both of them told the TRUTH. But because they weren’t identical (Cambridge “ye,” Oxford “he”) the old self-righteous, practical atheists – no Alexandrian has any higher authority than his opinions or the opinions of his friends – claimed “error.””

And once again, White’s claim is shown to be false. (Scrivener’s Appendix C notes that the 1611 reading in Jeremiah 34:16 is “**ye**” and that the reading “**he**” entered the 1629, 1638 editions. God has evidently allowed both readings to remain to the present day, as Dr Ruckman explains above.)

“He taketh the wise in their own craftiness: and the counsel of the froward is carried headlong” Job 5:13.

The above write-up on Jeremiah 34:16 contains further material with respect to James White’s attempt to exalt his own opinion over the 1611 Holy Bible, Proverbs 26:12. That material follows and provides the answer Grievous Wolf’s Question 49.

White refers to Dr Scrivener’s collation of changes in the various editions of the AV1611 but he fails to mention the dates of the changes. Perhaps this is because, like the above examples [i.e. in *James White’s 7 “Errors.”*], they were among the 72% of all textual variants that were finalised under the ministry of Drs Bois and Ward by 1638. Such an early date for the resolution of almost three-quarters of all such variants – and [according to Dr William P. Grady in *Final Authority* p 170] “Scrivener alludes to less than two hundred as noteworthy of mention” – effectively cripples White’s insistence [in *The King James Only Controversy* p 79] that “these changes...represent a sticky problem for the radical proponent of KJV Onlyism...when the KJV is made the absolute standard...once a person has invested the English translation with inspiration itself.”

Dr Grady [in *Final Authority* pp 227-228] also refutes White’s half-truth [*The King James Only Controversy* p 78] that “Editions with changes in the text came out as soon as 1612, [others] in 1613...1616, 1629, and 1638” and his allusion to William Kilburne’s claim in 1659 that “20,000 errors had crept into six different editions [of the AV1611] in the 1650s.” Dr Grady states.

“When all else fails, detractors of the King James Bible will invariably ask their despised opponents, “WHICH Authorised Version do you believe, the 1611, 1613, 1767 or perhaps the 1850?” And while their bewildered victims are pondering this troublesome innuendo (analogous to such nonsense as

“Have you quit beating your wife lately?”), they are subjected to an array of staggering statistics. Citing the Evangelical scholar Jack Lewis [also cited by White], Keylock quotes him as stating:

““Few people realise, for example, that thousands of textual errors have been found in the KJV. As early as 1659 William Kilburne found 20,000 errors in six KJV editions.”

“Reckless statements such as Lewis’ are incredibly misleading as the extent of these so-called “errors” are never explained to be primarily lithographical (printing) and orthographical (spelling) in nature. In 1611, the art of printing was an occupation of the utmost drudgery. With every character being set by hand, a multitude of typographical errors was to be expected...

“In addition to printing flaws, there was a continual change in spelling for which to care. Lewis did not inform his readers that there was no such thing as proper spelling in the seventeenth century...

“A significant portion of these twenty thousand “textual errors” were in reality nothing more than changing “darke” to “dark” or “rann” to “ran.” Who but a Nicolataine priest [like James White] would categorize as serious revisions the normal follow-up corrections of mistakes at the press?

“It is impossible to overstate the duplicity of such critics who would weaken the faith of some with their preposterous reports of tens of thousands of errors in the Authorised Version...In his Appendix A (List of wrong readings of the Bible of 1611 amended in later editions) of his informative work, The Authorised Edition of the English Bible (1611), Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives, Scrivener catalogued but a fraction of the inflated figures of modern scholarship.

“Excluding marginal alterations and Apocrypha citings, this author has personally reviewed pages 147-194 and counted LESS THAN 800 CORRECTIONS. And even this figure is misleading when you consider that many of the instances were repetitious in nature. (Six such changes involved the corrected spelling of “Nathanael” from the 1611’s “Nathaneel” in John 1:45-49 and 21:2).

“Whereas Geisler and Nix cited Goodspeed’s denouncing of Dr. Blayney’s 1769 Oxford edition for deviating from the Authorised Version in “at least 75,000 details,” Scrivener alludes to less than two hundred as noteworthy of mention.”

The “sticky problem” exists only in the convoluted thought processes of James White and his fellow travellers [like Grievous Wolf]. Clearly God worked with faithful, bible-believing editors such as Drs Bois and Ward to refine his Book just as He had summoned the scholarly King’s men to translate it in the first place. God was the Principal Editor as well as the Principal Author of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible and, as indicated earlier, the Book’s own testimony of itself, which White denies, is that it is **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”** 2 Timothy 3:16a.

See again Questions 28, 30, with respect to the purification process of Psalm 12:6, 7 that Grievous Wolf still doesn’t understand. See additional remarks under Questions 43.

48. Which reading is the verbally (word-for-word) inspired word of God to be the inerrant scripture – “sin” [Cambridge KJV’s] or “sins” [Oxford KJV’s] at 2 Chronicles 33:19?

Both are correct. See 2 Kings 21:17, 24:3.

“Now the rest of the acts of Manasseh, and all that he did, and his sin that he sinned, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah?”

“Surely at the commandment of the LORD came this upon Judah, to remove them out of his sight, for the sins of Manasseh, according to all that he did;”

Grievous Wolf is gnat-straining, Matthew 23:24, as he has done before. See Questions 10, 23.

49. Since the ten revisions of the KJV from 1613-1850 made (in addition to changes in punctuation, capitalization, and spelling) many hundreds of changes in words, word order, possessives, singulars for plurals, articles, pronouns, conjunctions, prepositions, entire phrases, and the addition and deletion of words – would you say the KJV was “verbally inspired of God and inerrant in all ten versions” in 1611, 1629, 1638, 1644, 1664, 1701, 1744, 1762, 1769, or 1850?

See the extensive remarks under *Question 47* and note that Grievous Wolf can identify only *two* of the additional “*many hundreds of changes*” to which he alludes, i.e. in *Questions 47, 48*, and cannot point the reader to *any* documented source where they may be found.

Grievous Wolf is clearly seeking to raise doubts about the validity of the 1611 Holy Bible, like his mentor has always sought to do. See *Question 31*.

“*Yea, hath God said...?*” Genesis 3:1.

See again *Questions 28, 30*, with respect to the purification process of Psalm 12:6, 7 that Grievous Wolf still doesn’t understand. See additional remarks under *Questions 43*.

Some further material in answer to *Question 49* may be inserted as follows, from this writer’s response to the attack by Dr Donald Waite of The Dean Burgon Society against Dr Mrs Riplinger and *Hazardous Materials* in his book *A WARNING!!* This material has been inserted to show that Bible believers have researched the issues that Grievous Wolf raises in *Question 49*. He has clearly not researched those issues himself, according to the exhortation in Romans 12:17 to “*Provide things honest in the sight of all men.*” See *Question 14*.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php.

Historian Alexander McClure [in *Translators Revived* pp 223-224] Dr Ruckman, *Differences in the King James Version Editions* and Dr Grady report on the work of the American Bible Society in comparing various editions of the AV1611. The society published the results of this work in 1852.

Alexander McClure states, his emphases that “*A very able Committee of the American Bible Society, spent some three years in a diligent and laborious comparison of recent copies of the best edition of the American Bible Society, and of the four leading British editions, namely, those of London, Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh, and also of the original edition of 1611. The number of variations in the text and punctuation of these six copies was found to fall but little short of twenty-four thousand. A vast amount! Quite enough to frighten us, till we read the Committee’s assurance, that “of all this great number, there is not one which mars the integrity of the text, or affects any doctrine or precept of the Bible.”*”

(It should be noted that Professor David Norton is author of probably the definitive contemporary review of differences between the AV1611 editions entitled *A Textual History of the King James Bible* and editor of *The New Cambridge Paragraph Bible with the Apocrypha, NCPB*, which consists of the King James Text as edited by Dr Scrivener for the original *Cambridge Paragraph Bible* with some further amendments by Professor Norton. Professor Norton dismisses the conclusions of the American Bible Society as “*nonsense*” and denigrates the text of the current 1611 English Holy Bible, i.e. Professor Blayney’s 1769 Text, as found in the *Cambridge Wide Margin Cameo Edition* and the *Cambridge Concord Edition* as “*fossilised*” and “*mutated*,” in urgent need of much improvement with respect to spelling, punctuation and presentation. See *A Textual History* pp 120, 125-126. However, apart from the kind of differences mentioned by the society, Professor Norton does not provide any examples of serious variation between the various AV1611 editions that would mar the integrity of the AV1611 Text, so Bible believers are urged to remain faithful to the current copies of the AV1611 that they already possess. Scrivener’s original *Cambridge Paragraph Bible* did not receive wide circulation compared with extant AV1611s and in this writer’s view, neither will any successor to it. Professor Norton’s NCPB was published several years ago and does not seem even to have begun to displace either the *Cambridge Wide Margin Cameo Edition* or the *Cambridge Concord Edition*. God seems to be ignoring Professor Norton’s efforts in that respect. For a more detailed analysis of Professor Norton’s efforts, see www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1316973114.pdf.)

Dr Ruckman and Dr Grady cite the conclusions of the Society: “*The English Bible as left by the translators has come down to us unaltered in respect of its text...With the exception of typographical errors and changes required by the progress of orthography in the English language, the text of our present Bibles remains unchanged, and without variation from the original copy as left by the translators...The present copies of the Bible accord throughout with the edition of 1611.*”

Clearly the three-year collation of AV1611 editions carried out by members of the American Bible Society decisively refutes Dr Waite's protestations about "*all of the hundreds of changes that have been made in the King James Bible from 1611 to the present.*"

A few samples of the more noticeable changes between the 1611 AV1611 and the current Cambridge Cameo AV1611 have been listed below. These are selections from a list of 30 verses forwarded to this author some years ago by an arch-Bible critic (now deceased) as indicating serious changes between AV1611 editions. The full list is; Leviticus 26:40, 2 Samuel 16:8, Psalm 18:47, 42:9, Jeremiah 19:11, Ezekiel 24:7, 46:23, Matthew 12:23, 13:45, 16:16, 26:36, 75, Mark 2:4, 5:6, 10:18, Luke 1:3, 19:9, 22:40, John 5:18, 15:20, Acts 4:27, 6:3, Romans 11:23, 1 Corinthians 4:9, 12:28, 2 Corinthians 12:2, 1 Timothy 1:4, 4:16, 1 Peter 1:22, 1 John 5:12, 30 verses in all.

The list has been addressed in this author's earlier work [*"O Biblios" – The Book* pp 225ff], although comments on 1 Corinthians 4:9 should be amended as shown below. This writer extends his apologies for any confusion arising from the earlier work with respect to this verse. The sample changes follow, with this writer's comments from the earlier work in italics, with some amendments and supplemented by dates of the changes that Dr Scrivener [in *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611)*, Appendices A, C] noted. See pp 181ff of the uploaded file, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.

Ezekiel 24:7

1611 AV1611

Current Cambridge Cameo AV1611

"she powred it upon the ground to couer it with dust"

"she poured it not upon the ground, to cover it with dust"

"Not" is in the Masoretic Hebrew* text, which would suggest that the omission in the 1611 reading is a typographical error. This is apparent not only in the first part of verse 7, "*she set it upon the top of a rock*" but also in verse 8, which reads "*I have set her blood upon the top of a rock, that it should not be covered.*" *The underlying texts are not the final authority with respect to "*all scripture*" that "*is given by inspiration of God*" 2 Timothy 3:16. The 1611 Holy Bible is the final authority. See Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks about 'the Greek etc.' under *Question 46*. The sense of the source text and that of the translation should match, however, which makes the 1611 omission of "*not*" a typo that needed correction and which was corrected. See *Question 35*.

Dr Scrivener notes that this particular typo was corrected in 1613.

Ezekiel 46:23

1611 AV1611

Current Cambridge Cameo AV1611

"there was a new building round about"

"there was a row of building round about"

The context in BOTH Editions indicates that each corner of the court was surrounded by buildings. Of course they were NEW (1611 reading), the whole temple was NEW - it hasn't even been built yet. If the buildings were "*round about*" a corner, they would have to be in a ROW. Both readings are correct.

Dr Scrivener notes that the current amendment dates from 1638.

Matthew 12:23

1611 AV1611

Current Cambridge Cameo AV1611

"Is this the sonne of David?"

"Is not this the son of David?"

"Meti", which is "*not*" in an exclamatory sense as "*What(?)*", is found in Berry's TR but is untranslated, yielding almost the same reading as the 1611 Bible. The people's amazement in the context shows that BOTH readings have the same sense, although the [current] reading is stronger because it includes the exclamatory term.

The change dates from 1638.

1 Corinthians 4:9

1611 AV1611

Current Cambridge Cameo AV1611

“approved to death”**“appointed to death”**

No change in meaning has occurred especially insofar as to be **“appointed”** an individual has to be **“approved.”**

The change dates from 1616.

1 Corinthians 12:28

1611 AV1611

Current Cambridge Cameo AV1611

“helpes in gouernmets”**“helps, governments”**

A literal rendering of Berry’s TR appears to support the [current] reading, so the change could be typographical.

However, BOTH Editions show that **“governments”** was a separate gift, Romans 12:8 and that **“helpers”** did help those with responsibility for church **“government”**, such as Paul. See Romans 16:2, 3, 6, 2 Corinthians 11:28, 1 Timothy 3:5. Therefore, both readings would be correct.

The [current] reading simply indicates that **“helps”** had a wider ministry than helping only in church government and reinforces Romans 12:8. Most significantly, the variation does NOT involve error, in EITHER Edition.

The change dates from 1629.

1 John 5:12

The [contemporary] Edition adds **“of God”** to the second reading of **“the Son.”** Obviously, this does NOT alter the meaning of the verse in ANY way. **“Theou”** or **“of God”** is found in Berry’s TR and so the addition* is clearly typographical.

*The words **“of God”** are not an unwarranted textual addition. They have support from the Received Text.

Dr Scrivener notes that the addition of **“of God”** dates from 1629 and was retained in 1638 but omitted from some subsequent editions until it was firmly established in 1658.

The above 6 examples are typical of those about which Bible rejecters like Grievous Wolf (and Professor Norton) seek to **“overthrow the faith of some”** 2 Timothy 2:18.

In sum, the quantity, nature and dates of changes between editions of the AV1611 confirm the conclusion of the American Bible Society in 1852 that **“there is not one which mars the integrity of the text, or affects any doctrine or precept of the Bible.”** Apart from actual typos, the early AV1611 editions differed only from the contemporary ones in that they needed some refinement that did not amount to changes in meaning. No AV1611 edition could therefore be described as either imperfect or not **“all scripture”** that **“is given by inspiration of God.”** Grievous Wolf is gnat-straining again, Matthew 23:24. See Questions 10, 23, 48.

50. Would you contend that God waited until a king named **“James”** sat on the throne of England before perfectly preserving His Word in English, and would you think well of an **“Epistle Dedicatory”** that praises this king as **“most dread Sovereign...Your Majesty’s Royal Person...”** – If the historical FACT was revealed to you that King James was a practicing homosexual all of his life? [documentation – Antonia Fraser - **“King James VI of Scotland, I of England”** Knopf Publ./1975/pgs. 36-37, 123 || Caroline Bingham - **“The Making of a King”** Doubleday Publ./1969/pgs. 128-129, 197-198 || Otto J. Scott - **“James I”** Mason-Charter Publ./1976/pgs. 108, 111, 120, 194, 200, 224, 311, 353, 382 || David H. Wilson - **“King James VI & I”** Oxford Publ./1956/pgs. 36, 99-101, 336-337, 383-386, 395 || plus several encyclopedias]. Did God inspire a homosexual to give us the only inspired Word of God for the English people? Can homosexuals take credit for the KJV?

In answer to Grievous Wolf's first question, he should at least have the integrity to state the basis for that question. The basis is from *The History of the New Testament Church Vol. 1* by Dr. Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1982, p 374, as found in this writer's earlier work "*O Biblios*" – *The Book*, Section 4.1, p 25. See p 16 of the uploaded file, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.

See also www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *The KJB Story – 1611-2011 Abridged* p 17.

““*To fulfil Acts 1:8 [for the Lord's witnesses to go to “the uttermost part of the earth”]. All the Lord needed was a Bible in line with what He had already written and preserved; since He had already decreed (in 1000 BC) that there had to be present “the word of a King” Ecclesiastes 8:4 before there could be any spiritual “power” in that word (Romans 13:1-4), and since His king was a JEW (John 18:34)...God needed a king with a Jewish name; He got one...this time it was JAMES. James is the English word for JACOB.*””

Grievous Wolf obviously doesn't know church history or he is unconcerned about the need to fulfil the Great Commission as expressed in Matthew 28:18-20, Mark 16:15, Luke 24:45-49, John 20:21, Acts 1:8. Inspection of the above site under the heading ***Gone into all the world*** will show that God set about fulfilling the Great Commission as Dr Ruckman describes above and as he sets out in considerable detail in his two-volume work *The History of the New Testament Church*.

Grievous Wolf clearly cannot refute any of Dr Ruckman's material in the above work, which is probably why he is too cowardly to cite any of it explicitly.

Concerning the person of King James 1st, Grievous Wolf is lying again. See *Questions 10, 15, 16, 25, 26, 37*. It should be noted that while Grievous Wolf lists certain historians who have written books on King James 1st, he does not cite anything that they say about James 1st. He has only given page references and publishers' details in order to portray himself as a researcher.

Like Amnon's friend Jonadab, Grievous would be a dangerous friend to have around.

“But Amnon had a friend, whose name was Jonadab, the son of Shimeah David's brother: and Jonadab was a very subtil man” 2 Samuel 13:3.

Yet again, Grievous Wolf has resorted to insinuation. See **Introduction**, *Questions 12, 16, 28, 31, 45, 46*. The historical material on James 1st follows, starting with this material from this writer's earlier work "*O Biblios*" – *The Book*, Section 12.3, pp 270-272.

See pp 211ff of the uploaded file, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.

Most of the material on James in Chapter 4 [of "*O Biblios*"] was stated specifically to consist of extracts from a Christian Newsletter, *Battle Cry* Sept./Oct. 1985. A copy of the item could have been forwarded to our critic upon request. Although the author, Baptist Pastor David Ralston, does not explicitly reference every quotation about James which he uses in his article, he does list his sources. They include the well-known works by Caroline Bingham, William McElwee and Lady Antonia Fraser.

Any objective examination of these extracts would reveal that their main purpose was not to present James himself in any hue whatsoever. The purpose was to highlight the outstanding achievements of James' reign, culminating in the publication of the Authorised Version. Whatever his shortcomings, James was a saved man whom God had endowed with great wisdom, great courage and Royal authority, essential qualifications for being “*the principal Mover and Author of the work*” of making “*God's holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people*”...

Ralston makes it clear that much of the criticism of James stems from two main sources. One was “*M. Fontenay, an agent for Mary Stuart who plotted for James' throne*” and who “*fostered much of the slanderous assault against the king.*” The other was Anthony Weldon, “*who successfully blackened King James through the pen portrait he first published in 1650...Antonia Fraser writes, “In fairness to James, (Weldon) should never be quoted without the important rider that he had been excluded from Court circles and had in consequence, a pathological hatred of the Stuarts. Weldon has had his revenge for the slight injuries done to him.”*”

Note again that although Grievous Wolf lists Lady Antonia Fraser as one of his sources, coward that he is, he fails to state anything that she actually said about James 1st. Her comments as cited by David Ralston above clearly reveal Wolf's deceit and insinuation about James 1st. Note additional statements about King James 1st, which may be found here:

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *The KJB Story – 1611-2011 Abridged Appendix* pp 1-4.

Ralston has this conclusion about the real reason for the manifold criticisms levelled against King James 1st. Note how Ralston's conclusion is supported by the Jesuit statement in *The Secret Plan* cited below.

“King James was regarded by those of his own time as ‘The British Solomon.’ He wanted the Holy Word of God to be in the hands of people, not chained to pulpits or hoarded in the cellars to be read only by Greek scholars...

“Do the critics of the Holy Word of God believe they can discredit the preserved authoritative scriptures by destroying the reputation of the man who helped bring it to the people? I am of the conviction that this indeed is the real cause of the slander against James.”

So is this writer, especially when the identity of the most implacable enemies of both James and the Bible associated with his name is unmasked.

This site www.jesus-is-savior.com/Bible/king_james-the_man.htm has a considerable amount of detailed information about King James 1st. It includes the *Basilicon Doron*, the *Kingly Gift* that James wrote in 1598 to his son Prince Henry, to instruct him in the manners, morals and ways of kingship.

James wrote as follows on the scriptures and on godly living.

“But when ye read the Scripture, read it with a sanctified & chaste eare: admire reverently such obscure places as yee understand not, blaming onlie your owne incapacitie; read with delite the playne places; and studie carefullie to understand those that are somewhate difficile: preasse to be a good texture [student], for the Scripture is ever the best interpreter of it selfe...

“Since al that is necessarie for salvation is contayned in the Scripture: for in anything that is expresly commanded or prohibited in the booke of God, ye cannot be over precise even in the least thing, counting every sin (not according to the light estimation and common use of it in the world) but as the book of God counteth of it:” See www.jesus-is-savior.com/Bible/basilico-king_james1.htm.

Any young person could benefit from reading the *Basilicon Doron*, including another young prince named Henry and all his friends and family.

Concerning James 1st's implacable enemies and those of the Book forever associated with his name, with whom Grievous Wolf is in suitable company, note the following.

Observe how much the Jesuits hated the 1611 Holy Bible, along with the king who approved its translation.

This is from *The Secret Plan*, compiled in the Jesuit College near Turin in Northern Italy in 1825. The plan was written up by Fr. Leone, SJ, translated and published in 1848 by Augusta Cooke. This is what the Jesuits had to say about the Authorized King James Bible of 1611.

“Then the Bible, that serpent which with head erect and eyes flashing threatens us with its venom while it trails along the ground, shall be changed into a rod as soon as we are able to seize it [1881, Revised Version, Westcott and Hort, Cambridge University; 1881, ‘Originals-onlyism,’ Hodge and Warfield, Princeton Theological Seminary, “Traitors, heady, highminded” 2 Timothy 3:4]...for three centuries past this cruel asp has left us no repose. You well know with what folds it entwines us and with what fangs it gnaws us.”

The Jesuit collusion in the Gunpowder Plot is documented in *Jesuit Plots from Elizabethan to Modern [1930s] Times* by Albert Close, The Protestant Truth Society, www.protestant-truth.org/bookshop/.

The venom directed by the likes of Grievous Wolf at King James 1st and the Book with which he is forever associated is therefore not surprising.

See also:

www.wildernesspublications.org/contents/en-uk/d13.html,

Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible? by David W. Daniels, p 111,

The Holy Bible Versus the Unholy Church, Revelation 17:1-5 by Alan O'Reilly, message on CD,

In Awe of Thy Word by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger, A. V. Publications, Corp., www.avpublications.com, pp 553, 571ff,

King James And His Translators by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger, A. V. Publications, Corp., www.avpublications.com.

The definitive work about King James 1st, is *King James Unjustly Accused?* by Stephen A. Coston Snr., Konigswort, 7245 34th Avenue North, St. Petersburg, Florida 33710-1315.

Stephen Coston's work decisively shows Grievous Wolf to be the craven liar that he is, as the following material proves. Grievous Wolf refers to historians Caroline Bingham, Otto J. Scott and David H. Wilson. Stephen Coston, p 230, quotes from Caroline Bingham's book *The Making of a King* p 132, where the author wrote that a certain John Hacket started a smear campaign against James 1st that Bingham dismisses as mere court gossip. Coston reveals that Hacket was a Puritan adversary of James 1st who, according to Bingham, could only circulate hints against James that could never be substantiated.

Coston gives an overview of the book by Otto J. Scott entitled *James I the Fool as King* (Grievous Wolf neglected to give the book's full title) in his Appendix on the libelling of James 1st, pp 343ff. Coston lists six reasons why Scott's accusations against James 1st consist merely of unsubstantiated rumours and concludes that Scott drew heavily on the book by David H. Wilson, *King James VI and I*, who in turn based his narrative on the "**malicious words**" 3 John 10 of James's adversaries, the disaffected courtiers Anthony Weldon, see above, and Francis Osborne, both of whom hated Scots generally and Scotsman James Stuart in particular. Scott's book, Coston notes, contains in its bibliography many historical works that are supportive of James 1st but which Scott did not use, such that, according to Coston, the *National Catholic Reporter*, this writer's emphasis, gave its approval to Scott's book.

The Catholics tried to assassinate James 1st's person in 1605, a *genuine "historical FACT"* that Grievous Wolf fails to mention. See *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* Chapter Seven. Four centuries later, they are more than ready to help assassinate his character. Rome is *semper eadem*, always the same.

Coston alludes on pp 178, 322, 323, 350, 351, 352 of his book to misleading statements that David H. Wilson makes about James 1st and the antagonistic portrayal of him that Wilson gives. Coston then cites the *Research Guide to European Historical Biography* Vol II, pp 1001-1002, 1004, which concludes that Wilson's verdict on James 1st could well have been influenced by his intense dislike for James and that his work will therefore most likely be superseded. Coston also refers to another work, *The Royal House* by Eric Linklater, who shows that Weldon, Wilson's and in turn Osborne's main source of information (or disinformation), is effectively useless as an authority on James 1st.

Stephen Coston reveals the spiteful nature of Weldon and Osborne in Chapter 8 of his book where he shows that, like those of John Hacket, see above, their accusations against James 1st that Grievous Wolf touts as "*the historical FACT*" were never explicit and never substantiated but sprang from hints, innuendo and insinuation only.

The historical accusations against James bear an uncanny similarity to many of Grievous Wolf's accusations against "**the scripture of truth**" Daniel 10:21, the Book forever associated with King James 1st.

The accusers appear to have the same mentor, described in Revelation 12:10 as "**the accuser of our brethren.**" Like him, they too will doubtless be "**cast down.**"

Dr Mrs Riplinger gives a true portrayal of King James 1st in her book *King James And His Translators* from *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 581-582, her emphases.

"The King's enemies spun wicked "cunningly devised fables" about him. Harvard University Press's Jacobean Pageant (1963) calls these, "slanders spread by defeated rivals..." Benjamin Disraeli said such authors, "filled their works with Libel and Invective, instead of History...This is the style which

passes for history with some readers.” “Historians can and should ignore the venomous caricature of the king’s person and behaviour,” notes Maurice Lee, author of *Great Britain’s Solomon: James VI*. Author Stephen A. Coston cites a personal letter to himself from Roger Magnuson, author and trial lawyer, graduate of Stanford University, Oxford University and Harvard Law School. Magnuson wrote, “I find no evidence” to prove the unkind accusations levelled at King James (Coston, pp 225, 234, 215, 324, 329, 258 n. 1). William Sanderson said,

““The King knew no better means to suppress the credit of **false rumors**, than by his own pious practice in religion, by outward frequency in the exercises of **prayer** and **preaching**, duly performing and executing his justice and **mercy**, with such wisdom, and piety, as made his virtues thereby more transparent to the common view and sense of all men” (Coston, p. 291).

“The KJV translators said of King James, “[H]e knew who had chosen him to be a Soldier, or rather a Captain, and being assured that the course which he intended made for the glory of God, and the building up of his Church, he would not suffer it to be broken off for whatsoever speeches...” (Holy Bible, 1611, *The Translators to the Reader*, London: Robert Barker). ”

Grievous Wolf’s calumny against James 1st is worse than the subversive attitude of Mohammedan jihadists who desecrate this country’s war memorials, because Grievous Wolf purports to be saved.

See www.jihadwatch.org/2010/04/uk-vandalism-of-war-memorial-with-islam-will-dominate-the-world-deemed-not-religiously-motivated.html.

51. Would you contend that the KJV translator, Richard Thomson, who worked on Genesis-Kings in the Westminster group, was “led by God in translating” even though he was an alcoholic that “drank his fill daily” throughout the work? [Gustavus S. Paine - “The Men Behind the KJV” Baker Book House/1979/pgs. 40, 69]

This writer would contend that Grievous Wolf is a slanderer of the first order. That Richard Thomson “drank his fill daily” does not make him an alcoholic in the accepted modern sense of compulsive and uncontrolled drinking. See www.netdoctor.co.uk/health_advice/facts/alcoholism.htm.

It is Grievous Wolf’s responsibility to prove otherwise.

Grievous Wolf refers to p 40 of *The Men Behind the KJV*. He didn’t quote it because it would have shown him up for the slanderer that he is. The relevant paragraph on p 40 reads as follows.

“[Thomson] was...called a “great propagator of Arminianism,” the anti-Calvinist way of thought developed in Holland.

“[William] Prynne said that [Thomson] was “a debauched drunken English Dutchman who seldom went to bed one night sober.” Yet Richard Montague called him “a most admirable philologist [linguist]. Few divines were averse to drinking, and few wholly abstained from it. “Dutch” Thomson is the only one of the learned men to whom any referred as drunken. But if he had what others may have thought too much by night, he arose in the morning with his head clear enough to go forward competently with the day’s work.”

William Prynne was an extreme Calvinist who, between the ages of 27 and 30, published three books “attacking Arminianism and its teachers. In the preface to one of them he appealed to parliament to suppress anything written against Calvinist doctrine and to force the clergy to subscribe to the conclusion of the Synod of Dort.”

See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Prynne.

Prynne’s rigid Calvinism no doubt influenced his invective against the Arminian Richard Thomson and Prynne cannot therefore be perceived as a wholly objective commentator with respect to Thomson.

However, Paine’s statement, on the page of his book to which Wolf refers, indicates the opposite of Wolf’s insinuation. Thomson, says, Paine, was able to carry out his translation work competently. Again, it is up to Grievous Wolf to show otherwise.

Richard Thomson and his drinking is, of course, only a means to an end for Wolf, by which he aims to discredit the 1611 Holy Bible through an *ad hominem* attack on one of the translators. It would benefit Wolf to study Billy Sunday's famous *Booze Sermon*.

See www.biblebelievers.com/billy_sunday_booze.html.

As that sermon indicates, Sunday was one of the most outstanding Christian campaigners against alcohol of all time. In addition, he was a thoroughgoing King James Bible believer who said that "*When the Bible (AV1611) says one thing and scholarship says another, scholarship can go plumb to the Devil!*"

See Peter Amue the Bible Corrector Part 1, p 2, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-7434.php.

Steadfast belief in the AV1611 is therefore instrumental and conspicuously effective in opposing alcohol consumption, regardless of aspects of the personal lives of any of the translators. Wolf seems ignorant of that fact of history.

He also appears ignorant of the first mention of wine in the scripture, which occurs in the very portion of the scriptures that Richard Thomson helped translate and which Wolf mentions, the Books of Genesis to Kings.

Genesis 9:21 states that "***And he drank of the wine, and was drunken; and he was uncovered within his tent.***"

However partial any individual may be to "***wine and strong drink***" Numbers 6:3, the 1611 Holy Bible clearly takes the *diametrically opposite stance*. Wolf can't appreciate that because as Proverbs 24:7 states, "***Wisdom is too high for a fool: he openeth not his mouth in the gate,***" only on the web.

Note that Wolf's allusion to Richard Thomson's drinking is one of 28 deceptive stratagems used by evolutionists against Biblical creationists that Malcolm Bowden lists in Appendix 4 of his book *Science vs Evolution*. Bowden identifies the stratagem that Wolf is using with respect to Richard Thomson's drinking as *Guilt (or Denigration) by Association* (no. 25 in Bowden's list). The stratagem is used to associate the person or object of criticism (in this case the 1611 Holy Bible) with an individual, situation or type of behaviour or belief that is deemed wrong or evil. In this way, the critic aims to 'prove' that whoever or whatever he is criticising (in this case the 1611 Holy Bible) must therefore, by association, also be wrong or evil.

Grievous Wolf has used the same deceptive stratagem in *Question 9* with respect to the King James translators as a group and in *Question 50* with respect to King James 1st. He will use *another, similar* deceptive stratagem with respect to denigrating the 1611 Holy Bible in *Questions 61, 62*, which consists of appealing to individuals whose character Wolf perceives as the *antithesis* of that of King James 1st, Richard Thomson and the King James translators as a group.

52. *Is it possible that the rendition "gay clothing," in the KJV at James 2:3, could give the wrong impression to the modern-English KJV reader?*

If it did, that is the reader's problem, not the problem of the 1611 Holy Bible. Grievous Wolf evidently can't tell the difference. He also forgot to read James 2:2 that defines "***gay clothing***" in James 2:3.

"For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment;"

"Gay clothing" is "goodly apparel" i.e. expensive clothing worn by a rich man who can afford "a gold ring." Wolf is being wilfully ignorant again, 1 Corinthians 14:38. See *Questions 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 25, 38, 46*.

53. *Did dead people "wake up" in the morning according to Isaiah 37:36 in the KJV?*

Yes, shortly before they actually dropped dead. The relevant verses are as follows.

"And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the LORD went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses" 2 Kings 19:35.

“Then the angel of the LORD went forth, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses” Isaiah 37:36.

Usually when the Lord smote an individual or individuals in scripture, death followed immediately or in a very short space of time. See Exodus 12:29, 30, 1 Samuel 6:19, 25:38, 2 Samuel 6:7, Acts 12:23. However, the Lord can smite an individual so that death is certain but not instantaneous. King Jehoram of Judah is a case in point, from 2 Chronicles 21:18-19.

“And after all this the LORD smote him in his bowels with an incurable disease. And it came to pass, that in process of time, after the end of two years, his bowels fell out by reason of his sickness: so he died of sore diseases. And his people made no burning for him, like the burning of his fathers.”

In a similar way, “the angel of the Lord” smote the Assyrians such that their deaths were certain but not immediate (and in this case not displaying any symptoms of a debilitating disease such as eventually killed Jehoram). Having been smitten during the night, the Assyrians arose in the morning, formed up in battle array to advance on Jerusalem, 2 Kings 19:32 and dropped dead on the spot, or took one pace forward and then dropped dead. It is apparent from 2 Kings 19:35, Isaiah 37:36 that the Assyrians died in unison, which indicates that they were in formation when their foreordained deaths struck.

Note that the Lord can slay without the slain dying immediately, even though, once again, the deaths are certain. See Ezekiel 9:5-6, 10.

“And to the others he said in mine hearing, Go ye after him through the city, and smite: let not your eye spare, neither have ye pity: Slay utterly old and young, both maids, and little children, and women: but come not near any man upon whom is the mark; and begin at my sanctuary. Then they began at the ancient men which were before the house...And as for me also, mine eye shall not spare, neither will I have pity, but I will recompense their way upon their head.”

Grievous Wolf should really make more of an effort to “Search the scriptures” John 5:39 instead of remaining wilfully ignorant of them. See Questions 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 25, 38, 46, 52.

54. Was “Baptist” John’s last name according to Matthew 14:8 and Luke 7:20 in the KJV?

Wolf has a surname. Why should he begrudge John the same privilege? What is the difference between “John Baptist” in Matthew 14:8, Luke 7:20 and “John the Baptist” in Matthew 3:1, 11:11, 12 and 10 other places and “Jesus Christ” in Matthew 1:1, 18, Mark 1:1 and 94 other places and “Jesus the Christ” in Matthew 16:20? If “Jesus Christ” and “Jesus the Christ” are both acceptable New Testament expressions in English, insofar as Wolf doesn’t question either of them, why shouldn’t “John Baptist” and “John the Baptist” be equally acceptable?

Grievous Wolf doesn’t say. He continues to be wilfully ignorant of “the holy scriptures” 2 Timothy 3:15. See Questions 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 25, 38, 46, 52, 53.

55. Is 2 Corinthians 6:11-13 in the KJV understood or make [sic] any sense to the modern-English KJV reader? – “O ye Corinthians, our mouth is open unto you, our heart is enlarged. Ye are not straitened in us, but ye are straitened in your own bowels. Now for a recompense in the same, (I speak as unto my children,) be ye also enlarged.” If this can be translated to make sense to us in modern language terms would that be a sin?

Paul has just written in detail in 2 Corinthians 6:4-10 “approving ourselves as the ministers of God” and being genuinely ‘transparent’ with respect to the Corinthians “because I have you in my heart” Philippians 1:7 “being affectionately desirous of you” 1 Thessalonians 2:8. He urges them to be likewise in return so that he and “Timothy our brother” 2 Corinthians 1:1 may minister more effectively to the Corinthians. Paul’s concern for the Corinthians was the same as his concern for the Thessalonians as seen in 1 Thessalonians 3:10.

“Night and day praying exceedingly that we might see your face, and might perfect that which is lacking in your faith...”

The issues that Paul raises in 2 Corinthians 6:14-18 on personal relationships, including personal relationship with God, call for genuine transparency, trust and desirous affection on the part of both “the

ministers of God” and those to whom they minister in order to be resolved *“to the glory of God”* 1 Corinthians 10:31.

2 Corinthians 6:11-13 already makes sense in Biblical language and has done so for 400 years. Any attempt to change the passage into supposedly *“more modern language terms”* would simply be more satanic corruption of *“the scripture of truth”* Daniel 10:21. See *New Age Versions* by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger.

Grievous Wolf is being wilfully ignorant again. See Questions 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 25, 38, 46, 52, 53, 54. If he has trouble with the word *“bowels,”* the expression in scripture includes the heart, Psalm 22:14, Jeremiah 4:19, Lamentations 1:20. That is why Paul uses the expression to describe, more vividly than by means of any modern alternative, the deepest and most sincere qualities of the saved individual’s character as in Colossians 3:12.

***“Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering;*”**

56. *Does the singular “oath’s,” occurring in every KJV at Matthew 14:9 and Mark 6:26, “correct” every Textus Receptus Greek which has the plural (“oaths”) by the post-1611 publishers, misplacing the apostrophe?*

Yes, because Herod only made one oath, regardless of the opinions of modern editors to the contrary as found in the NIV/TNIV /2011NIV/NKJV. See Matthew 14:7, Mark 6:23.

“Whereupon he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she would ask.”

“And he sware unto her, Whatsoever thou shalt ask of me, I will give it thee, unto the half of my kingdom.”

Grievous Wolf continues to be wilfully ignorant of *“the holy scriptures”* 2 Timothy 3:15. See Questions 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 25, 38, 46, 52, 53, 54, 55.

It should be noted that ‘the Greek’ for *“sabbath”* in Matthew 28:1 is *plural* in any Greek text, including editions of the Received Text, e.g. Ricker Berry’s edition of Stephanus’s 1550 Edition, minority text editions such as Nestle’s 21st Edition (which says *“sabbaths”* in its English interlinear text) and the Farsstad-Hodges so-called ‘Majority’ Text. Modern versions, NIV/TNIV/2011NIV/NKJV, nevertheless translate the *plural* ‘Greek’ word for *“sabbaths”* as the *singular* word *“sabbath,”* showing that ‘the Greek’ with respect to singulars and plurals is not really the final authority, even for modern translators. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1295.

57. *Did Jesus teach a way for men to be “worshipped” according to Luke 14:10 in the KJV, contradicting the first commandment and what He said in Luke 4:8? [Remember – you may not go the Greek for any “light” if you are a KJV only advocate].*

The correct term is not *“KJV only advocate.”* It is King James Bible *authority* advocate. That is a much more robust stance on authority than that of Grievous Wolf, whose only authority is two-and-a-half pints of human brains. See **Introduction**.

‘The Greek’ doesn’t give any *““light,””* as Grievous Wolf’s last 57+ questions have revealed. He should reflect carefully upon Luke 11:35.

“Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness.”

See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks under Question 46 on ‘the Greek’ that God has finished with.

Once again, Grievous Wolf is being wilfully ignorant of *“the holy scriptures”* 2 Timothy 3:15. See Questions 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 25, 38, 46, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56.

Luke 14:10 does not say *“worshipped”* as in Luke 4:8 *“Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God.”* Luke 14:10 says *“Friend, go up higher: then shalt thou have worship.”* To *“have worship”* in the context is simply to be brought *“higher”* and acknowledged as *“more honourable”* Luke 14:8 or *“exalted”* according to Luke 14:11.

“For whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.”

58. *Is the Holy Ghost an “it” according to John 1:32; Romans 8:16, 26; and 1 Peter 1:11 in the KJV? [Again – you may not go the Greek for any “light” if you are a KJV only advocate].*

See remarks above with respect to “KJV only advocate” and ““light”” from ‘the Greek.’ The verses in Question 58 read as follows, with the additions of Romans 8:17, 27, Hebrews 7:25. Note the underlined words.

John 1:32 *“And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him.”*

Romans 8:16-17 *“The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.”*

Romans 8:26 *“Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.”*

Hebrews 7:25 *“Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.*”

1 Peter 1:11 *“Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.”*

Each of the above passages, including the cross reference Hebrews 7:25, contains a reference to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Biblical answer to Question 58 is therefore found in John 16:13-14. Again, note the underlined words.

“Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.”

In passages where “the Spirit of Christ” draws attention to the Lord Jesus Christ, “the Spirit itself” glorifies the Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore “he shall not speak of himself.” That is why the words “it” or “itself” are found in John 1:32, Romans 8:16, 26, 1 Peter 1:11 and not “he” or “himself” as the NIV/TNIV/2011NIV/NKJV wrongly insert in those verses.

Simple, really, as in Luke 10:21:

“In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight.”

59. *Does Luke 23:56 support a “Friday” crucifixion in the KJV? [No “day” here in Greek].*

No. John 19:31 shows why. Regardless of ‘the Greek,’ “day” is where it should be in English in the 1611 Holy Bible in Luke 23:56. The modern counterfeits, NIV/TNIV/2011NIV/NKJV, are in error in omitting “day” because the omission implies that the week of the crucifixion had only the normal Sabbath, namely Saturday. However, as John 19:31 shows, that week had two Sabbaths, just as the seven days of unleavened bread in Exodus 12:15-18 incorporated two Sabbaths.

“The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.”

See the Ruckman Reference Bible pp 1257-1258 and Dr Ruckman’s commentary *The Book of Matthew* pp 218, 584-585, 709. The Lord Jesus Christ was crucified on the Wednesday and the “high day” Sabbath of that week was the next day, Thursday, followed by the conventional Sabbath, Saturday, such that the Lord spent a full 72 hours “in the heart of the earth” according to Matthew 12:40.

“For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.”

Note that by the omission of “**day**” in Luke 23:56, it is ‘the Greek,’ so-called and the modern counterfeits that “*support a “Friday” [i.e. Catholic] crucifixion*” by implying that the week of the crucifixion included *only one Sabbath* i.e. the conventional Saturday Sabbath.

60. Did Jesus command for a girl to be given “*meat*” to eat according to Luke 8:55 in the KJV? [or, “*of them that sit at meat with thee.*” [sic] at Luke 14:10], or did he mean “*food*”?

“**Meat**” in scripture refers to any kind of food. See for example Genesis 1:29, 9:3, 25:29 with Hebrews 12:16, 27:4, 40:17, Leviticus 2:4, 14, Judges 14:14, 2 Samuel 13:10, 1 Kings 19:8, Psalm 78:25, Isaiah 62:8, Ezekiel 16:19, 45:15, 47:12, Matthew 3:4, 15:37, John 21:5-6.

Once again, Grievous Wolf is being wilfully ignorant of “**the holy scriptures**” 2 Timothy 3:15. See Questions 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 25, 38, 46, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59.

61. Was Charles Haddon Spurgeon a “Bible-corrupter” for saying that Romans 8:24 should be rendered “*saved in hope,*” instead of the KJV’s “*saved by hope*”? [Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, Vol 27, 1881, page 485 – see more Spurgeon KJV comments in What is “KJV-Onlyism?”, his & many others’ views in the article, “*Quotes on Bible Translations*”].

Yes.

Grievous Wolf (and Charles Haddon Spurgeon on this occasion) forgot to read the context of Romans 8:24.

“And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body” Romans 8:23.

“For we are saved by hope; but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?” Romans 8:24.

“But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it” Romans 8:25.

Romans 8:24 makes reference to the salvation of *the physical body*, Romans 8:23, not the soul, at the Lord’s Return, 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17, which Paul describes as “**that blessed hope**” in Titus 2:13.

“Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;”

The Christian is “*saved by hope*” with respect to “**the redemption of our body**” because “**that blessed hope**” is the *reality* of the Return of “**the Lord from heaven**” 1 Corinthians 15:47 as Paul explains in Philippians 3:20-21. (The opening statement of Philippians 3:20 matches Ephesians 2:6, which states that the believer is even now seated “*in heavenly places in Christ Jesus*”).

“For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.”

Paul therefore exhorts believers to “**with patience wait for it**” Romans 8:25 i.e. “**that blessed hope**” according to 2 Thessalonians 3:5.

“And the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ.”

See Dr Ruckman’s commentary *The Book of Romans* pp 321-322 and the Ruckman Reference Bible p 1497.

Once again, Grievous Wolf is being wilfully ignorant of “**the holy scriptures**” 2 Timothy 3:15. See Questions 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 25, 38, 46, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60.

The NIV/TNIV/2011NIV/NKJV/NJB/NWT/HCSB all have “*in hope*” or similar. The JB has “*content to hope.*”

The RV, DRB have “*by hope*” in agreement with the AV1611.

The Coverdale Bible has “i(n) hope.”

The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Great, Bishops', Geneva Bibles have “by hope” in agreement with the AV1611.

On balance, the witnesses for and against the AV1611 reading “**by hope**” in Romans 8:24 show that on this occasion, Spurgeon aligned himself with the wrong crowd, namely the NIV, TNIV, 2011NIV, NKJV, NJB, NWT, HCSB etc. and Grievous Wolf.

62. *Was R. A. Torrey “lying” when he said the following in 1907 – “No one, so far as I know, holds that the English translation of the Bible is absolutely infallible and inerrant. The doctrine held by many is that the Scriptures as originally given were absolutely infallible and inerrant, and that our English translation is a substantially accurate rendering of the Scriptures as originally given” [Difficulties in the Bible, page 17].*

Yes.

Note this extract from www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ AV1611 vs Rome – The Holy Bible vs The Unholy Church! p 13. It describes the heresy of ‘originals-onlyism’ in the modern era. This heresy stemmed from individuals who were “**Traitors, heady, highminded**” 2 Timothy 3:4.

1881, Year of Infamy

1881 was a year of infamy. Westcott and Hort published the RV in 1881. That same year, Professors Archibald Hodge and Benjamin Warfield of Princeton Theological Seminary attacked the Holy Bible - by appealing to the lost ‘originals.’ In The Presbyterian Review, 1881, Vol. 2, No. 6, pp 237-8, they said this.

“All the affirmations of Scripture...are without any error, when the ipsissima verba [the precise words] of the original autographs are ascertained and interpreted in their natural and intended sense.”

*That is, only the ‘originals,’ which you don’t have, are God’s words and only the ‘scholars’ can tell you what God **really** said. So ‘scholarship’ is now the final authority for Protestants, just as the Church is the final authority for Catholics. Today, Christian fundamentalists proclaim the heresy of ‘scholarship onlyism’ or ‘originals-onlyism’ from pulpits up and down the land. Why no revival? You have the answer.*

Note the following extract from www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ The KJB Story 1611-2011 Abridged pp 15-16. It consists of the testimonies of men who spoke unequivocally of the infallibility, inerrancy and indeed inspiration of the 1611 Holy Bible, regardless of whether they were for or against it.

“Give me that Book” - Bunyan, Wesley, Spurgeon, Ryle, Shaw

This is from John Bunyan, The Immortal Dreamer, by W. Burgess McCreary: “A university man met Bunyan on the road near Cambridge. Said he to Bunyan, “How dare you preach, not having the original Scriptures?” “Do you have them - the copies written by the apostles and prophets?” asked Bunyan. “No,” replied the scholar. “But I have what I believe to be a true copy of the original.” “And I,” said Bunyan, “believe the English Bible to be a true copy too.””

John Charles Ryle was the first Church of England Bishop of Liverpool.

See [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/J. C. Ryle](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/J._C._Ryle).

In the 1870s, he wrote a book entitled The Christian Leaders of the Last (i.e. 18th) Century, about the great revival preachers like Whitefield and Wesley.

He said this about these preachers and the 1611 Holy Bible, his emphases.

*“The spiritual reformers of the last century taught constantly **the sufficiency and supremacy of Holy Scripture**. The Bible, whole and unmutated, was their sole rule of faith and practice. They accepted all its statements without question or dispute. They knew nothing of any part of Scripture being uninspired. They never allowed that man has any “verifying faculty” within him, by which Scripture statements may be weighed, rejected or received. They never flinched from asserting that there can be no error in the Word of God; and that when we cannot understand or reconcile some part of its contents,*

the fault is in the interpreter and not in the text. In all their preaching they were eminently men of one book. To that book they were content to pin their faith, and by it to stand or fall. This was one grand characteristic of their preaching. They honoured, they loved, they revered the Bible.”

One of those men was John Wesley. He said this about the 1611 Holy Bible.

““I want to know one thing – the way to heaven – how to land safe on that happy shore. God Himself has condescended to teach the way; for this very end He came from heaven. He hath written it down in a book. Oh, give me that book! At any price give me the book of God! I have it: here is knowledge enough for me. Let me be a man of one book.””

Consider what Charles Haddon Spurgeon had to say about the 1611 Holy Bible.

“The Bible is God’s word, and when I see it, I seem to hear a voice saying, ‘I am the Book of God, man, read me; I am God’s writing: open my leaves, for I was penned by God’...I plead with you, I beg of you, respect your Bibles, and search them out. Go home and read your Bibles...O Book of books! And wast thou written by my God? Then I will bow before thee, thou Book of vast authority! For He has written this Book Himself...let us love it, let us count it more precious than fine gold!”

In the English-speaking world, even up until World War 2, the attitudes toward the 1611 Holy Bible expressed by those men; Bunyan, Wesley, Ryle and Spurgeon, were not as exceptional as we might think, as this statement shows:

“In all these instances the Bible means the translation authorised by King James the First...to this day the common human Britisher or citizen of the United States of North America accepts and worships it as a single book by a single author, the book being the Book of Books and the author being God.”

What a bibliolatrous thing to say about the Britain and the United States of a mere 60 to 70 years ago! Who could possibly make such an outrageous statement?

Answer: George Bernard Shaw, who was a lifelong atheist.

See www.liberator.net/articles/SloanGary/Shaw.html.

However, Shaw was of course an accomplished and well-known writer, so he was in a position to know what Britons and Americans of his time thought about literature.

In answer to Grievous Wolf’s citation of Spurgeon against the 1611 Holy Bible in Question 61, this is what Spurgeon said to his students about the 1611 Holy Bible a few months before he died in 1892. See www.spurgeon.org/misc/gfw.htm.

“If this book be not infallible, where shall we find infallibility? We have given up the Pope, for he has blundered often and terribly; but we shall not set up instead of him a horde of little popelings fresh from college. Are these correctors of Scripture infallible? Is it certain that our Bibles are not right, but that the critics must be so?...

“But where shall infallibility be found? “The depth saith, it is not in me”; yet those who have no depth at all [spiritually] would have us imagine that it is in them; or else by perpetual change they hope to hit upon it...

“We shall gradually be so bedoubted and becriticized, that only a few of the most profound [intellectually] will know what is Bible, and what is not, and they will dictate to all the rest of us. I have no more faith in their mercy than in their accuracy: they will rob us of all that we hold most dear, and glory in the cruel deed. This same reign of terror we shall not endure, for we still believe that God revealeth himself rather to babes than to the wise and prudent, and we are fully assured that our own old English version of the Scriptures is sufficient for plain men for all purposes of life, salvation, and godliness. We do not despise learning, but we will never say of culture or criticism, “These be thy gods, O Israel!””

It remains for Grievous Wolf to state unequivocally whether it was God or the Devil that prompted Spurgeon to make the statements given above under Question 62 and to explain his choice of prompter.

Further testimony to the infallibility, inerrancy and indeed inspiration of the 1611 Holy Bible may be found in this extract from www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1309647082.pdf Peter Amue the Bible Corrector Part 1. See pp 2-3.

The words of evangelist Billy Sunday ring down the decades. See "O Biblios" The Book by Alan O'Reilly, Covenant Publishers, 2001, p 102.

See p 86 of the uploaded file, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.

"When the Bible (AV1611) says one thing and scholarship says another, scholarship can go plumb to the Devil!"

Despite his highly unorthodox attitude and 'offensive' manner, "Billy Sunday saw over 1,000,000 men and women "hit the sawdust trail" in open profession of faith in our Lord Jesus Christ", according to the paper How Great Soul winners Were Endued with Power, by Dr Rev Ian Paisley...

Yet another distinguished witness, William Lyon Phelps, Lampson Professor of English Literature at Yale University, said this. See Human Nature in the Bible by William Lyon Phelps, 1922, Introduction.

"We Anglo-Saxons have a better Bible than the French or Germans or the Italians or the Spanish; our English translation is even better than the original Hebrew and Greek. There is only one way to explain this; I have no theory to account for the so-called "inspiration of the Bible," but I am confident that the Authorized Version was inspired.

"Now as the English-speaking people have the best Bible in the world, and as it is the most beautiful monument ever erected with the English alphabet, we ought to make the most of it, for it is an incomparably rich inheritance, free to all who can read. This means that we ought invariably in the church and on public occasions to use the Authorized Version; all others are inferior. And, except for special purposes, it should be used exclusively in private reading. Why make constant companions of the second best, when the best is available?"

Though not a bible believer himself, journalist and essayist H. L. Mencken, 1880-1956, is said to be "regarded as one of the most influential American writers and prose stylists of the first half of the 20th century." See [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/H. L. Mencken](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/H._L._Mencken).

He said this about the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

"It is the most beautiful of all the translations of the Bible; indeed, it is probably the most beautiful piece of writing in all the literature. Many attempts have been made to purge it of its errors and obscurities...many learned but misguided men have sought to produce translations that should be mathematically accurate, and in the plain speech of everyday. But the Authorized Version has never yielded to any of them, for it is palpably and overwhelmingly better than they are..."

See The Men Behind the King James Version by Gustavus S. Paine, Baker Book House, 1977, p viii.

Somehow, God has never honoured any attempts "to purge it of its errors and obscurities" in four centuries. How does Mr Amué explain this testimony of history?

"In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established" 2 Corinthians 13:1b.

Eight witnesses in favour of the inerrancy, infallibility and inspiration of the 1611 Holy Bible have been cited above, fourfold the minimum number. Grievous Wolf can no more explain that testimony of history in favour of the inerrancy, infallibility and inspiration of the 1611 Holy Bible than the poor benighted Mr Amué could.

Note this statement from p 34 of "O Biblios" – The Book by this writer with respect to the underhanded method that Grievous Wolf has used to attack the 1611 Holy Bible in Questions 61, 62. The statement includes an illusion to R. A. Torrey.

See p 25 of the uploaded file, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.

A variation on this criticism [to the effect that any Bible translation (especially the AV1611) is imperfect because men are imperfect and all Bible translators are men, i.e. the satanic syllogism] is that 'good, godly men corrected the AV1611 on occasion, so it must need correcting'. The simple answer is

that when any man **“holds the truth in unrighteousness”** Romans 1:18, by exalting HIS own authority over that of [the 1611 HOLY BIBLE], he *CEASES* to be ‘good’ and he ceases to be ‘godly’.

“My glory will I not give to another” Isaiah 42:8, not Torrey, not Spurgeon, not Ryle, not Calvin, not Wesley, not Moody, not Scofield, not ANY other.

The above statement illustrates another deceptive stratagem that Malcolm Bowden lists in his book *Science vs Evolution*. See Question 51.

Under Question 51, Grievous Wolf used the deceptive stratagem of what Malcolm Bowden terms *Guilt (or Denigration) by Association* (no. 25 in Bowden’s list) in order to denigrate the 1611 Holy Bible by allusion to translator Richard Thomson’s drinking. Under Questions 61, 62, Grievous Wolf is attempting to subvert the 1611 Holy Bible by means of guilt (or denigration) by *dissociation*.

Malcolm Bowden refers to that particular deceptive stratagem as *Fallacious Appeal to Authority*. It is no. 12 on his list. The stratagem consists of appealing to a well-known individual to act as a deciding authority in a subject in which he is not an expert.

Charles Haddon Spurgeon and R. A. Torrey were well-known individuals in their respective fields of preaching and evangelism but they were not experts with respect to the text of the 1611 Holy Bible, although Spurgeon nevertheless acknowledged the inerrancy, infallibility and inspiration of the 1611 Holy Bible when **“in his right mind”** Mark 5:15. See Question 61.

Dr William Grady notes in his book *What Hath God Wrought!* pp 357-379 that Torrey fell under the destructive influence of the ‘originals-onlyists’ at Moody Bible Institute and, as their student, that of the German higher critics of the Lutheran Universities of Leipzig and Erlanger with **“the poison of asps...under their lips”** Romans 3:13 against the 1611 Holy Bible, from which Torrey’s belief in the AV1611 suffered permanent damage.

As Solomon warns in Proverbs 13:20 **“He that walketh with wise men shall be wise: but a companion of fools shall be destroyed.”**

The Expert with respect to the text of the 1611 Holy Bible is its Author, of Whom John states in Revelation 5:1:

“And I saw in the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the backside, sealed with seven seals.”

This is what one of the Author’s experts with respect to that Book, Dr Miles Smith, said in *The Translators To The Reader*. See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ The KJB Story 1611-2011 Abridged p 21.

“Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines [Genesis 26:15], neither prefer broken pits before them with the wicked Jews [Jeremiah 2:13]. Others have laboured, and you may enter into their labours; O receive not so great things in vain, O despise not so great salvation!...a blessed thing it is, and will bring us to everlasting blessedness in the end, when God speaketh unto us, to hearken; when he setteth his word before us, to read it; when he stretcheth out his hand and calleth, to answer, Here am I, here we are to do thy will, O God. The Lord work a care and conscience in us to know him and serve him, that we may be acknowledged of him at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom with the holy Ghost, be all praise and thanksgiving. Amen.”

If Grievous Wolf was **“in his right mind”** Mark 5:15, he would listen to both the Expert, John 16:13, and the experts, like Dr Miles Smith.

63. Did God supernaturally “move His Word from the original languages to English” in 1611 as affirmed by The Flaming Torch?

Whatever The Flaming Torch says is irrelevant.

See extensive remarks under *Question 28* for an outline of God's purification process for **"the words of the LORD"** according to Psalm 12:6-7 and of how the 1611 Holy Bible is the final stage of perfection for that purification process.

64. *Is it a sin to use different translations to try and understand all that could be translated from the manuscripts?*

The exercise is pointless. See Dr Mrs Ripilinger's remarks under *Question 46* on 'the Greek' that God has finished with.

65. *If God was so intent on preserving an error free text, why is it that there is no Hebrew text preserved that is error free?*

The question is a declaration of the heresy of 'originals-onlyism' according to Hodge and Warfield. See *Question 62*. It is a blatant denial of the promise of the providential preservation of **"the words of the LORD"** Psalm 12:6, 7 and of the priesthood of all believers, Malachi 2:7, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 780 with respect to the promise of the providential preservation of **"the words of the LORD"** Psalm 12:6, 7.

An error-free Hebrew text is not the issue because 'the Hebrew' is not the final authority. The 1611 Holy Bible is the issue because it is the final authority. See Dr Mrs Ripilinger's statement from *Question 46*.

"Two hundred years later, in 1838, the Jews' Society followed the KJB [translators'] method of accessing a pure vernacular Bible, when creating an edition of the Hebrew New Testament. They made changes to the Greek, "following in most dubious cases the reading of the English version" (see the chapter "The Scriptures to All Nations" [Hazardous Materials Chapter 30], for many more such examples; John McClintock and James Strong, Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, vol. 12, p 535.)"

Note this extract from *Question 30*. Hebrew and Greek texts were simply stages in the preservation and purification of **"the words of the LORD"** Psalm 12:6, 7. They have been superseded by the scriptures in the language of the End Times. The inerrancy or otherwise of today's extant Hebrew and Greek texts is irrelevant.

Dr Laurence Vance has shown in The Bible Believer's Bulletin, February 2003, June 2006 how Psalm 12:6, 7 was fulfilled in the broad sweep of history by means of:

- *A received Hebrew text, 1800 BC to 389 BC*
- *A received Aramaic text at the same time (Genesis, Daniel, etc.)*
- *A received Greek text from AD 40 to AD 90*
- *A received Syrian text from AD 120 to AD 200*
- *A received Latin text from AD 150 to AD 1500*
- *A received German text from AD 1500 to AD 2006*
- *A received English text from AD 1611 to AD 2006 (2011+)*

That analysis would satisfy a genuine Bible believer, although it may not satisfy Grievous Wolf.

See pp 7-8 of www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1309647082.pdf Peter Amue the Bible Corrector Part 1 with respect to **Missionary Effectiveness** of the 1611 Holy Bible in English, not Hebrew or Greek.

See pp 6-7 of www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1309647107.pdf Peter Amue the Bible Corrector Part 2 with respect to the pre-eminence of English as the *lingua franca* of the End Times and with it, the pre-eminence of the 1611 Holy Bible **"for obedience to the faith among all nations, for his name:"** Romans 1:5.

Note the following statement from Dr Mrs Ripilinger from *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 19-20 that emphasises *English* as the premier missionary language and the 1611 Holy Bible in English, not Hebrew or

Greek as the premier missionary Bible, with no necessity for anything from either ‘the Hebrew’ or ‘the Greek.’

“In 1611 the KJV served only 5 million English-speaking people. Today the KJV could be used to bring this century’s nearly 2 billion English speakers to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ (49% of these are native speakers of English; 51% of these can speak some English as their second language). This is nearly 33% of the world’s population [year 2000 total world population 6 billion]...The teaching of English is now required in most nations of the world. [Stanford University] English Professor, Seth Lerer, feels that ‘in many ways, the central feature of 20th century English is its status as a global language.’”

66. If God was so intent on preserving a Greek text error free, why is it that there is no Greek text preserved that is error free?

The question is a declaration of the heresy of ‘originals-onlyism’ according to Hodge and Warfield. See Question 62. It is a blatant denial of the promise of the providential preservation of **“the words of the LORD”** Psalm 12:6, 7 and of the priesthood of all believers, Malachi 2:7, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 780 with respect to the promise of the providential preservation of **“the words of the LORD”** Psalm 12:6, 7.

An error-free Greek text is not the issue because ‘the Greek’ is not the final authority. The 1611 Holy Bible is the issue because it is the final authority. See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement from Question 46 and related remarks.

“The desire to appear intelligent or superior by referring to ‘the Greek’ and downplaying the common man’s Bible, exposes a naivety concerning textual history and those documents which today’s pseudo-intellectuals call ‘the critical text,’ ‘the original Greek,’ the ‘Majority Text,’ or the ‘Textus Receptus.’ There existed a true original Greek (i.e. Majority Text, Textus Receptus). It is not in print and never will be, because it is unnecessary. No one on the planet speaks first century Koine Greek, so God is finished with it. He needs no ‘Dead Bible Society’ to translate it into “everyday English,” using the same corrupt secularised lexicons used by the TNIV, NIV, NASB and HCSB [Holman Christian Standard Bible]. God has not called readers to check his Holy Bible for errors. He has called his Holy Bible to check us for errors.

“What Would Jesus Do?”

- ☒ Inspire a Bible people can read?
- ☐ Inspire conflicting Greek editions which few can read?
- ☐ Inspire unsaved liberals to write conflicting Greek lexicons to translate conflicting one-man Greek editions?
- ☐ Inspire originals then lose them?” (author’s emphasis)

Those are salutary remarks for all serious students of the bible translation issue. What Grievous Wolf would make of them, though, is anybody’s guess.

See remarks under Question 65 with respect to *English* as the premier missionary language and the 1611 Holy Bible in English, *not Hebrew or Greek* as the premier missionary Bible, with no necessity for anything from either ‘the Hebrew’ or ‘the Greek.’

67. If God wanted an error free English text, why is it that there was no error free Greek or Hebrew text from which to translate an error free version?

The question is a declaration of the heresy of ‘originals-onlyism’ according to Hodge and Warfield. See Question 62. It is a blatant denial of the promise of the providential preservation of **“the words of the LORD”** Psalm 12:6, 7 and of the priesthood of all believers, Malachi 2:7, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 780 with respect to the promise of the providential preservation of **“the words of the LORD”** Psalm 12:6, 7.

Error-free Hebrew and Greek texts are not the issue because ‘the Hebrew’ and ‘the Greek’ are not the final authority. The 1611 Holy Bible is the issue because it is the final authority. See Dr Mrs Riplinger-

ger's statements from Questions 46, 65, 66 above and note her definitive statement from *In Awe of Thy Word* p 31 about 'the Hebrew' and 'the Greek.'

"God said, "I have not spoken in secret," in lexicons hidden on scholars' bookshelves, but "in the volume of the book" in "other tongues," such as English (Isa. 45:19, Heb. 10:7). The phrase, "in the Greek" and "in the Hebrew" is too often immediately followed by echoes from the "bottomless pit," warns Rev. 9:11. Unlike today's editors, the KJV translators' final authorities were Bibles, not lexicons. They saw the KJV as the final "perfected" and "finished" English Bible. "Satan," they warned, benefited from "various editions" [i.e. of future 'bibles' such as RV of 1881 and all those that followed]."*

*Revelation 9:11 (!) is the only place in scripture where the expressions ***"in the Greek"*** and ***"in the Hebrew"*** occur together in the one verse.

"The bottomless pit" is where Grievous Wolf's mindset has stemmed from and that of his fellow travelers. Nothing further need be said under Question 67 except to warn those individuals what will happen to their *grievous* works at the Second Advent (and *persons* if either they or any of their co-'originals-onlyists' are unsaved when the Lord comes back). See Matthew 13:41-42.

"The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; And shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth."

See remarks under Questions 65, 66 with respect to *English* as the premier missionary language and the 1611 Holy Bible *in English, not Hebrew or Greek* as the premier missionary Bible, with no necessity for anything from either 'the Hebrew' or 'the Greek.'

Conclusion

All of Grievous Wolf's questions have been answered and ***"the scripture of truth"*** Daniel 10:21 has been proven true with each and every answer. As Paul says in Romans 3:4:

"...yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged."

If ever Grievous Wolf ***"came to himself"*** Luke 15:17 such that he was ***"in his right mind"*** Mark 5:15, he would let the 1611 Holy Bible judge him, not the other way round.

Alan O'Reilly
February 2012