

Answering the "Unanswerable"

Answers to "Unanswerable Questions"

Posed by King James Bible Critic, Gary Hudson

By

Timothy S. Morton

The Nature of The Questions

Sooner or later any person who is interested in "Bible issues" or the "KJV debate" will be confronted with so-called "probing questions" questioning the purity of the word of God as found in the KJB. These questions [now usually found on the Internet] are often **presented in a pompous, arrogant manner typical of the "Autograph Only/KJB critic" crowd.** Since these characters live in a **cold, sterile, "logical" world void of even the possibility of a pure Bible,** they pose these "intelligent and revealing" questions to "unlearned and ignorant" Bible believers in **an attempt to humiliate us into subjection.** Here is an example of their smug, condescending rhetoric by Gary Hudson after he came up with a list of 40 "unanswerable" questions,

*While I could go on with many more questions regarding the growing facets of "KJV-Onlyism," I have limited them to these 40. I am sure that Unlearned Men like... **Peter Ruckman, Samuel Gipp, Jack Hyles, Don Edwards, Herb Evans, Joe Chambers, David Cloud, D. A. Waite, Walter Beebe, Jack Chick, Texe Marrs, E. L. Bynum, William Grady, Floyd Jones, Dallas Bunch, Brad Weniger, Herbert Noe, Larry Vance, Ken Johnson, Robert Diehl,** (+ women like **Gail Riplinger**) and **others**_____ ("Birds of a feather flock together...") of their persuasion, would like to have the answers to these questions!*

Mr. Hudson's "grace and humility" is "like a breath of fresh air" isn't it? His attitude and demeanor are a perfect reflection of the Christian ideal. Pardon my sarcasm, but **boisterous, conceited, braggarts "rub me the wrong way."** Not only does Mr. Hudson deem his questions as unanswerable, **he implies his intellect and grasp of the truth is superior to all the people he named plus all others who may believe likewise!** If one reads much anti-KJB material he soon realizes personal humility is not a trait these characters strive to manifest. Nearly all of them think they are more intelligent, more knowledgeable, more "reasoned," and more spiritual than practically any Christian.

In spite of Mr. Hudson and his cohorts allusions to knowledge and intelligence, Bible believers have something they don't have by their own admission: **the pure, infallible words of the Living God in the KJB.** We can produce the Bible we profess to believe. Hudson and his ilk cannot. This distinction is what fuels their

tirades against Bible believers. **Since we can produce the Bible we believe and they cannot, this makes them jealous of our "appearance of orthodoxy."** We appear to some as more orthodox, legitimate Christians since we can produce our final authority, and, of course, appearance is everything if you are a vain, egotistical, self-serving Bible corrector. **They, instead of us, must appear as "orthodox believers" at whatever the cost.**

In the following we will answer these "unanswerable" questions. The reader can judge both the merit of the questions and the answers. We believe the discerning believer will find most of these "deep, probing questions" from "serious, contemplative minds" are **as shallow as a birdbath**. Furthermore, the reader will soon realize **these questions are not true questions at all**. They are not given to gain knowledge or learn something. They are actually **"rhetorical questions"**; questions given for dramatic effect or in an attempt expose a supposed weakness. No answer we give will satisfy the incorrigible heart of the professional Bible critic, **but our hope is some of our answers will cause one who is honestly searching for the truth to realize God's word does exist in tangible form and is available to all who will pick up a King James Bible.**

Here is the link to the questions as found on Hudson's site,
<http://www.kjvonly.org/gary/questkjv.htm>

Here is a link to answers
http://www.angelfire.com/nt/baptist/HE_64questions.html
Bible believer Herb Evans gave to 64 questions by another KJB critic which appears to be from this site, <http://www.bible.ca/b-kjv-only.htm>. Some of these questions are **exactly the same** as Hudson's! A little plagiarism going on here boys?

I did review brother Evans' answers as I was preparing mine, and as one would expect some of our answers will be similar. When you ask two people who believe the same about a subject you can expect similar answers. But many of the questions from these two websites are **identical** without either one giving the other credit. Typical KJB critic behavior. You be the judge.

The Questions Considered

(1) 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?

There are 5 questions here; I will answer each briefly. Some questions will be touched on again in later answers.

a. Not always; let me explain. If Hudson is referring to the **complete and pure word of God** then no English translation other than the AV will qualify. On the other hand one can have **part of "the word of God" in a New Testament, tract, or quotation**. For example, a person cannot be saved apart from the "word" but this doesn't mean he must have a complete Bible. **Multitudes have been saved by tracts that only contain a very small but vital section of the word—the gospel.**

What does he mean by "flawless," anyway. **We only contend the true and pure meaning of words or a passage must be preserved**, not that spelling, grammar, sentence construction, font, etc. must be identical to the "original."

b. How do you **know** the "originals" were "perfect"? How do you know their were no typo's in the autographs? Remember, much of the Bible was penned by scribes, not the authors. Answer these questions consistantly and you'll better understand our position.

c. We don't "limit" 'the word of God'" to the KJB. As we just said **a tract can contain the "word of God" or even another translation that agrees with the AV in a passage**. We do, however, limit the **complete and pure word of God in English** to the KJB. **It is our final authority.**

d. Before 1611 the "word of God" was a little here; a little more there; etc. It was spread all around in various languages and various manuscripts. **One would have to live at the time to make a proper decision as to which to use and believe**. Looking back any English translation before the AV would have been acceptable [except the Catholic Rheims version]. The English Bible was in a refining process until 1611. I'm little concerned where the Bible was 500 years ago, **I'm concerned about where it is today!**

e. As for the Geneva Bible, **it contained the "word of God"** but it was not the complete and pure word of God. A little more refining had to be done.

(2) Were the KJV translators "LIARS" for saying that "the very meanest [poorest] translation" is still "the word of God"?

No, they were not liars for saying that, but **all men are liars anyway** [Rom. 3:4] including Hudson and myself. This is why all men's words must be "**tried**." The distinction mentioned in answer #1(a) applies here as well. The KJV translators **did not say "the very meanest translation" was the complete and pure word of God**, but that it can convey elements of the word of God. If they thought this "meanest" translation was the pure, complete word then **why would they spend over seven years giving the English language a "better" version?**

(3) Do you believe that the Hebrew and Greek used for the KJV are "the word of God"?

Of course! However, even if we knew precisely which Hebrew and Greek the KJ translators used, it would be of little value to English speaking people. On the other

hand, **I do not believe the texts the KJ translators did NOT use are the word of God where they differ from the KJB.**

(4) Do you believe that the Hebrew and Greek underlying the KJV can "correct" the English?

(5) Do you believe that the English of the KJV "corrects" its own Hebrew and Greek texts from which it was translated?

No in both cases. I do believe, however, that KJB English defines the **proper definition** of the Hebrew or Greek.

(6) Is ANY translation "inspired"? Is the KJV an "inspired translation"?

(7) Is the KJV "scripture"? Is IT "given by inspiration of God"? [2 Tim. 3:16]

Yes on all counts, but let me clarify. **The KJB is the pure word of God, originally given by inspiration, preserved in English.** Therefore, the KJB itself must be "inspired" to use your term. It is given by inspiration in that it is the preserved word. **We don't contend God's word had to be "reinspired" when it was translated into English.** God's word is living and cannot die. **It would have to be dead to be "reinspired" or teach "double inspiration."** All the attributes of the word of God apply to the KJB [inerrant, infallible, pure, scripture, etc.].

(8) WHEN was the KJV "given by inspiration of God" —1611... or any of the KJV major/minor in 1613, 1629, 1638, 1644, 1664, 1701, 1744, 1762, 1769, and the last one in 1850?

When God gave His word originally. See #6-7 above.

(9) In what language did Jesus Christ [not Peter Ruckman and others] teach that the Old Testament would be preserved forever according to Matthew 5:18?

Another "loaded" rhetorical question. First, **Christ doesn't mention any "language" in Matt. 5:18**, but we know the game Hudson is playing. He wants to make a big deal out of the words "jot" and "tittle," but look both words up in an English dictionary. Jot means, **"the least bit: iota" [a Greek term]. Tittle means, "1: a point or small sign used as a diacritical mark in writing or printing 2: A very small part."** So what Christ is saying is simply the smallest part of the law [like a dot for an "i" or cross for a "t"] will not go unfulfilled. What language did Christ say this in? Who knows. If you know Mr. Hudson, let us know, but remember, **you must prove it.**

(10) Where does the Bible teach that God will perfectly preserve His Word in the form of oneseventeenth-century English translation?

More rhetoric. Where did we or any other Bible believer claim this could be found in the Bible? For that matter **where in the Bible does God say He will preserve the Bible in only the original languages or that only the original**

languages can convey His pure word? "Straw man" questions like this reveal Hudson's conceit.

(11) Did God lose the words of the originals when the "autographs" were destroyed?

The God of the Bible hasn't lost anything. What kind of weakling God are you talking about, Hudson? **The only people who have lost these idolized manuscripts are Bible correctors who come near to worshipping them.** We Bible believers believe God's word will endure as He has preserved it among His people in its purity forever.

(12) 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?

No, they were much more honest than most "scholars" today. The question is misleading. The title page at the beginning of the 1611 King James Bible says it was "translated from the original **tongues**" [languages] clarifying their "original Greek" statement on the NT title page. Clearly they were referring to the original Greek language. They didn't claim to have the original autographs.

(13) Was "the original Greek" lost after 1611?

Why no. Much to the dismay of modern Bible correctors the original Greek autographs dissolved into dust many centuries earlier. **Who needs them anyway? God doesn't need them, we Bible believers don't need them.** The only people who seek them [like the Jews sought the brazen serpent] are "Autograph Only" Bible correctors like Hudson.

(14) Did the great Protestant Reformation (1517-1603) take place without "the word of God"?

As we said the word of God was available before 1611, just not in pure, complete form in English. **If God can save a soul with a few spoken words or a few words written on a tract, He can cause a reformation or revival from incomplete Bibles as well.** Everybody knows God's word was available in several different forms and languages before 1611.

(15) What copy or translations of "the word of God," used by the Reformers, was absolutely infallible and inerrant? [their main Bibles are well-known and copies still exist].

None of them at least not in English. They all needed refining to be made pure.

(16) IF... the KJV is "God's infallible and preserved word to the English-speaking people," did the "English-speaking people" have "the word of God" from 1525-1604?

The English-speaking people did have "the word of God" but they didn't yet have "God's infallible and preserved word to the English speaking people." **Actually they had more of the word of God than people who use one of the modern translations today. How pitiful. Modern scholarship has defrauded believers out of the pure word of God and given them translations inferior to those used by Christians over 400 years ago!**

(17) Was Tyndale's [1525], or Coverdale's [1535], or Matthew's [1537], or the Great [1539], or the Geneva [1560]... English Bibles absolutely infallible?

No. We explained why in previous answers. These were Bibles in transition.

(18) If neither the KJV nor any other one version were absolutely inerrant, could a lost sinner still be "*born again*" by the "*incorruptible word of God*"? [1 Peter 1:23]

Though I normally don't answer hypothetical questions [there is no way to prove a hypothetical answer], I will this one. Of course a sinner could be saved. **All he needs is access to an uncorrupted portion of God's word that contains the gospel. This could be found in a tract, book, or even spoken.** As another has said, "Before the word of God as a whole was completed, it was still the word of God in part." Think, Christian, the apostle **Paul did not even have the complete word of God!** At least four books were written after his death [John's books] and he quite likely did not see all the existing NT epistles while he was alive!

(19) If the KJV can "*correct*" the inspired originals, did the Hebrew and Greek originally "*breathed out by God*" need correction or improvement?

Who believes this? Send me a quote. Talk about "straw-man" arguments.

(20) Since most "*KJV-Onlyites*" believe the KJV is the inerrant and inspired "*scripture*" [2 Peter 1:20], and 2 Peter 1:21 says that "*the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,*" would you not therefore reason thus — "*For the King James Version came not in 1611 by the will of man: but holy men of God translated as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*"?

Boy, talk about desperate attempts. **No, 2 Peter 1:21 is referring to the giving of prophecy.** The KJ translators were not prophets. However, the translators appear to have been guided by God [in a manner known only by Him] from looking at their result—the KJB. **God has used and blessed it more than any other Bible in any language.**

(21) Which reading is the verbally (word-for-word) inerrant scripture — "*whom ye*" [Cambridge KJV's] or, "*whom he*" [Oxford KJV's] at Jeremiah 34:16?

What does it matter? Take your pick. The passage's meaning is not affected either way. Looks like a printer's error.

(22) Which reading is the verbally (word-for-word) inerrant scripture — "sin"[Cambridge KJV's] or "sins"[Oxford KJV's] at 2 Chronicles 33:19?

Again, take your pick. The term "sin" can also mean "sins."

(23) Who publishes the infallible "INERRANT KJV"?

Anybody who wants to. Apart from typographical errors there should be **no difference in any edition from the major publishers** [Cambridge, Oxford, Nelson, etc.]. I have a reprint of the 1611 edition and there is **no difference between it and my Nelson or Cambridge 1769 editions that can be HEARD while reading apart from the relatively few typographical printing errors.** Of course, there are many spelling and punctuation differences but these do not affect the words and their meaning.

Larry Pierce, editor of the Online Bible claims versions 6 and later of his Bible software contains the **exact King James Bible text of the 1769 edition as provided by Cambridge Publishers in England.** He said Sharp Electronics of Japan spent a considerable amount of money verifying the accuracy of his KJB text. This digital edition of the KJB is easily and freely available to anyone who wants it, thus **anyone who desires can print it themselves.** [Don't try to print a copy of the NIV, though, Zondervan [its publisher] may sue you in court!]

(24) Since the 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 inerrant" in 1611... or 1629, 1638, 1644, 1664, 1701, 1744, 1762, 1769, or 1850?

First, what you call "revisions of the KJV" are **not true revisions at all.** These are various editions printed to correct previous printing errors. **Not one edition was to "revise" the words.** The intent of these editions [apart from spelling and punctuation updating] was to restore the original text given by the translators to the printers.

All of these versions are inerrant apart from any typographical error. My Nelson KJB, a recent, modern printing, spells "because" "bcause" in one place. Does this mean it is not inerrant? Only in the warped mind of an "Autograph Only."

How do you know, KJB critic, **that the original autographs didn't have typographical errors in them?** Can you prove your answer from Scripture? Can you prove Peter, a poor fisherman, **dotted every "i" and crossed every "t" so to speak in his autographs?** Why he might have even misspelled a word or two or even used bad grammar! I have read "scholars" who claimed Peter's language and grammar is inferior to Luke's. What a revelation! What about the scribes or writers who actually penned these words after they were spoken? Tertius penned Romans [Rom 16:22]. How do you know he didn't make a mistake since he was neither prophet or apostle? **These kind of questions really give you people fits, don't they?** You pompous egomaniacs don't even know how to respond to such questions.

That's because you have **locked yourself into a "logic tight" belief system that won't even allow God in. Pathetic; Pitiful.**

I asked a similar question to Rick Norris in response to a letter he sent me a few years ago and he couldn't even come up with a sensible reply. Here is what I said,

However, how do you know the autographs didn't have typos in them? Chapter and verse?....2 Peter 1:21 says "...holy men of God SPAKE...", often someone else wrote it down (Jer. 36:32). Can you prove they always wrote it down correctly? What about Peter's "bad grammar" in his epistles? Scholars say his grammar is much inferior to Luke's. Is errors in grammar "inspired"? You have plenty of obstacles to overcome with "logic." Isn't it easier to trust God?

All Norris could come up with for a response was,

Do you have a completely Biblical concept of inerrancy? It is clear that inerrancy defined with reference to the Bible is absolutely no errors of any type or kind. Logically by definition, it is undeniably true that an inerrant Bible could not have misprints since misprints are still errors....

He claims to have a "completely Biblical concept of inerrancy" that won't allow an "error" of any kind, **but the problem is he cannot Scripturally prove his "concept"! His concept of inerrancy is "logically derived" by feeble human logic, not Scripturally derived.** Of course, Norris cannot produce his final authority, none of his kind can. It is a fantasy Bible that doesn't exist.

(25) 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]**

[Since he apparently could not come up with any more relevant questions, Hudson starts making personal, ad hominem attacks. Typical behavior.]

God did not have to wait on anyone to give His word as He wants the English speaking people to have it. Who claims that he had to wait?

The King James translators were **honoring the king as the Bible says** [1 Peter 2:17]. Even if James was a sodomite history reveals he was a **much more tolerant king than those in Peter's day.**

The charge that James was a sodomite is often used by enemies of the AV. Even if he was it would not affect the integrity of the translation. **James did not translate one word of the Bible that bears his name.** He only authorized its translation in 1603. There is also information in print that states James was **against homosexuality.** Furthermore, there indications that one of James's enemies started this rumor after his death.

(26) 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]

Who knows who is led by God and who isn't? **Only an arrogant, conceited Bible corrector would presume to know such things.** Was the murderer Moses led by God? Was the adulterer David led by God? Was the polygamous Solomon led by God? **How can one prove if a person is led by God or not?**

(27) 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?

I suppose. Some people can get the wrong impression from anything. **Some misguided souls get the wrong impression from 2 Tim. 3:16 and think the term "Scripture" in the passage refers to only the "original autographs."** Any person who wants the truth will find the truth. You can't blame the Bible because some people wish to remain ignorant.

(28) Did dead people **"wake up"** in the morning according to Isaiah 37:36 in the KJV?

There is no "wake up" in Isaiah 37:36. Did you not think we would check the passage, Hudson? We do find in the verse where some people "arose" and found those who had been smitten by the angel were now "all dead corpses."

(29) Was **"Baptist"** John's last name according to Matthew 14:8 and Luke 7:20 in the KJV?

Yes, if you want to call it that. "Christ" could be called Jesus's last name for that matter.

(30) Is 2 Corinthians 6:11-13 in the KJV understood or make 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."** As clearly understood from the New International Version [NIV] – **"We have spoken freely to you, Corinthians, and opened wide our hearts to you. We are not withholding our affection from you, but you are withholding yours from us. As a fair exchange – I speak as to my children – open wide your hearts also."**

It makes sense to those who want the sense of it. **Who said the Bible was supposed to read like a cheap novel?** Sometimes it takes a little effort to get the gist of a passage.

Furthermore, after all the hype above about the KJB supposedly "correcting the Greek," **why do you use the NIV here which adds words to the passage not found in the Greek?** Apparently you believe the NIV "corrects the Greek" since you use it instead of the Greek. Your duplicity is evident to all, Hudson. **You have different standards for the KJB than you do the NIV.**

(31) 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?

So you will accept the NIV's adding of words not found in any Greek text, but you not accept the reading of "oath's"? **The translators were following the context in these passages and translated accordingly.** There is only one "oath" referred to in the passages [Matt. 14:7].

(32) Did Jesus teach a way for men to be "worshiped" 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-Onlyite!]**

There is no need to go to the Greek. All one needs to do is **look up the definitions of "worship" in any good dictionary.** You will find the term can be defined as, **"greatness of character; honor; dignity; worthiness"** in addition to worshipping God.

(33) Is the Holy Spirit 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-Onlyite!]**

Yes. Christ is also called "it" in Rev. 12:4. What's your problem. "It" is a common expression for people in English. [Who's there? "It's me!]

(34) Does Luke 23:56 support a "Friday" crucifixion in the KJV? [No "day" here in Greek]

No. As for there being no "day" in Greek, then **what kind of Sabbath was it if it wasn't a Sabbath Day?** Where is the "commandment" for a Sabbath other than a Sabbath day?

(35) 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." at Luke 14:10]**

Sure. Of course you know that "meat" means food in the Bible. "Flesh" in the Bible means "meat" as we use it today.

(36) Was **Charles Haddon Spurgeon** a "**Bible-corrector**" 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, , page 485 — see more Spurgeon KJV comments in , his& mp;mp; many others' views in the article,]*

Indeed he was. I'm glad you recognized it. "Saved by hope" is correct.

(37) Was **J. Frank Norris** a "**Bible-corrector**" for saying that the correct rendering of John 3:5 should be "**born of water and the Spirit,**" and for saying that "**repent and turn**" in Acts 26:20 should be "**repent, even turn**"? [*Norris-Wallace Debate, 1934, pgs. 108, 116*]

Yes, same here. You don't get the picture do you, Hudson. **Anyone who corrects the Bible is a Bible-corrector.** Norris did a lot of things in his ministry right, but this is one area where he is dead wrong.

Also, is **Norman Pickering** an "**Alexandrian Apostate**" for stating, "**The nature of language does not permit a 'perfect' translation — the semantic area of words differs between languages so that there is seldom complete overlap. A 'perfect' translation of John 3:16 from Greek into English is impossible, for we have no perfect equivalent for "agapao" [translated "loved" in John 3:16].**"?

I don't know about being an "Alexandrian Apostate," but from this statement one can see he is [was] a very narrow-minded and presumptuous man. **Imagine someone saying it is impossible for God to make a "perfect" translation of a word. "Impossible" means impossible.**

(38) 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*]

Could not Torrey just have been ignorant and mistaken instead of lying? "Lying" means he intended to deceive. I will give him the benefit of the doubt. **Torrey apparently ran in limited circles since he did not encounter any one who believed the Bible they had [KJB] was infallible.** Or did he mean only "orthodox scholars"?

(39) Is **Don Edwards** correct in agreeing "**in favor of canonizing our KJV,**" thus replacing the **inspired canon** in Hebrew and Greek? [*The Flaming Torch, June 1989, page 6*]

I don't know the context of Edward's statement but let's look at the definitions,

canonize -ized, -izing

1 to declare (a deceased person) a saint in formal church procedure

- 2 to glorify
- 3 to put in the Biblical canon
- 4 to give church sanction or authorization to

The 1st and 3rd definitions can't apply, but why can't the 2nd and 4th? **Can a church or group not "glorify" the KJB? Can an independent church not "sanction" or "authorize" the KJB for use?** I don't see why not. You do believe in religious freedom, don't you?

As for replacing the "inspired canon in Hebrew and Greek," **does this mean you believe the available Greek and Hebrew texts are "the inspired canon"?** As another has said, "Hebrew for the Hebrews, Greek for the Greeks, English for the English and we will all be fine."

(40) Did God supernaturally "move His Word from the original languages to English" in 1611 as affirmed by *The Flaming Torch*? [same page above]

I don't know about "move His word" but I believe **He definitely did COPY His word in all its purity to the English language in 1611.** The methods He used are unknown to me and I don't profess to know even in the slightest how God "moves" things or people, but I believe He does it. **I believe God has kept His promises and preserved His word, and we who speak English have been greatly blessed in that He has chosen to preserve it in English.** Unlike the "archaic" Greek language which is idolized by the "Autograph Only" **God has given man His word in the most prominent and expressive language on earth today—English.**

The Results of the Questions

The statement we made earlier that these questions are rhetorical in nature should now be clear to the reader. **There are no answers we could give that would be acceptable to Hudson and his crowd;** their minds are made up. For the most part these questions were **sarcastic comments on the position of Bible believers.** Only around 10 questions could be considered legitimate.

The reader should also note that Hudson doesn't hesitate to claim the KJB is not the pure word of God, **but he doesn't offer what he believes to be the pure word in its place.** This is a universal trait among Bible correctors. They campaign to destroy one's confidence in the KJB [or any Bible for that matter] **but offer NOTHING in return but unbelief!** How does it harm them for believers to believe they have the pure word of God in tangible form? Why do they so desperately attempt to undermine this belief? I have my ideas, but the fact remains **they greatly resent that many Christians believe they have the pure word of God in the King James Bible** and they resort to desperate means to try to convince them they are wrong. It's not that they have evidence to prove that the KJB is not pure and they offer a translation they believe is pure, **they offer NOTHING but unbelief!** They insist no Bible in any language is [or can be] inerrant and pure.

Although I believe the NIV is a corrupt imitation of God's word, **I would have more respect** for a person who believed it was inerrant and pure and **treated it as**

such than I do for these clowns who have "logically deduced" that no pure Bible is possible. Every saint in the Bible **could produce the Scriptures they believed** without reservation. They believed they had access to the pure, inerrant words of God. These "Autograph Only" "experts" can produce no Bible at all. **Why would any believer follow them?**