

12/14/02

What follows is my response to Khoo's "A Plea for a Perfect Bible":

Khoo:

King James Version (KJV) fundamentalists who affirm the *verbal plenary inspiration* (VPI) of the Bible, and believe in a perfect God who has given His Church a perfect Hebrew and Greek Text underlying the King James Bible are being labelled "cultic" and "dangerous" by non-KJV fundamentalists. Since when has believing in a perfectly inerrant Bible in the original languages ever been considered such? Are 21st century fundamentalists recanting their belief in verbal and plenary inspiration that their 20th century forebears fought so hard to define and defend against the modernists? These Neo-fundamentalists are saying: We had a perfect Bible then, but we do not have a perfect Bible now! The danger in fundamentalism today is the failure among fundamentalists to affirm the *verbal plenary preservation* (VPP) of the Scriptures.

Price:

Khoo misrepresents Historic Fundamentalists of the 21st century. None of them say it is "cultic" to believe "in a perfectly inerrant Bible in the original languages." None of them deny the verbal, plenary inspiration and preservation of Scripture. The issue is not the fact of inspiration and preservation, but the manner in which preservation occurred. Historically, fundamentalists have understood that God preserved the text (words) of Scripture through the hand-written copies of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles that have survived down through history—that is, the preserved ancient Bibles (manuscripts). They understand that the autographic text resides in the genealogical consensus of all these preserved ancient Bibles—that is, the consensus among ancient independent witnesses. Historic Fundamentalists are bothered by a new doctrine of preservation that finds the autographic words in an eclectic Greek text created after the fact to support the English words of the King James Version—a text that had no tangible existence in any ancient Bible or printed edition existing prior to 1611, or in fact, prior to the mid-nineteenth century. They see the creation of this new doctrine as a pseudo-scholarly attempt to justify accepting the English words of the KJV as absolute authority. This new doctrine came into being in the last decades of the 20th century, being virtually unknown before that time. Khoo rightly called the proponents of this new doctrine KJV Fundamentalists—the real neo-Fundamentalists—they are clearly not Historic Fundamentalists.

Khoo:

Apparent Discrepancies or Scribal Errors?

Anti-VPP fundamentalists would deny that God's people today have the perfect Word of God. According to them our Bible today contains scribal errors. However, such errors are so insignificant that they do not affect the spiritual truths taught in the Scriptures. This sounds rather neo-evangelical, doesn't it? Anti-VPP fundamentalists appear to be quite sure that 2 Kings 8:26 (Ahaziah is 22 years old) and 2 Chron 22:2 (Ahaziah is 42 years old), and 2 Sam 8:4 (700 horsemen) and 1 Chron 18:4 (7000 horsemen) are *true contradictions or errors*. Although some might concede that the reformers "are quick to consider many of these contradictions as merely apparent" (which is my view for "it is not improbable to reconcile the apparent contradiction between 2 Kings 8:26 and 2 Chron 22:2 by explaining that prior to his official reign at the age of 42, he might have co-reigned with his father at the age of 22," and

as for 2 Sam 8:4 and 1 Chron 18:4, it might be explained that one counted them one-by-one, and the other group-by-group, and so both figures could be correct), they prefer not to see them as apparent discrepancies but “scribal errors.” If they are indeed scribal errors, surely there must be manuscripts that reflect the correct reading. Surely God could not have possibly allowed the corruption to be so devastating that not a single manuscript would reflect the autographical reading.

Price:

Khoo employed inaccurate labeling to bolster his weak case. Historic Fundamentalists are not against divine inspiration, verbal plenary preservation, or inerrancy; so they are not anti-VPP. However, like their fundamentalist forebears, they regard inerrancy to be limited to the autographic text, not to later copies and translations that are subject to human fallibility. Khoo knows this fact because he is a member of the Evangelical Theological Society; the principal doctrine of that society is the inerrancy of Scripture in the original autographs, and all members sign an affirmation of belief in that doctrine, including Khoo. The society also has a clear statement about preservation. Historic Fundamentalists and Evangelicals recognize that no subsequent copies and translations were flawless replicas of the autographs, as does Khoo (except of course for the KJV). They recognize that preservation is not without its problems, two of which Khoo mentioned above.

However, it is impossible to reconcile the discrepancy between the two ages Khoo mentioned above by means of his alleged coregency or by any other rationalization. The apparent discrepancies are simply due to textual variants. Ahaziah’s father was 32 years of age when he began to reign, and he reigned for only 8 years (2 Kings 8:17; 2 Chr. 21:20). If Ahaziah became coregent at age 22 in the first year of his father’s reign, then he would have been born when his father was only 10 years old ($32 - 22 = 10$). But the problem gets worse because Ahaziah was the youngest of several sons (2 Chr. 22:1); this hypothesis is impossible without a miracle. Further, since his father reigned only 8 years and Ahaziah reigned only one year before he died (2 Kings 8:26; 2 Chr. 22:2), no room exists for a 20-year coregency. Likewise, according to the text in 2 Chronicles, Ahaziah was 42 years older when his father died at age 40 year; it is impossible, even with a miracle, for a person to be two years older than as his father.

Fortunately, the correct age (22) is preserved in the parallel passage in 2 Kings, being confirmed by the preserved Lucian edition of the Greek Septuagint, and the preserved Syriac and Arabic versions. The other preserved editions of the Septuagint confirm the number 20 of the “twenty and two” rather than 40. The following modern versions render the verse in harmony with 2 Kings and the ancient versions: NASB, NIV, ESV, NAB, NLT. These modern versions clear up this discrepancy that is obviously due to a genuine ancient scribal error. It is better to resolve textual problems like this than to leave irresolvable discrepancies in a translation, thus causing problems for intelligent believers. Examples like this indicate that the Masoretic Text is not a flawless replica of the autographs, but has its own textual variations. The evidence preserved in the ancient translations sometimes helps to resolve textual discrepancies like this.

Regarding the discrepancy between the numbers mentioned above, the Hebrew Masoretic Text of 2 Samuel 8:4 actually reads “one thousand and seven hundred horsemen,” and the Hebrew text of 1 Chronicles 18:4 reads “one thousand chariots and seven thousand horsemen.” The Greek Septuagint text of 2 Samuel 8:4 reads the same as that of 1 Chronicles 18:4. The King James translators emended the Hebrew text of 2 Samuel by adding the word

“chariots” as found in 1 Chronicles and the Greek Septuagint; however, they did not consistently follow 1 Chronicles and the Greek Septuagint with respect to the number of horsemen. The witness of the Septuagint confirms that the 1 Chronicles text is original and the 2 Samuel text contains the scribal error. The NIV consistently followed the witness of 1 Chronicles and the Septuagint in 2 Samuel 8:4.

Khoo’s suggested resolution is that in one account the author counted individual horsemen and the other author counted groups of ten; however, this alleged resolution is as problematic as the textual problem. For one thing, both accounts list the thing counted as “horsemen” not “groups of ten horsemen.” For the scribe to omit the words “groups of ten” is just as textually problematic as the initial discrepancy of numbers. It is better to resolve textual problems like this than to leave irresolvable discrepancies in a translation, thus causing problems for intelligent believers.

Khoo:

Anti-VPP fundamentalists say they are able to correct the errors found in our present Bible by a collation of various manuscripts. But where are the manuscripts? Why did the Masoretes—the keepers of the purity of the OT Scriptures—refuse to correct these “scribal errors?” Was Jesus wrong when He said that the Hebrew Scriptures the Jews had at the time when He was on earth, which were not the autographs, were word perfect to the jot and tittle (Matt 5:18)? Interestingly, the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* lists no variants. If this is the case (ie, there are no extant manuscripts that reflect the correct reading), then they could be *actual* and *factual* errors committed by the original inspired writers and not necessarily scribal, could they not? Is this not a serious problem? Would this not lead to a denial of VPI?

Price:

More inaccurate labeling. The methods of textual criticism include all the evidence, not just manuscripts. The textual evidence from the ancient translations resolved the above problems, leaving no discrepancies. It is not known why the Masoretes would have perpetuated known discrepancies. Perhaps they were as bound to tradition as 21st century KJV fundamentalists. Khoo is right that the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) listed no variant manuscripts for these texts, but it did list evidence from the ancient translations that Khoo failed to mention. The above evidence was taken from the textual notes in BHS. So Khoo’s hypothetical *factual* errors lack *actual* existence.

Likewise, Khoo surely has misinterpreted the words of Jesus to mean that the hand-copied Hebrew Bibles of His day were flawlessly letter perfect replicas of the autographs. The “Law” Jesus referred to was the autographic words Moses wrote. He inferred that these words would be preserved, but not necessarily in any hand-written copies, but in their consensus. The omniscient Christ knew about textual variations.

Khoo:

Anti-VPP fundamentalists ape the neo-evangelicals when they say that it is of no consequence whether such discrepancies are simply scribal errors or true factual errors since they are so “minor,” they deal with numbers, names, dates, and places, and hence do not affect our salvation since the gospel is not impaired by such “errors.” Is this correct thinking?

Price:

More inaccurate labeling. Khoo misrepresented Historical Fundamentalists and Evangelicals. They think for themselves and do not accept factual errors in the autographic text. He knows this, or else why would he be a member of the Evangelical Theological Society and subscribe to their doctrine of Scripture? We accept the doctrine of inerrancy. The discrepancies he referred to are not in the autographic text but in later hand-written copies and translations. His zeal to defend the authority of an English translation has blinded his eyes to the difference. Why should a man-made translation be blindly defended in places where it obviously has followed a wrong reading? How can he defend a man being two years older than his father when there is a simple textual explanation that avoids the whole problem? Is he incapable of explaining these things to intelligent believers in his church? Why is he unwilling to offer a textual explanation instead of an invalid rationalization? Conclusion: Khoo is defending an English translation, not the autographic text!

Khoo:

I submit that if they proceed with this line of thinking and of judging the Bible, crying “error, error, error” here and there, they are no better than the neo-evangelicals who say that our Bible is only inerrant in a limited sense (see “Discrepancies in Scripture,” in *The Battle for the Bible* by Harold Lindsell, 164-184).

Price:

Again Khoo has misrepresented Historic Fundamentalists. We believe in the inerrancy of the autographic text. A scribal error is not an error in the Bible, but a human error in a man-made copy of the Bible. The “errors” Khoo refers to are of that type, not errors in God’s Word. When one finds a man-made error in a translation, he should not attribute the error to God’s Word. The Word of God consists of the autographic words written by the prophets and apostles, not those words mistakenly copied by later scribes. The Word of God does not change. What was the Word of God still is the Word of God. It has not been replaced by a translation. Khoo has mistakenly replaced the Word of God with an English translation with its inherent man-made blemishes.

Khoo:

No one denies that scribal errors were committed during the work of copying Scripture. But the question is: Did God allow any of His inspired words in the autographs to be lost during this transmission process? Although the Church does not have the autographs (the very first scripts) today, she has the apographs (copies) which reflect the autographs. Providentially speaking, the autographs were *neither lost nor destroyed*.

Price:

Khoo speaks of the “apographs” as though they are existing exact replicas of the autographs. But on the contrary, the term “apograph” has an uncertain definition. Does he mean by the term the different printed editions of the Greek NT at time of the reformation? (The KJV did not exist in the days of Luther and Calvin.) Or perhaps he means the different printed editions of the Greek NT used by the King James translators. But those various editions differed among themselves and were all of eclectic origin. Perhaps he means the Greek text that underlies the English words of the KJV. But that exact collection of Greek words did not exist in a single manuscript or printed edition in 1611, and had no tangible existence until the mid-nineteenth century. It is hard to understand how a Greek text that had no tangible existence for 1,800 years could reasonably be regarded as having been providentially preserved throughout history for all believers. That hypothesis is hard to believe. It is much easier to believe that the Hebrew and Greek Bibles (hand-written copies with their minor blemishes) used in antiquity were sufficiently accurate and reliable to meet the spiritual and doctrinal needs of the people and churches that used them. After all, they were God’s Word as He preserved it for them.

Khoo:

Was God careless in preserving His Scripture? Can He even allow “minor” corruptions? 17th century theologian—Francis Turretin—wrote, “It will not do to say that divine providence wished to *keep it free from serious corruptions, but not from minor*. For besides the fact that this is gratuitous, it cannot be held without injury, as if lacking in the necessary things which are required for the full credibility of Scripture itself. Nor can we readily believe that God, who dictated and inspired each and every word to these inspired (*theopneustois*) men, would not take care of their entire preservation. If men use the utmost care diligently to preserve their words (especially if they are of any importance, as for example a testament or contract) in order that it may not be corrupted, how much more, must we suppose, would God take care of his word which he intended as a testament and seal of his covenant with us, so that it might not be corrupted.” Turretin does not deny scribal errors in the *copying process* but he says that “even if some manuscripts could be corrupted, *yet all could not*.”

By faith, we believe in God’s promise that He will allow none of His words to be lost. Ps 12:6-7 says, “The *words* of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt *keep them*, O LORD, thou shalt *preserve* them from this generation for ever.” Jesus declared in Matt 24:35, “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my *words* shall not pass away.” In Matt 5:18. Jesus promised, “For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, *one jot or one tittle should in no wise pass* from the law, till all be fulfilled.”

Price:

Historic Fundamentalists believe in preservation. No one questions the sacred doctrine. It is not an issue over the fact of preservation, but the manner in which preservation took place. If God did not preserve His Word by means of the surviving hand-written copies of the ancient Hebrew and Greek Bibles (and ancient translations), then how did He preserve it? If God has preserved His Word throughout history in every time and every place, then His Word has been just as well preserved before 1611 as it has been after that date.

Khoo:

Closest and Purest

There are some other fundamentalists who believe that the purity of the Scriptures has been purely *maintained*, but not finally *attained* in the Traditional Hebrew Masoretic Text and Greek Textus Receptus underlying the KJV. The Dean Burgon Society statement which declares that “the Texts which are the *closest* to the original autographs of the Bible are the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text for the Old Testament, and the Traditional Greek Text for the New Testament underlying the King James Version.” They take the word “closest” to mean that the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures that underlie the KJV are *not completely inerrant* since they contain so-called “scribal mistakes.”

Price:

If the traditional *Textus Receptus* is accepted as the “apographs” and it admittedly contains scribal mistakes, then it cannot be identical with the autographic text. If it is not identical with the autographs, then it cannot be the perfectly preserved Word of God.

Khoo:

It must be clarified that the word “closest” in the Dean Burgon Society statement does not at all mean that we have an errant text or that the text is not the same as the original writings. The Dean Burgon Society statement must be understood in the context (ie, the battle against Westcott and Hort) in which the statement was phrased. Westcott and Hort had puffed up their cut-up Greek text as being closest to the original since they based it on the 4th century Alexandrian manuscripts, which Dean Burgon had dismissed as “most corrupt.” The term “closest” seeks to *correct and counteract* Westcott and Hort’s view on the identity of the true text. The term “closest” also distinguishes between the autographs (past and “lost”) and the apographa (present and existing). VPP fundamentalists do not deny that the autographa and apographa though distinct are the same. The paper may be different, but the contents are the same.

Price:

The word “closest” cannot be stretched to mean “exactly the same.” It infers a difference that cannot be rationalized away.

Khoo:

The word “closest” should be interpreted to mean “purest.” Dr D A Waite, President of the Dean Burgon Society, likewise understands the statement to mean “that the WORDS of the Received Greek and Masoretic Hebrew texts that underlie the KING NAMES BIBLE are the very WORDS which God has PRESERVED down through the centuries, being the exact WORDS of the ORIGINALS themselves.” This declaration is entirely consistent with the fundamental doctrines of VPI and VPP.

Price:

The word “purest” is a comparative term, and like “closest,” it cannot be rationalized to mean “as pure as” the autographs.

Khoo:

Such a high view of Scripture grants believers *maximum certainty* with regard to the authenticity of the inspired words of Scripture. And such certainty can only be had if the doctrine of the special providential preservation of the Scriptures is upheld. Dr E F Hills wrote, “if we believe in the special providential presentation of the Scriptures ... we obtain *maximum certainty*, all the certainty that any mere man can obtain, all the certainty that we need. For we are led by the logic of faith to the *Masoretic Hebrew text*, to the *New Testament Textus Receptus*, and to the *King James Version*.”

Price:

The term “maximum certainty” is a comparative term that cannot be rationalized to mean the same as the “absolute certainty” of the autographs. Hills admitted that the *Textus Receptus* lacks perfection:

There are a few New Testament passages in which the true reading cannot be determined with absolute certainty. There are some readings, for example, on which the manuscripts are almost evenly divided, making it difficult to determine which reading belongs to the Traditional Text. Also in some of the cases in which the *Textus Receptus* disagrees with the Traditional Text it is hard to decide which text to follow. And, as we have seen, sometimes the several editions of the *Textus Receptus* differ from each other and from the King James Version.¹

Khoo:

Does the Lord want His people to be certain about His inspired words? Listen to what the Lord says, “Have not I written to thee excellent things in counsels and knowledge, That I might make thee know *the certainty of the words of truth*; that thou mightest answer the words of truth to them that send unto thee?” (Prov 22:20-21). Be sure of this: God wants us to have certainty concerning His words, and we can be certain of God’s words only if we apply the logic of faith consistently.

Price:

Unfortunately, the words “closest,” “purest,” and “maximum certainty” do not express unwavering faith; they leave room for doubt. The fact that the Dean Burgon Society admits that the *Textus Receptus* contains scribal errors indicates that the text lacks perfection. No amount of faith can rationalize admitted error away. On the other hand, the autographic text is

¹ Hills, *The King James Version Defended*, 201.

the “exact,” “perfectly pure,” “absolutely certain” divinely inspired, infallible, inerrant Word of God, with no room for doubt.

Khoo:

Which Textus Receptus?

If there exists a perfect TR, then which of the many editions of the TR is perfect? It must be affirmed that all the editions of the TR being from the pure stream of God’s preserved text are *pure*, no doubt about it. But which is the *purest*? It is the TR underlying the KJV. Dr Hills takes the same view concerning the KJV and TR. Hear Dr Hills himself, “The texts of the several editions of the Textus Receptus were God-guided. They were set up under the leading of God’s special providence. Hence the differences between them were kept down to minimum ... But what do we do in these few places in which the several editions of the Textus Receptus disagree with one another? Which text do we follow? The answer to this question is easy. We are guided by the common faith. Hence we favor that form of the Textus Receptus upon which more than any other *God, working providentially*, has placed the stamp of His approval, namely, the King James Version, or more precisely, the Greek text underlying the King James Version.”

Like Dr Hills, we believe that all the TR editions are pure, but there is one that is purest - the one underlying the KJV. Dr Hills said that the King James Version “ought to be regarded not merely as a translation of the Textus Receptus but also as an independent variety of the Textus Receptus.” Is not the Greek Text underlying the KJV the Textus Receptus? Whose TR? Not completely Erasmus’s, Stephen’s, or Beza’s, it is a *new edition* of the TR which reflects the textual decisions of the KJV translators as they prayerfully studied and compared the preserved manuscripts. According to the Trinitarian Bible Society, “The editions of Beza, particularly that of 1598, and the two last editions of Stephens, were the chief sources used for the English Authorised Version of 1611. ... The present edition of the *Textus Receptus* underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611 follows the text of Beza’s 1598 edition as the primary authority, and corresponds with ‘The New Testament in the Original Greek according to the text followed in the Authorised Version,’ edited by F H A Scrivener.”

Price:

Here Khoo uses the wrong words. If the various editions of the Textus Receptus differ from one another, then they are not “pure,” but “almost pure.” Likewise, if the edition of Textus Receptus that underlies the English words of the KJV is the “purest” of those that are “almost pure,” then it too falls short of perfect purity. In fact, because God’s providence had failed to perfectly preserve the autographic text in any printed edition of the Textus Receptus up until 1611, Hills invented special providence (special in that it was over and above the normal providence operative up until 1611) to enable the King James translators to make perfect textual decisions in their translation, a providence not available to earlier text editors, and to translators of earlier English versions. This special providence, available neither before nor after 1611, amounts to double inspiration, a new doctrine not found in Scripture. Strangely, the same special providence, that so meticulously guided the KJV translators to make perfect textual decisions, failed to preserve that newly revealed text in printed form until over 200 years later. Likewise, Providence failed to preserve a record of the reasons behind the KJV translators’ textual decisions. It was not until the mid-nineteenth century that the text underlying the KJV

was created by reconstructing it from the English words of the KJV. In other words, the English words of the King James Version corrected the “almost pure” printed editions of the Textus Receptus.

Khoo:

Special Providence Not Static But Dynamic

It ought to be noted that God’s providential preservation of His Scripture is **not static but dynamic**. The deistic heresy that God inspired His Word but did nothing to preserve it must be rejected. Dr Timothy Tow rightly said, “If Deism teaches a Creator who goes to sleep after creating the world is absurd, to hold to the doctrine of inspiration without preservation is equally illogical ... inspiration and preservation are linked one to another. Without preservation, all the inspiration, God-breathing into the Scriptures, would be lost. But we have a Bible so pure and powerful in every word and it is so because God has preserved it down through the ages.”

Price:

Khoo’s choice of words is again defective. The word “dynamic” means “characterized by or tending to produce continuous change or advance.” This thought is the exact opposite of true providential preservation. Perhaps he meant “continuous” as opposed “one time only.” Historic Fundamentalists accept the continuous preservation of God’s Word.

Khoo:

I believe God providentially guided the KJV translators to produce the purest TR of all. The earlier editions were individual efforts, but the TR underlying the KJV is a corporate effort of 57 of the most outstanding biblical-theological, and more importantly, Bible-believing scholars of their day. And as the Scripture says, “in a multitude of counsellors there is safety” (Prov 11:14). The KJV translators had all the various editions of the TR to refer to, and they made their decisions with the help of the Holy Spirit. I believe the Lord providentially guided the King James translators to make the right textual decisions. As such, I do not believe we need to improve on the TR underlying the KJV. No one should play textual critic, and be a judge of God’s Word today. God is His own Textual Critic. I accept God’s special providential work in history during the great 16th Century Protestant Reformation.

Price:

See my earlier comments about such special providence. What Khoo described here is a form of double inspiration—something over and above normal providential care. If the KJV translators had such special providential guidance in textual matters, did they also have the same special providential guidance for their theological decisions? If so, why is Khoo not a Church of England Anglican rather than a Presbyterian? Does he believe in selective special providential guidance?

Khoo:

Why the TR Underlying the KJV?

Now the question remains: Why the TR underlying the KJV and not Luther's German Bible, or the Spanish Reina Valera, or the Polish Biblia Gdanska, or the French Martin Bible, or some other language Bible? Now we do not deny there are faithful and reliable versions that are accurately translated and based on the TR, nor do we discount the need for foreign language Bibles, but here is Dr Hills's reply to the question: "God in His providence has abundantly justified this confidence of the King James translators. The course of history has made English a world-wide language which is now the native tongue of at least 300 million people and the second language of many millions more. For this reason the King James Version is known the world over and is more widely read than any other translation of the holy Scriptures. Not only so, but the King James Version has been used by many missionaries as a basis and guide for their own translation work and in this way has extended its influence even to converts who know no English.

Price:

The early post-Reformation missionaries translated from the original languages, not from the KJV. They may have consulted the KJV, but their final authority was the Hebrew and Greek texts available to them at the time. It has been only in the last few decades that KJV-Only missionaries have translated from the English KJV.

Khoo:

For more than 350 years therefore the reverent diction of the King James Version has been used by the Holy Spirit to bring the Word of life to millions upon millions of perishing souls. Surely this is a God-guided translation on which God, working providentially, has placed the stamp of His approval." This is in keeping with Jesus' words, "Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit ... Wherefore *by their fruits ye shall know them*" (Matt 7:17-20).

Price:

Modern versions have been available for only the last 100 years, and most for only the last four decades. Modern versions are easier to understand by those for whom English is a second language. It is vain to suppose that God does not bless and prosper the Gospel no matter what English version it is presented in.

Khoo:

I believe the purity of God's Word has been *faithfully maintained* throughout the whole transmission of the Traditional/Byzantine/Majority/Received Text, and is *fully represented* in the Apographa of the Hebrew Masoretic Text for the Old Testament and the Greek Textus Receptus for the New Testament underlying the KJV. So I agree with David W Cloud, in his paper quoting E F Hills, that "the KJV is accurate in all textual matters, *and if there is a difference between a KJV reading and any certain edition of the Received Text, we follow the KJV*" (ie, the TR underlying the KJV). I also agree with Dr Hills who warned, "We must be

very cautious therefore about finding errors in the text of the King James Version, and the same holds true also in the realm of translation. Whenever the renderings of the King James Version are called in question, *it is usually the accuser that finds himself in the wrong.*"

Price:

The bottom line of all the above verbiage is a blind commitment to the theory that the English words of the King James Version are the divinely inspired, divinely preserved Word of God, regardless of any Hebrew and Greek evidence to the contrary. It is neither the Traditional Text, nor the Byzantine Text, nor the Majority Text, nor any of the various editions of the Textus Receptus that is the final authority, so why mention them? To Khoo, Cloud, and Hills, the final authority in all matters of text and translation is the English King James Version of 1769 in one of its various differing editions. The Textus Receptus that underlies the English words of the KJV is a phantom text that had no tangible existence prior to its being created after the fact in the mid-nineteenth century, so why mention the others at all?

Khoo:

A Virtual Photocopy

As regards the Traditional Hebrew and Greek Scripture underlying the KJV being a “virtual photocopy”, of the original, G I Williamson did write to this effect in his commentary on the *Westminster Confession* concerning preservation, “This brings us to the matter of God’s ‘singular care and providence’ by which He has ‘kept pure in all ages’ this original text, so that we now actually possess it in ‘authentic’ form. And let us begin by giving an illustration from modern life to show that an original document may be destroyed, without the text of that document being lost. Suppose you were to write a will. Then suppose you were to have a photographic copy of that will made. If the original were then destroyed, the photographic copy would still preserve the text of that will exactly the same as the original itself: The text of the copy would differ in no way whatever from the original, and so it would possess exactly the same ‘truth’ and meaning as the original. Now of course photography was not invented until long after the original copy ... had been worn out or lost. How then could the original text of the Word of God be preserved? The answer is that God preserved it by His own remarkable care and providence.”

Concerning what the Westminster theologians meant when they declared that the Hebrew OT and the Greek NT “being immediately inspired of God, and by His singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic,” we have another commentary from Prof William F Orr of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary who wrote, “this affirms that the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Greek of the New which was known to the Westminster divines was immediately inspired by God because it was *identical* with the first text that God had kept pure in all the ages. *The idea that there are mistakes in the Hebrew Masoretic texts or in the Textus Receptus of the New Testament was unknown to the authors of the Confession of Faith.*”

Price:

The formerly supplied quotations from John Calvin demonstrate the falsity of that statement. The fact that the KJV translators emended the Masoretic Text in at least 228 places

and emended the various printed editions of the Textus Receptus in at least 131 places demonstrates the falsity of that statement.

Khoo:

Biblical Basis

So does the Church have a perfect Hebrew and Greek Bible today? Yes, indeed she does. Based on what? Based on God's promise that He would preserve every one of His words to the jot and tittle (Exod 32:15-19, 34:1-4; Pss 12:6-7, 78:1-8, 105:8; 119:89,111,152,160; Prov 22:20-21; Eccl 3:14, Jer 36:30-32, Matt 4:4, 5:18, 24:35; Mark 13:31; Luke 21:33; John 10:35; 1 Pet 1:23-25; Rev 22:18-19).

Some may say that this belief on biblical preservation is a result of "circular reasoning." Indeed it is. On what basis does the Church believe in VPI? Is it not on the testimony of the Bible itself (2 Tim 3:16, Matt 5:18)? "God says it, I believe it, that settles it." Circular reasoning or *a priori* reasoning is not illegitimate. It is fallacious only when the premise to begin with is false. If I reason, "I am perfect because I say I am," it is fallacious because the presupposition is utterly untrue (Rom 3:4-23). If God says of Himself, "I am perfect because I say I am," that is absolutely true. Why do we believe God has preserved His Word and words perfectly? It is simply because God has promised to do just that in the Scriptures cited above. We simply take God at His Word because God cannot lie (Num 23: 19).

Do we know everything that went on in the transmission of the text? No, we do not. But God knows; He knows everything and we believe He knows what He is doing. For instance, we were not there when God created the world. We did not see His work with our own eyes. When Science contradicts what the Bible says concerning origins, who are we going to believe? Science or the Bible? We believe the Bible. Heb 11:3 says, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Faithfulness to God and His Word demands that a Christian believe in a perfect God who has given His Church a perfect Bible. Biblical epistemology is not "seeing is believing, but "believing is seeing."

Price:

Historic Fundamentalists do not deny preservation as inferred by the Biblical passages mentioned by Khoo.

Khoo:

Canonisation and Preservation

Is there a historical precedent that tells us that God's providential work can involve a closure, a terminus? The answer is yes. All the inspired NT books were completed by AD 100 when the Apostle John wrote the last book of Revelation, and God warned against adding to or subtracting from His Word in Rev 22:18-19. However, we know that in the first few centuries, there were uninspired men who penned spurious gospels and epistles, and passed them off as Scripture. Some of these were the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Nicodemus, the Epistle of Barnabas, etc. Nevertheless, none of the inspired books of Scripture have been lost or obscured in the canonical process. By the providential guidance of the Holy Spirit, God's people were

led to identify the 27 books to become our NT Canon, no more, no less. There was a terminus to the canonisation of Scripture at the Council of Carthage in 397.

In like manner, the Lord allowed copyist errors and corruptions to enter into the transmission process through the pen of fallible scribes. Nevertheless, His providential hand kept His inspired words of Scripture from being lost. In light of God's providence, that nothing happens by chance, and that history is under His sovereign control, I believe that in the fulness of time—in the most opportune time of the Reformation when the true church separated from the false, when the study of the original languages was emphasised, and the printing press invented (which meant that no longer would there be any need to handcopy the Scriptures thereby ensuring a uniform text)—God restored from out of a pure stream of preserved Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, the purest Hebrew and Greek Text of all—the Text that underlies our KJV—that accurately reflects the original Scriptures.

That the providential preservation of Scripture sees its historical parallel in the providential canonization of Scripture was Dean Burgon's thinking as well. Dr Hills wrote of Burgon: 'Burgon ... never lost sight of the special providence of God which has presided over the transmission of the New Testament down through the ages, expressly set out to maintain against all opponents that the Church was divinely guided to reject the false readings of the early centuries, and to gradually accept the true text. He denied that he was claiming a perpetual miracle that would keep manuscripts from being depraved at various times, and in various places. But 'The Church in her collective capacity, has nevertheless—as a matter of fact—been perpetually purging herself of those shamefully depraved copies which once everywhere abounded with her pale' (*The Revision Revised*, 334-5). He believed that just as God gradually settled the *Canon* of the New Testament by weaning His churches from non-canonical books, so He did with the *Text* also."

Price:

Historic Fundamentalists do not deny preservation. However, they believe that the autographic text has been preserved in the genealogical consensus of the hand-written copies of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles that God providentially allowed to survive. They reject the unbiblical claim of special providence for an English translation that itself determines the words of the autographic Hebrew and Greek texts, regardless of the actual preserved textual evidence. That claim rejects the witness of all the preserved Hebrew and Greek Bibles used by Christians for the past two thousand years in favor of the witness of one late English translation. Such rigid rejection of the actual providentially preserved evidence in favor of human dogma is not characteristic of Biblical faith, but of the cultic.

Khoo:

A Perfect Bible Today!

What kind of Bible do fundamentalists have? Do they have a perfect Bible? The VPP fundamentalist would say yes, but the anti-VPP would say no. Make no mistake about it, both claim to believe in VPI, but despite this, anti-VPP fundamentalists say they do not have a perfect Bible. Is this biblical? Is this logical? Is this safe? Anti-VPP fundamentalists say that God's preservation of His Bible is *imperfect*. They say God did not preserve His words, only His doctrines; it is conceptual, not verbal preservation. What? Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, and Matt 24:35 tell us explicitly that God will preserve His "pure words," and every "jot and tittle" of

His “words.” Did not the Lord convey His doctrines through words? Without the words, where the doctrines?

Price:

Again Khoo incorrectly labels the Historic Fundamentalists and misrepresents their position. Historic Fundamentalists believe in verbal plenary preservation. The issue is not the fact of preservation, but the manner of preservation. They believe in perfect verbal preservation. The issue is not the fact of perfect verbal preservation, but the method of recognizing the preserved words. The KJV (neo) Fundamentalists find the preserved words by means of the authority of the English words in the KJV; the Historic Fundamentalists recognize the words through the genealogical consensus of all the hand-written copies of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles God providentially allowed to survive.

Khoo:

Dr Hills sounded a pertinent warning, “Conservative scholars ... say that they believe in the special, providential preservation of the New Testament text. Most of them really don’t though, because, as soon as they say this, they immediately reduce this special providential preservation to the vanishing point in order to make room for the naturalistic theories of Westcott and Hort. As we have seen, some say that the providential preservation of the New Testament means merely that *the same “substance of doctrine”* is found in all the New Testament documents. Others say that it means that the true reading is always present in *at least one of the thousands of extant New Testament manuscripts*. And still other scholars say that to them the special, providential preservation of the Scriptures means that the true New Testament text was providentially *discovered in the mid-19th century by Tischendorf; Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort* after having been lost for 1,500 years.

Price:

Khoo misrepresents the Historic Fundamentalist’s position. We believe that the autographic text has been preserved down through history in the consensus of the surviving copies of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles. The autographic text has been preserved whether or not people have always been able to accurately recognize the autographic words in precise detail. In earlier times, people compared the ancient copies of the Bible available to them in order to determine the autographic words in places of variation, and God prospered those hand-copied Bibles in spite of their minor deficiencies. In relatively recent times people have developed better methods for distinguishing autographic readings from non-autographic ones in places of variation, and many more copies of ancient Bibles are now available for comparison, so the ability to accurately recognize the autographic text has improved. But even in places where the identity of the autographic words remains uncertain, one can be certain that one or the other preserved reading is autographic; the text was never lost. Numbers of representatives of the non-Byzantine text traditions other than the 4th century uncials have also survived.

In recent decades, a new doctrine of preservation was invented that finds the autographic words on the basis of the English words of the KJV. That newly created text had no tangible existence until the mid-nineteenth century. The advocates of this new textual theory call

themselves KJV Fundamentalists. To them, the autographic text of the Bible was lost for 1800 years until it was reconstructed by the King James translators under special providential guidance of the Holy Spirit, and finally put in print over 200 years later. It does no good to respond that the Textus Receptus was virtually preserved before 1611 because that claim can also be made by advocates of the critical text.

Khoo:

“If you adopt one of these false views of the providential preservation of Scriptures, then you are logically on your way toward *the denial of the infallible inspiration of the Scriptures*. For if God has preserved the Scriptures so carelessly, why would he have infallibly inspired them in the first place? It is not sufficient therefore merely to say that you believe in the doctrine of the special, providential preservation of holy Scriptures. You must really believe this doctrine and allow it to guide your thinking. You must begin with *Christ* and the *Gospel* and proceed according to the logic of faith. *This will lead you to the Traditional text, the Textus Receptus, and the King James Version*, in other words, to the common faith.”

Price:

Khoo again has misrepresented Historic Fundamentalists. Throughout the history of Christianity, believers have had to deal with variant readings and scribal errors. That problem has not led them to deny the infallible inspiration of Scripture. The founding fathers of Fundamentalism did not hold to the new so-called KJV Fundamentalism because it did not exist at that time. Today most Fundamentalists do not accept KJV Fundamentalism, and have given no thought of questioning or denying inspiration, infallibility, inerrancy, or preservation. Those of us who are old enough remember the birth of this new doctrine and recognize its faults.

Khoo:

God forbid that we should ever make this anti-biblical statement: “The Bible contains mistakes and errors but they are so small and so minor they should not cause us any worry.” If the Bible contains error, no matter how small or minor, I worry! “For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all” (Jas 2:10). If a person says he believes in a perfect Bible, and yet denies just one verse, yea even a jot or tittle, he is guilty of denying all of the Bible. Jesus warned, “But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were downed in the depth of the sea” (Matt 18:6).

Price:

Khoo here uses the term “Bible” (referring to his English Bible) as though it were the Word of God as contained in the autographic text. The Bible is the Word of God as contained in the autographic text; it is that Bible to which the above quotations apply, not to any man-made translation, no matter how reputable. English Bibles have no jots and tittles. Khoo’s English Bible does contain discrepancies due to scribal errors; he listed two above. There are many more.

Khoo:

I believe in a perfect God who has given us a perfect Bible. “*Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar*” (Rom 3:4)! Since God said it, that settles it, and my duty is simply to *believe it!* This kind of faith ought to be instilled in every Christian. We need to cleave on to the very words of God and never doubt the veracity of His words! No one has all the answers. God has all the answers, and sometimes He allows false prophets (like Westcott and Hort with their Accursed Text), and false doctrines (like limited inerrancy and imperfect preservation) to come into the scene in order to test whether we love Him or not (Deut 13:3, Ps 139:21-22). Would we doubt or question Him, or would we trust and obey His every word no matter what man may say? “Man shall not live by bread alone, but by *every word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of God” (Matt 4:4).

Price:

God did give us a perfect Bible, and He preserved its text. He did not promise perfect copyists, translators, textual experts, interpreters, teachers, or preachers. Copyists, translators, textual experts, interpreters, teachers, and preachers are all fallible; and they all make mistakes that show up in their work. The Bible does not promise a second work of inspiration, otherwise known as special providence, for any translation. That would amount to double inspiration.

The King James Version does contain discrepancies due to scribal errors of text or translator. The following are a list of some:

Numerous known discrepancies in grammar, spelling, capitalization, and printing are still retained in many modern editions. The following sections list examples of such discrepancies.

Grammar

Scrivener listed a number of examples of grammatical irregularities:²

(1) The following illustrate irregular verb forms:

- Ex. 9:31—“the flax and barley was smitten”
- 2 Sam. 17:29—“The people *is* hungry, and weary, and thirsty”
- 2 Chr. 1:12—“wisdom and knowledge is granted”
- Mark 9:3—“no fuller...can white them.”
- Luke 1:19—“Gabriel, that stand”
- John 11:57—“if any man knew where he were”
- Acts 1:15—“the number of names together were...”
- Acts 6:7—“a great company...were obedient”
- Acts 23:15—“or ever he come near”
- 1 John 5:15—“if we know that he hear us”

² Scrivener, lii-liii; Scrivener was an expert editor. I accept his judgment about English grammar at the turn of the 20th century.

Rev. 18:17—“so great riches is come”

(2) The following illustrate antiquated singular forms that were usually corrected to plurals by the revisers, but evidently overlooked in these places:

Judg. 14:12, 13—“thirty change of garments”

1 Kings 10:17—“three pound of gold”

Ezra 2:69—“five thousand pound of silver”

Neh. 7:71—“two hundred pound of silver”

Neh. 7:72—“two thousand pound of silver”

Luke 9:28—“an eight days”

(3) The following illustrate the irregular use of an adjective for an adverb:

2 Chr. 2:9—“wonderful great”

2 Pet. 2:6—“live ungodly”

(4) The following illustrate the irregular use of double superlatives:

Mark 10:44—“chiefest” (see also 1 Sam. 2:29; 9:22; 21:7;

2 Chr. 32:33; Song 5:10; 2 Cor. 11:5; 12:11)

Acts 26:5—“most straitest”

(5) The following illustrates the irregular suppression of the sign of the genitive (of):

Rev. 18:12—“all manner vessels” (twice)

Spelling

The revisers usually corrected the archaic spelling of words. Scrivener listed numerous examples of words not corrected due to oversight:³

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Archaic Spelling</u>	<u>Usually Corrected to</u>
Gen. 8:11	pluckt	plucked
Gen. 18:7	fetchtd	fetchd

³ Scrivener, xlviii-1; the American Bible Society Edition had generally corrected archaic spelling discrepancies.

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Archaic Spelling</u>	<u>Usually Corrected to</u>
Ex. 17:7	Tentation	Temptation ⁴
Ex. 33:22	clift	cleft
Judg. 6:31	whilst	while
2 Sam. 7:13, etc.	stablish	establish
2 Chr. 2:16	flotes	floats
Ezra 9:3, etc.	astonied	astonished
Job 41:18	neesings	sneezings
Psa. 68:13	lien	lain
Ezek. 21; 29	whiles	while
Ezek. 35:6	sith	since
Ezek. 40:31, etc.	utter	outer
Luke 9:62	plough	plow

Other spelling discrepancies are the result of original translator's inconsistency in spelling names. Often the name of a person or place is spelled one way in one book of the Bible and another way in another book, even though the spelling is the same in the Hebrew or Greek. The following are a few examples:

<u>Usual Spelling</u>	<u>Variant</u>
Abida	Abidah (Gen. 25:4)
Ai	Hai (Gen. 12:8; 13:3)
Joshua	Jehoshua (Num. 13:16)
	Jehoshuah (I Chr. 7:27)
Sabtechah (Gen. 10:7)	Sabtecha (I Chr. 1:9)
Shammua	Shammuah (2 Sam. 5:14)
Zerah	Zarah (Gen. 38:30)
Zechariah	Zachariah (2 King 14:29)

Capitalization

The revisers usually corrected the text to make consistent the use of initial capital letters with proper nouns, and with nouns and adjectives that refer to God. The following words were usually capitalized: Creator, Father, the Most High, the Holy One, Maker, Mighty God, Redeemer, Saviour, King, Judge, Spirit, Holy Spirit. In spite of their meticulous care in this area, numerous discrepancies in capitalization exist.⁵

⁴ Marginal note on the word "Massah." The word is still misspelled in the Oxford edition, but corrected in the Cambridge edition.

⁵ The American Bible Society Edition has generally corrected discrepancies of capitalization.

Creator. The word “Creator” is used five times in the Bible, always in reference to God. four times it is capitalized; once it is not: “creator of Israel” (Isa. 43:15).

Father. The word “Father” is used often in the Bible to refer to God, and is nearly always capitalized when so used. A few exceptions occur: “our father, our redeemer” (Isa. 63:16); “O LORD, thou art our father” (Isa. 64:8); but compare “everlasting Father” (Isa. 9:6).

Maker. The word “Maker” is used 13 times in the Bible as a name for God. Nine times it is capitalized; four times it is not. For example,

“his maker” (Job 4:17)

“my maker” (Job 32:22)

“God my maker” (Job 35:10)

“my Maker” (Job 36:3)

“our maker” (Psa. 95:6)

“his Maker” (Prov. 14:31; 17:5; Isa. 17:7; 45:9, 11; Hos. 8:14)

“thy Maker” (Isa. 54:5)

“the LORD thy maker” (Isa. 51:13)

Redeemer. The word “Redeemer” is used sixteen times in the Bible to refer to God. Eight times it is capitalized, and eight times it is not. For example,

“your redeemer, the Holy One of Israel” (Isa. 43:14)

“thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel” (Isa. 48:17; 54:5)

“the LORD, thy redeemer” (Isa. 44:24; 41:14)

“the LORD, the Redeemer of Israel” (Isa. 49:7)

“the LORD thy Redeemer (Isa. 54:8)

“the LORD his redeemer (Isa. 44:6)

“my redeemer” (Job 19:25; Psa. 19:14)

“our redeemer” (Isa. 47:4; 63:16)

“thy Redeemer” (Isa. 49:26; 60:16)

“their redeemer” (Psa. 78:35; Prov. 23:11)

“their Redeemer” (Jer. 50:34)

“the Redeemer” (Isa. 59:20)

Saviour. The word “Saviour” is used 34 times in the Bible to refer to God. It is capitalized 29 times, and five times it is not. For example,⁶

“God their saviour” (Psa. 106:21)

“God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour” (Isa. 43:3)

“God my Saviour” (Luke 1:47)

⁶ For “saviour” see also: 2 Sam. 22:3; Hos. 13:4; and for “Saviour” see also: Isa. 45:21; 49:26; 60:16; 63:8; Luke 2:11; John 4:42; Acts 5:31; 13:23; Phil. 3:20; 1 Tim. 1:1; 2:3; 2 Tim. 1:10; Tit. 1:3, 4; 2:10, 13; 3:4, 6; 2 Pet. 1:1, 11; 2:20; 3:2, 18; 1 John 4:14; Jude 1:25.

“O hope of Israel, the saviour” (Jer. 14:8)
“O God of Israel, the Saviour” (Isa. 45:15)
“he is the saviour of the body” (Eph. 5:23)
“who is the Saviour of all men” (1 Tim. 4:10)

Mighty God. The term “mighty God” is used in the Bible nine times. eight times the word “mighty” is not capitalized; once it is. Examples:⁷

“his name shall be called...The mighty God” (Isa. 9:6)
“the Great, the Mighty God, the LORD of hosts, is his name: (Jer. 32:18)

King. The word “King” is used often in the Bible to refer to Deity. It is nearly always capitalized. The following illustrate a few exceptions; the list is not exhaustive:

“So shall the king greatly desire thy beauty:
for he is thy Lord; and worship thou him.”
(Psalm 45:11; see also verses 1 and 14)
“my king” (Psa. 2:6; Isa. 33:22)
“thy king” (Hos. 13:10)
“the Holy One of Israel is our king” (Psa. 89: 18)
“the LORD is our king” (Isa. 33:22)
“the LORD is the true God, he is the living God,
“and an everlasting king” (Jer. 10:10)

Judge. The word “Judge” is used seven times in the Bible to refer to God. Four times it is capitalized; three times it is not.

“Judge of all the earth” (Gen. 18:25)
“the LORD the Judge” (Jud. 11:27)
“God is the judge” (Psa. 75:7)
“the LORD is our judge” (Isa. 33:22)
“Judge of quick and dead” (Acts 10:42)
“the Lord, the righteous judge” (2 Tim. 4:8)
“God the Judge of all” (Heb. 12:23)

Spirit. The word “Spirit” is used in the Bible about 218 times to refer to the Holy Spirit of the Lord. The word is usually capitalized, but about 53 times it is not. The following are examples:

⁷ Gen. 49:24; Deut. 7:21; Psa. 50:1; 132:2, 5; Isa. 9:6; 10:21; Jer. 32:18; Hab. 1:12.

Usually

“Spirit of God” (Gen. 1:2)

“Spirit of the LORD” (Judg. 3:10)

“the Spirit” (Mark 1:10)

“his Spirit” (Isa. 48:16)

“my Spirit” (Acts 2:17)

Discrepancies

“spirit of God” (Ex. 31:3)⁸

“spirit of the Lord” (Isa. 11:2)⁹

“the spirit” (Num. 11:17)¹⁰

“his spirit” (Num. 11:29)¹¹

“my spirit” (Gen. 6:3)¹²

In addition to the above, the following are places where capitalization is not used with reference to God.

“thy spirit” (Neh. 9:30)¹³

“the spirit which is of God” (1 Cor. 2:12)

On the other hand, here are references where the word “spirit” is capitalized where it refers to an evil spirit:

“Spirit of the LORD” (1 Kings 22:24)

“Spirit of the LORD” (2 Chron. 18:23)

Holy Spirit. The term “Holy Spirit” is used seven times in the Bible. It is usually written “holy Spirit,”¹⁴ but there are two differences:

“thy holy spirit: (Psa. 51:11)

“the Holy Spirit” (Luke 11:13)

Angel. There are about 59 places where the terms “angel,” “angel of God,” “angel of the LORD,” or “angel of His presence” are used to refer to God. Usually capitalization is not used, but there are four exceptions:

“The Angel which redeemed me” (Gen. 48:16)

⁸ See also Ex. 35:31; Num. 24:2; I Pet. 4:14.

⁹ See also Ezek. 37:1; Mic. 2:7, 3:8.

¹⁰ See also Num. 11:25, 26; 27:18; 1 Chr. 12:18; Isa. 32:15; 34:16; Mal. 2:15; Matt. 4:1; Mk. 1:12; Jn. 6:63; Acts 11:28; 19:21; Phil. 3:3; 1 Jn. 5:8; Rev. 4:2; 11:11; 17:3; 21:10.

¹¹ See also Job 26:13; Isa. 34:16; Zech. 7:12.

¹² See also Isa. 30:1; 42:1; 44:3; 59:21; Ezek. 36:27; 37:14; 39:29; Joel 2:28, 29; Hag. 2:5; Zech. 4:6; 6:8; Matt. 12:18.

¹³ See also Psa. 104:30; 139:7; 143:10.

¹⁴ See Isa. 63:10, 11; Eph. 1:13; 4:30; 1 Thes. 4:8.

“I send an Angel” (Ex. 23:20)

“mine Angel shall go” (Ex. 23:23)

“mine Angel shall go” (Ex. 32:34)

Other Discrepancies of Capitalization. The word “Lord” is always capitalized when it refers to God, but not so when it refers to a man or angel. One notable deviation is Daniel 12:8 where the word is capitalized although it refers to an angel.¹⁵

Nouns that refer to God are often capitalized, but not so when they refer to a man or angel. One notable deviation is Genesis 3:24 where the word “Cherubims” is capitalized although it obviously refers to angels.

Use of Pronouns

Usually the gender of pronouns is consistent with that of the underlying Greek or Hebrew text, but there are occasional discrepancies:

“when his branch is yet tender” (Matt. 24:32)

“when her branch is yet tender” (Mark 13:28)¹⁶

Usually the second person plural pronoun is translated as “ye” when it is the subject of a sentence. Here some instances where it is erroneously translated as “you”:

“Turn ye not unto idols” (Lev. 19:4) [how it usually is]

“But *as for* you, turn you [ye], and take your journey” (Deut 1:40)

“now return ye, and get you [ye] unto your tents” (Josh. 22:4)

The same is true for second person plural pronouns as predicate nominatives:

For it is not ye that speak (Matt. 10:20) [how it usually is]

for it is not ye that speak (Mark 13:11) [same]

So now *it was* not you [ye] *that* sent me hither (Gen. 45:8)

Use of the Particles of Exclamation

The particle “O” appears to be used consistently when a person is being addressed; but before an expression of hope or desire, sometimes it is “O that,” (Deut. 32:29), and sometimes it is “Oh that” (Job 6:2; Jer. 9:1).¹⁷

¹⁵ The Hebrew is *‘Adoni*, not *‘Adonai* used only of deity.

¹⁶ The Greek pronoun is feminine in both cases.

¹⁷ *Report*, 22.

Use of the Indefinite Article

The usual practice was to use the article “a” before words beginning with consonant, and the article “an” before words beginning with a vowel. There are many discrepancies in the use of the indefinite article especially before words beginning with “h.” The following are examples:¹⁸

- an hairy (Gen. 25:25)
- a hairy (Gen. 27:11)
- an hammer (Judg. 4:21)
- a hammer (Jer. 23:29)
- an harp (1 Sam. 16:16)
- a harp (1 Sam. 10:5)

Misprints

There is at least one misprint of the 1611 edition that has been perpetuated in all the editions of the King James Version to the present time: “strain at a gnat” instead of “strain out a gnat” (Matt. 23:24).¹⁹ The Greek word is *diulizo* which means “filter out, strain out.”²⁰ Arndt and Gingrich noted that this is widely considered a misprint, but that some regard this as archaic usage.²¹ However, the evidence is against an archaism here; none of the earlier English versions used “strain at.” The evidence is as follows:

- Wycliffe (1380) “blinde leders clensenge a gnat, but swolowyng a camel.”
- Tyndale (1534) “Ye blinde gydes which strayne out a gnat and swalowe a cammyll.”
- Coverdale (1539) “ye blynde gydes, which strayne out a gnat, and swalowe a Camell.”
- Geneva (1557) “Ye blynde guydes, which strayne out a gnate, and swallow a cammel.”
- Bishops’ Bible (1568) “. . . straine out a gnat . . .”
- Rheims (1582) “Blinde guides, that straine a gnat, and svvallovv a cammel.”
- King James (1611) “Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel.”²²

“To strain *at* something” is not the correct English idiom for “to remove or free by filtration.” Instead, a new idiom has developed “from a misunderstanding of ‘strain at a gnat’

¹⁸ *Report*, 22.

¹⁹ Bruce, *Bible*, 108.

²⁰ W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 199.

²¹ Arndt and Gingrich, 199.

²² *English Hexapla*.

(Matt. 23:24)” which means “to hesitate or be unwilling; balk (at).”²³ Therefore, the word “at” must be a misprint for “out.”

Other Inadvertent Oversights

Scrivener listed two examples of what he called “oversight” and “inadvertence.”²⁴ In Acts 19:20 all the English Versions (except Coverdale) read “of God” although the Greek texts all read “of the Lord.” The only support for the reading “of God” seems to be the Clementine edition of the Latin Vulgate.

In Hebrews 10:23 the King James Version reads “faith,” although all previous English Bibles and the Greek texts read “hope.” These “oversights” continue in all present editions of the King James Version.

Now these discrepancies cannot be dismissed as mere typographic errors of the typesetters because such errors are corrected in subsequent printings; but these discrepancies have persisted since 1769.

In addition, the various editions of the KJV differ from one another, containing internal variants much like the textual variations in the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts. I have catalogued over 680 such variations. Here are a few examples of differences between the two most prestigious editions, the Oxford edition of 1975 and the Cambridge edition of 1980:

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Oxford</u>	<u>Cambridge</u>
Josh. 19:2	and Sheba	or Sheba
1 Chr. 2:47	Gersham	Gershan
1 Chr. 7:1	Shimrom	Shimron
2 Chr. 33:19	sins	sin
Nah. 3:16	fleeth	flieth
Job 30:6	cliffs	clifts
Psa. 148:8	vapour	vapours
Eccl. 18:18	further	farther
Jer. 34:16	whom he	whom ye
Ezek. 7:11	their’s	theirs
Matt. 4:1	spirit	Spirit
Matt. 26:39	farther	further
Acts 11:12	Spirit	spirit
1 John 5:8	Spirit	spirit
Rev. 11:11	spirit	Spirit

²³ *Webster’s New World Dictionary* (2nd College ed.; New York: World Publishing Co., 1970), 1406.

²⁴ Scrivener, c. (cf. corrigenda).

Khoo:

Instead of the rationalistic approach that begins with the opinions of man and then work backwards to the truth of God, which confuses it, we ought to take the faith approach. That is why Hills warned that if we do not really apply the logic of faith consistently and allow it to reach its logical conclusion, we would end up ultimately denying the very Word of God itself. It is thus no surprise that anti-VPP fundamentalists are prepared to call what are apparent contradictions in the Bible “errors.” In denying VPP they effectively deny VPI as well. They are not able to say they have a perfect Bible.

Can we afford to believe in a Bible that is less than perfect? If God is incapable of giving us a perfect Bible, what makes us so sure that He is capable of preserving our salvation to the very end? We are thrown into all kinds of doubts. If we doubt our Bible, we might as well doubt our salvation (cf 1 Cor 15:14-19). If we as biblical fundamentalists are unwilling to affirm that we have a perfectly flawless Bible *today*, something is seriously wrong somewhere! *Absolute and unquestioning faith in God’s infallible and inerrant Word is the only solution!*

Price:

Although these minor discrepancies have no effect on the overall doctrinal teachings of the Bible, they do affect minor details. It must be concluded that the current editions of the King James Version are doctrinally reliable, but are not flawless in their minute details.

Therefore, it is ethically wrong to dogmatically insist, apart from the authority of the Hebrew and Greek texts, that the King James Version is the verbally inspired, infallible, inerrant Word of God, when it is known that the various current editions have verbal differences with variations of meaning. Likewise, it is wrong to claim that the King James Version of the Bible is the providentially preserved English Bible, when it is known that the various editions of the King James Version differ from one another, from decade to decade, and from edition to edition, even to the present day. The doctrine of verbal inspiration and inerrancy is limited to the words that were written by the inspired prophets and apostles. Translations must remain dependent on the Hebrew and Greek texts from which they were made, and must be expected to exhibit some measure of human fallibility.

The differences that exist among current editions of the King James Version are much like the differences that exist between the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of the Scripture. They are not as numerous, but are of the same kind. Those who place final authority in the English words of the Authorized Version do so to avoid the problem of variant readings in the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible. To them, any degree of uncertainty is intolerable—a Bible with flaws is no Bible at all. But they have the same problem with variant readings in the current editions of the Authorized Version. They still must ask which English variant is the authentic one. But they do not have a flawless Standard English text of the King James Version to which they can appeal for final authority. To resolve the differences they still must appeal to the Hebrew and Greek texts to determine which English words are authentic. Their retreat to a preserved, authoritative translation has solved nothing; they still have the uncertainty inherent in variant readings in the English texts, and the problem cannot be blindly ignored.

Khoo:

Affirmation of VPI and VPP

It is absolutely vital for those who love God and His Word to affirm the twin doctrines of VPI and VPP. Here is a summary statement of my faith in a perfectly inspired and preserved Bible today:

- (1) I do affirm the biblical doctrine of providential preservation that the inspired words of the Hebrew OT Scriptures and the Greek NT Scriptures are “kept pure in all ages” as taught in the Westminster Confession.
- (2) I do believe that “the Texts which are closest (ie, purest) to the original autographs of the Bible are the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text of the Old Testament, and the Traditional Greek Text for the New Testament underlying the King James Version.”
- (3) I believe that the purity of God’s words has been faithfully maintained in the Traditional/Byzantine/Majority/Received Text’ and fully represented in the Textus Receptus that underlies the KJV. Providential preservation is not static but dynamic.
- (4) I do believe that God’s providential preservation of the Scriptures concerns not just the doctrines but also the very words of Scripture to the last jot and tittle (Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, 24:35, Mark 13:31, Luke 21:33, Rev 22:18-19).
- (5) I do not deny that other faithful Bible translations, including foreign language ones, that are based on other editions of the Textus Receptus can be deemed the Word of God.
- (6) I do believe in the verbal plenary inspiration and total inerrancy of Scripture. I do not believe there are any scribal errors in our present Bible, and any alleged errors are only apparent and not errors at all.
- (7) I do not believe we need to improve on the TR underlying the KJV. I do not want to play textual critic, and be a judge of God’s Word. I accept God’s special hand in His providential work of perfect Bible preservation during the Reformation.

Price:

See my comments above. They apply here also. The perfect Bible is found in the autographic texts. It has been preserved and is available to the extent that people are able to recognize the autographic readings. Nothing can replace it. What was God’s Word still is God’s Word. God’s Word does not change.

I hope this has been of help.

Blessings,

James D. Price