

**The KJB in Relation to Inspiration,
Inerrancy and Providential Guidance**

**By
Dr. Larry Bednar**

**Indiana Fundamental Bible College
New Paris, IN**

Introduction

Scholars say scripture inerrancy is limited to long-lost originals, making it unverifiable. But why would only some earliest readers of Hebrew/Aramaic or Greek have inerrant texts? Isn't everyone entitled to inerrancy if all are to live and be judged by God's word? (Mt.4:4, Jn.12:48 - error can render judgment unjust). That God would inspire inerrant autographs just to let inerrancy be lost, isn't credible, full accuracy being vital to His people. Logically, He will guide select copying and translation that, in finished form, are equivalent in effect to inspiration, despite basic differences in the methods. Thus His progressively-revealed inerrant word would be preserved for His people at their times in history.¹

But scholars invent critical Greek texts, choosing readings they prefer in rediscovered long-lost manuscripts (they see themselves as the means of preservation). They deny full accuracy of copies or translations and assume their preferences are fine. We refute this, making a case that God's Word can only be traditional texts, fully preserved by Him and revealing His hand on them, that His people may know His will with certainty. We begin making our case with evidence of God's hand linking select translation to inspiration. The KJB shows this evidence by consistent accuracy, unique at times, and indicative of inerrancy, in turn indicative of an inerrant textual basis that reproduces inspired inerrant autographs. Accuracy is striking in passages where scholars deny it.

Defining and Illustrating the Autograph-Inspiration Method

Plenary/verbal inspiration requires that each word be dictated to men's minds by the Spirit to achieve inerrancy. Scholars dismiss dictation due to human input in the form of writing style and supposed error in scripture. Consistent KJB accuracy defies the notion of error, and human writing style is seen since, contrary to how scholars define it, dictation doesn't suspend writer intellect.

¹. L. Bednar. *God's Word in the life of His People*, IFBC: God's Word in the available history of true churches. LawrenceBednar@zoomtown.com

Dictation takes variant form. Writing style can be absent due to verbatim dictation, as in Exodus 34:27 that says, *And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words...* Jeremiah 30:1,2 says, *The word that came to Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Thus speaketh the Lord God of Israel, saying, Write thee all the words that I have spoken to thee in a book.*

A vision dictates to a writer's eye and ear. Revelation 1:10, 11 says...*I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying...What thou seeest, write in a book...* Dictation is also to the ear. In 2:1 Christ in the vision says, *Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus write; These things saith he...* Intact faculties are indicated. In 1:10 John hears a voice behind him and turns and gives details of what he sees. In 1:17 he falls at the feet of Christ in the vision, as expected of one with intact faculties confronted by a representation of God.

Dr. Phil Stringer, Ravenswood Baptist Church, Chicago, IL, points out scripture's most unique case of dictation, the speech of Balaam's donkey. God spoke to Balaam by the animal in words recorded in Numbers 22:28 that says, *And the Lord opened the mouth of the ass, and she said unto Balaam, What have I done unto thee, that thou hast smitten me these three times?* The ass had no possible speaking style, yet spoke her feelings to Balaam. She seems intellectually involved, an impossibility, so God preserved her "viewpoint." Thus preservation of viewpoints, and so mental faculties, of scripture penmen is expected.

Dictation can be so unique a writer exercises normal intellect and style as Holy Ghost supervision of his writing by-passes his awareness (God's still small voice). Scripture reveals dictation of acts and words of people without their knowledge. We consider Jesus' mother Mary, *great with child* (Lk.2:5) in Nazareth ~75 miles from Bethlehem. If she or Joseph knew the Micah 5:2 prophecy on a Bethlehem birth, in the hardship of the final stage of pregnancy, she'd dread a difficult trip to Bethlehem. And Joseph would dread hazards of labor pains, miscarriage or premature

delivery in a lonely area on the way. God had to handle such details, but how would He get her to Bethlehem? He'd stir the mind of a pagan, Caesar Augustus, to see a need to finance the empire in ways better than resented harsh taxes (Lk.2:1-5). There likely was a fear of tax rebellion then (Acts 5:37 tells of tax rebellion when the Roman governor of Syria was Cyrenius,² who ruled earlier when Mary and Joseph went to Bethlehem - Lk.2:2). God would move Caesar to require empire residents to enroll for taxation at their native cities to establish connections of each to family assets through local authorities (an old private-contractor system using locals would be fair, but publicans like Zaccheus would cheat). All would pay by ability, the masses not being affected enough to incite rebellion (it occurred later). Augustus introduced a graduated income/property tax (Thompson finds the tax enrollment began with Augustus,³ as is logical, for it accords with his *Pax Romana*, a time of relative peace, prosperity and tax reform). The taxation summons was timed too close to the birth of the Child to allow delivery before Mary and Joseph had to go to Bethlehem. Thus they came, in timely fashion, to their city of origin as descendants of David, because God subtly dictated the acts of many people in a vast empire without anyone realizing it.

Regarding word dictation, in Ps.22:8 David speaks words of men who persecute and taunt him, saying, ***He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him: let him deliver him...*** This prophesies words spoken by Jesus' persecutors at the Cross 1000 years later. In Matthew 27:43, priests, elders and scribes taunt Jesus saying, ***He trusted in God; let him deliver him.*** The prophecy is fulfilled on behalf of Jesus by His worst enemies, authenticating Him as the Son of David, God's Messiah, the last thing in the world they would willingly do. Had they known this meaning, they would never have spoken these words. Thus dictation by-passes speaker awareness, and makes use of malicious free-will word choice,

2. King James Bible Commentary. 1999. Nashville. Nelson. p1343.

3. Thompson, J.A. 1962. *The Bible and Archaeology*. Eerdmans. p375.

literal word meaning and speaking style. It's said they mocked Jesus with David's prophecy, but they revered David and would not identify themselves with men vilifying him. And they would never relate prophetic words of David to Jesus, lest they present prophecy authenticating Jesus as the Messiah. Actually they'd not see the verse as prophecy useful in feigned fulfillment, for, of itself, it's indicative only of David's history, not of prophecy.⁴

Now would the Spirit work in men just used by satan? In Matthew 27:42 they said of Jesus...*let him now come down from the Cross, and we will believe him*, opposing salvation. The one alternative to a Spirit role is God putting just the right men with just the right free-will mindset in just the right place to fulfill His will in just the right way. With the prophecy made ~1000 years before the Cross, this would mean God logistically or genetically controlled people in ~40 or 50 generations for 1000 years, choosing to intervene in free-will decisions to establish His will. Mt.10:

4. Scholars say the initial Ps.22:8 clause should be the imperative, *Commit yourself to the Lord* (NASV), not *He trusted on the Lord*, which would nullify Mt.27:43 fulfillment of the Ps. prophecy. Hebrew grammar indicates an imperative or infinitive, but an imperative would link a 2nd person command (*Commit yourself to the Lord*) directly to a 3rd person declaration (*let Him deliver him*) in one thought in absurd grammar/syntax; the scholars justify this, saying the clause after the imperative is an aside, with taunters talking to each other. Well, declarative clauses with a difference in person can link in poetic/prophetic Hebrew to vary perspective (e.g. Is.52:14, 61:7). But linking a command to a declaration, with a difference in person, all in one thought, requires extra words not in the text.

The infinitive expressed as perfect tense (*He trusted*) is indicated by the inerrant New Testament. Ps.22:8 relates to Mt.27:43 priests and elders who address the people, but aim their talk at Jesus on the Cross to taunt Him (indirect taunting is differentiated from Mt.27:40,44 direct taunting of others). Words of indirect address aimed at Jesus but spoken to others, fulfill prophecy on earlier indirect address aimed at David but spoken to others. The imperative applies only to direct address (e.g.Ps.37:5, Pr.16:3), and there's no verb form for the indirect. The form needed will correlate with jussive verb sense (wish) concluding the verse, as the infinitive expressed as perfect-tense does (*He trusted in the Lord...let him deliver him*).

29,30 supports this in saying, *Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered.*

If the Spirit did not speak through these men, dictation was indirect, through control of many generations. Otherwise it was direct, using minds and speaking styles of evil men against their will, with no appearance of dictation. One way or another, God made evil men in control of their faculties speak His words.

Thus the Spirit dictates to obedient servants, unknown to them, which would be by thought motivation. Luke 1:3 says, *It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write...* This gospel seems written at a whim from memory, but the Spirit directing Luke without his awareness explains *It seemed good...to write*, which explains his *perfect understanding*... Now we see the passage very differently. Luke writes in his style by his intellect, and the Spirit motivates his free will, supervising the writing by allowing or disallowing word choice (i.e. keep this word Luke, not that one). God dictates each word, editing words produced by Luke's intellect and style to avoid all appearance of dictation. 2 Peter 1:20,21 suggests such inspiration, saying, *the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost* (men's words as willed by the Spirit).

In Psalm 69 David tells of his reproach and persecution, relating his words to those of the Son of David on the Cross 1000 years later. David's words begin resembling those of Jesus at the Cross in verse 7, and on reaching verse 21, he speaks Jesus' own words of His persecution and reproach and toxic gall and pain-numbing vinegar offered to Him (Mt.27:34). A transition from David's words to those of Jesus is like parting of a curtain to reveal the mind of the deity dictating all of David's words. David speaks in regular human terms of himself, but his words that are Jesus' literal words relate only figuratively to himself and are those he wouldn't normally say of himself, further indicating dictation.

A 3-fold dictation, in a prophecy on betrayal of Jesus for 30 pieces of silver, appears in Zechariah 11:12,13 that says, *So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. And the LORD said unto me, Cast it unto the potter...And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord.* The speaker of *my price* can only be Christ pre-incarnate speaking by (dictating to) Zechariah. Judas, after the betrayal, is moved in his mind (dictated to) by Christ to do the right thing, to return the blood money to the priests and elders; he casts it down in the temple in disgust at what he's done, selling his soul for money. And priests and elders causing the Crucifixion, normally covetous men, used the money for the potter's field to bury strangers (Gentiles they hated), being moved in their minds (dictated to) by Christ to use the money properly. Christ figuratively cast the silver to the potter in casting it down in the house of the Lord, doing so by dictating thoughts of Judas and priests and elders.

Equivalence of God-Guided Translation and Inspiration

Objective textual study shows the KJB is consistently accurate, and accuracy is striking in passages where scholars vehemently contest it. Indeed KJB accuracy is so consistent it appears to be total and thus indicative of inerrancy that, in turn, is indicative of an inerrant textual basis reproducing inerrant autograph originals. And such English-text accuracy is realized despite very different grammar of underlying Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek languages.

All this points to providential guidance of an inerrant-text history concluding in the KJB. Inerrancy will identify the KJB as a written-word offspring of virgin inspiration in the true textual family, even though inspiration differs greatly from hard work of translation scholarship. Translation ordained and guided by God would be equivalent in effect to inspiration. The Spirit dictated autographs undetected, and He can guide translator thought or arrange textual matters undetected, with full equivalence. The equivalence will continue as God ordains new editions with new language convention for new generations, but modern English

versions are excluded, being just man's work utilizing humanist scholarship and deficient language unworthy of the sacred text.

Full translation accuracy, vital to many who can't read Greek or Hebrew, necessitates inerrancy, which is attained only by providential guidance. KJB consistent accuracy indicative of inerrancy is illustrated below, and in other treatises of this writer (ref.14). Scholars are to teach recognition of such matters, but their anti-KJB humanist scholarship misleads them and their followers.

1. An ultimately-unique word sense: *Replenish*, Gen.1:28.

An evidence of KJB providential guidance in the Old Testament would be prophecy fulfillment seen only in the KJB, while Hebrew-text inerrancy is truly represented, which occurs in Genesis. Some evolution advocates propose a millions-of-years gap from Gen.1:1 to 1:2 in which man-like creatures lived and perished, saying the KJB 1:28 *replenish the earth* means Adam was to repopulate the earth. But it says Adam was to fill the earth, for *replenish* meant *fill* in 1611 England (*replete* still means *filled*), and the translators didn't know of the future *refill* sense. Use in a refill sense occurred ~1 year after KJB publication, in poetry that distorts literality, and it occurred sporadically in later centuries (Oxford Eng. Dict). It wasn't established until over 200 years later, still meaning *fill* in the U.S. in Webster's 1828 dictionary.⁵

Use of *replenish* in Genesis is unique. In view of the *refill* sense applying long after 1611, the 1:28 command to replenish can be seen as signifying veiled prophecy on earth's population loss in the great flood, *replenish* appearing in the same command in Genesis 9:1 after the flood to fulfill 1:28 prophecy. That is, God spoke to Adam on filling the earth, and prophesied to Noah in Adam's loins on refilling it after the flood (similar to Heb.7:10 where Levi in Abraham's loins pays tithes to Melchisedec).

KJB translators unknowingly linked *replenish* in Genesis 9:1 and 1:28, making these the only uses in Genesis. They rendered

5. Daniels, D.W. 2002. Chick Publications web site on Bible versions.

Hebrew for *replenish*, *fill* in a 1:22 command in the same context as 1:28, regarding fish not fully destroyed in the flood and not in need of refilling. This Hebrew is used in like sense in 7 other Genesis verses, and they rendered it *fill*, not *replenish*, and *refill* doesn't apply. How can this be when they didn't differentiate *fill* and *replenish*? It appears God guided them by a need to replace antiquated *plenish* (fill) with *replenish*, English versions consulted providentially placing *plenish* where *replenish* later would substitute, and much later would mean *refill* (God's work, for no version writer knew the future). KJB translators would be aware only of a textual item, but 9:1 fulfilling of 1:28 prophecy, visible only in the KJB and long after 1611, reveals God's guidance in arranging a textual item. *Replenish*, marking God's hand on the text, must be retained, and Blayney's 1769 edition providentially ended KJB language up-dating that alters a word of this type.⁶

2. Christ's close scriptural-ministry tie to John the Baptist

Details of God's plan revealed in the New Testament only in the KJB, while Greek-text inerrancy is truly represented, will reveal KJB providential guidance, and this occurs in Matthew 14 and Luke 7. Evidently God signified the end of the Old Testament era in a way that gives precedence to the New, as indicated by criticism of the KJB for making John's baptizer role a last name. Matthew 14:8 says *John Baptist's head*...Luke 7:20 says *John Baptist*...Now to say that *John the Baptist* can't be called *John Baptist* is to say *Jesus the Christ* can't be called *Jesus Christ*. *Christ* and *Baptist* signify roles that become names by usage.⁷

In both verses the Greek is literally *John the Baptist*, as the KJB usually has it. *John Baptist* isn't an error or an oversight, the

6. By this Providence, other older words that can be up-dated aren't, indicating suitability of older language and unsuitability of ever-degenerating modern language in the scripture text (glossaries can define older words). Scholars miss this and can't explain it to those who reject old English.

7. More examples: *Simon Zelotes* signifies *Simon the zealot*, avid follower & *Mary Magdalene* signifies *Mary the Magdalene*, resident of Magdala.

name appearing in two gospels, and its use relates to the same event in both, John's imprisonment and death (Mt.11:2 shows John in prison during the discourse of his disciples and Christ noted in Lk.7:20). Thus this matter is one of deliberate design.

Context overrules a literal rendering here. Jesus Christ and John the Baptist brought in the New Testament era (John prepared the way, introducing Christ by miraculous birth partly reflecting the Virgin Birth, and by baptism of Jesus in Jordan, and he preached and baptized for repentance crucial to salvation). But John's work would soon end at the time of the Mt.14/Lk.7 event; as the last Old Testament prophet, his death ended Old Testament ties to the work. *Jesus Christ* signifies Jesus the Christ, the anointed Savior whose death and resurrection began the New Testament era. And *John Baptist* signifies John the baptizer, the role of the last prophet whose death ended the Old Testament era (he said of Christ, *He must increase, but I must decrease* - Jn.3:30). John is a very unique Old Testament prophet, for, while others like Moses and Isaiah foretold Christ, John introduced Him. *John Baptist* stresses, by the role, his close tie to Jesus Christ in bringing in the New Testament era (they were even kinsmen by the earthly tie). The tie is also seen in that, as Jesus had God's Spirit beyond measure (Jn.3:34), John was filled by God's Spirit from before birth (Lk.1:15). And the Malachi 4:2 Sun of righteousness with healing in his wings is Christ, while the Malachi 4:5 Elijah introducing the day of the Lord is John in association with Christ [1st & 2nd Advents are noted in Malachi, with Elijah-type John at the 1st Advent (Mt.17:9-12) and literal Elijah at the 2nd (Rev.11:3)].

The *John Baptist* tie to *Jesus Christ* signifies the end of the Old Testament era at John's death, and gives precedence to the New Testament era soon to begin with Jesus' death and resurrection. Death ends the Old Testament era, but Resurrection victory over death begins the better New era. God's guidance is indicated in KJB-translator recognition of veiled contextual sense overruling literal translation to relate John's Old Testament status to his

New Testament work through his baptizer role. *John Baptist* ties John's forerunner baptism of repentance signifying death to self-desire, to Christ's baptism signifying death to the old self and resurrection to new life. Thus a fully consecrated *John Baptist* left this world fully identified forever with his Lord, *Jesus Christ*.

3. Unique word sense from context/history: Easter, Acts 12:4

Another evidence of providential guidance is translation scholarship that can't be matched, the greatest scholars being selected for work ordained by God. Great scholarship includes knowledge far beyond the textual, in history and other humanities, to permit recognizing contexts requiring unique renderings; this is the case for a much-criticized KJB Acts 12 rendering of *pascha* as *Easter*.

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

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

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

Pascha is usually *passover* in the KJB, but Providence preserves something unique in this context by the KJB. The case is like that of the Isaiah 7:14 *virgin* regarding Mary and the Lord's Virgin Birth. The Hebrew for *virgin* can mean *young woman* or *maiden*, but Isaiah 7:14 context and related word sense demand *virgin*. *Pascha* has more than one possible meaning, and *Resurrection Day*, or *Easter*, is demanded by history and Acts 12 context.⁸

In 12:2,3 Herod killed James and imprisoned Peter in the *days of unleavened bread*. Others have noted this can refer to the feast of unleavened bread, 6 days following Jewish Passover day [in Lev.23:5-6 & Ex.12:18 Passover is at evening on the 14th day of

8. Early English versions first use *Easter* generally in the N.T, but later favor *Passover*. The Bishops' Bible retains *Easter* at Acts 12:4, but makes *Jews' Passover* an untenable *Jews' Easter* at Jn.11:55, indicating a lack of analysis of *Easter* usage. The KJB rightly limits *Easter* to Acts 12:4.

the proper month, and the feast of unleavened bread is 6 days from the 15th (at evening) until the 21st day (at evening) – Including Passover day yields 7 days of unleavened bread of Lev.23: 6]. If Herod killed James and imprisoned Peter in the 6 days of unleavened bread, Jewish Passover day was over, and an Acts 12 later Passover wouldn't refer to normal Jewish Passover day.⁹

Yet Acts 12 can refer to Passover day plus the next 6 days of unleavened bread. Ezekiel 45:21 calls the term a 7-day event, saying...*in the fourteenth day of the month, ye shall have the passover, a feast of seven days; unleavened bread shall be eaten.* This accords with Exodus 12:18 that tells of eating unleavened bread in the evening from the 14th until the 21st day of the month (7 days of unleavened bread), and Leviticus 23:5 that says the Passover meal is on the 14th day at evening. A 7-day passover can change Acts 12:4 interpretation. It might seem that Herod killed James and imprisoned Peter during the combined 7 days of Passover day and unleavened bread, which hadn't ended at this point, and he might plan to bring out Peter at the end of this 7-day Jewish Passover. But this interpretation proves to be wrong.

Context/history deny *Passover* in Acts 12:4, which could only be Jewish Passover in this context on days of unleavened bread, and that doesn't fit context/history. Lack of a fit relates to Herod's friendship with Roman Caesar Caligula (hated by the Jews) and his ancestry as an Edomite, a people historically antagonistic to Israel. Herod's rule was difficult,¹⁰ but he endured, ingratiating himself with the Jews by favoring their religion and culture.

Acts 12:3 says Herod took Peter prisoner since James' death pleased the Jews. They'd see James as an enemy as fast-growing Christianity threatened their religion and way of life. Thus there was no problem with the Jews in killing Peter right after James, and Herod had no reason to wait until after Jewish Passover, the first day or the 7 days. Yet he would wait, risking a problem with

9. Moorman, Jack. *Conies, Brass and Easter*. Way of Life literature.

10. Broadman Bible Commentary. Vol.10. 1970. Nashville. p75-76.

the Jews by a suggestion of changing his mind in acting against the foremost leader of the fast-growing church.

And scholars are wrong to say Herod had to wait until after Jewish Passover to kill Peter since Jews objected to executions during their holy days. That was usually so, but he had no reason to worry about that at this time in history. Christians were now considered heretics by the Jews, so a public execution reinforced the Jewish position. As Acts 12:3 says, the Jews approved of the killing of James during holy days of unleavened bread at that time. Thus context and history deny interpreting Acts 12:3 to mean Herod would wait until after Jewish Passover to kill Peter.

But Pascha as Resurrection Day fits context/history. The Jewish 1st- century church knew Jewish Passover was typological, being fulfilled and superseded by Christ the ultimate Passover, so their Pascha would be based on the Crucifixion/Resurrection. Timing of this Pascha would fit Acts 12 days-of-unleavened-bread context/history since the only initial timing basis was Crucifixion/Resurrection timing relative to that of Passover. The Crucifixion was on a preparation day for Passover starting that evening (Mt. 27:62, Jn.19:14), requiring a 3-day observance at the same time relative to 7-day Passover, both events starting at evening for a close relationship.¹¹ Herod could kill James and imprison Peter on an evening that began a Jewish Passover day, or on the next day, which would be during the days of unleavened bread, and he might wait to kill Peter until after the third day, Resurrection Day. Herod's political situation indicates that this was the case.

Herod was accepted by the Jews, but despised by Judean

¹¹. 1st-century church pascha was a Crucifixion/Resurrection observance starting on the evening Jewish Passover began (no. of days & other details are murky). In the 2nd-century eastern church, a 1-day Pascha at the same time likely reflects 1st-century timing of a 3-day Pascha starting that day. In starting pascha observance on Crucifixion Day and making it a 1-day event, Resurrection Day is observed on a day signifying Crucifixion Day, an irregularity likely due to an earlier 3-day event starting the same time (*Easter and Paschal Controversies*. "Evang. Dict. of Theo." 1984. Baker).

Romans (Lk.23:12)¹² crucial to his rule, causing political tension. Pleasing the Jews was a priority, but his Roman trouble required avoiding antagonism of any large segment of Judea's population that could cause political unrest and give local Roman leadership an excuse to depose him (a good excuse was vital as Caesar appointed Herod). He'd worry over Christian reaction to killing Peter (The sizeable Christian population still had political status, for Roman rulers wouldn't persecute them for another 20 years). He killed James without repercussion, but would worry that killing Christ's most famous disciple, Peter, right after James, might incite an uproar, especially if he did so at Resurrection-Day time. To Christians this day is sacred, and public killing of two great disciples at this time would be very politically antagonistic, mocking Christ's victory over death. In this act Herod would make a political statement like, "Is this your day of victory of eternal life over death? I'll kill Christ's great disciples at this time to make it a day of death. I'll show you what I think of your God." While Christians endured persecution, Herod knew killing famous Peter right after James, and insulting Christ, might incite an uproar. By executing Peter soon after Resurrection Day, he'd placate the Jews without unduly risking great Christian protest adding to his Roman problem. This would seem wise to Herod and is why he would wait until after Christian Passover, not the Jewish one.

Pascha in Acts 12 refers to Christ, Passover of Christians (1 Cor.5: 7). For Jews Passover observance was 7 days as Ezekiel 45:21 says. But 1st-century Christian-Passover observance would be 3 days from Good Friday to Easter. Herod planned to execute Peter after Christian Passover to avoid antagonizing Christians, or more specifically, after Resurrection Day. This very important day for Christians would be the day of greatest concern to Herod.

Actually, in the Resurrection, Christian Passover superseded the Jewish, so *pascha* is Christian Passover after the Resurrection, or after Acts 1 in scripture, where it appears 3 times. A Hebrews 11:

12. Funk & Wagnalls Encyclopedia. Vol.13. p81.

28 use refers to Old Testament times and isn't pertinent. The 1 Cor.5:7 use is rendered *Passover*, for this is the verse where Christian Passover supersedes the Jewish, and it clearly is the Christian one since Christ and the Cross are its basis. Acts 12:4 use can only refer to Christian Passover. *After Easter*, more specific and better understood by readers, replaces *after Christian Passover*. *Easter* communicates the sense of Resurrection Day, despite a 1st-century observance different from that of later times.

Some reject the term *Easter* since it didn't have a Christian sense until long after writing of the New Testament, making its use in Acts 12:4 anachronistic, out of place in time. But Pascha was Resurrection Day specifically by the 4th/5th century, and it was Easter by the 8th. Since the 8th century, *after Easter* has been the right current way to note the end of the 3-day Passover Herod had to wait out to kill Peter. So why are 17th-century KJB translators scorned for proper use of current terminology? Modern translators often do so and are praised for communicating with moderns. For example an NIV *gallons* (Lk.16:6, Jn.2:6) is fine today, but it's out of place in time, and out of place in culture, having never applied to Hebrew, Greek or Roman culture, so *gallons* is further removed from a 1st-century setting than *Easter*.

The KJB is the one English translation affirming 1 Cor.5:7 teaching on Christian Passover superseding the old. The KJB precisely reflects the Greek text, using *Easter* to signify the last day of Pascha to avoid uncertainty on the number of days Pascha lasted in the 1st century and to specify the day Herod had to get past. But today scholars treat translation precision as if it were error! Providential guidance resulted in selection of KJB scholars with skill and insight far exceeding that of modern scholars. Guidance would include directing scholar history knowledge to pertinent contextual factors during translator-group debates on renderings.

4. The "modern" science principle of wind generation.

Another indication of KJB providential guidance is preservation

of modern-science truth in an ancient Bible book written ages before men knew this truth, and translated long before they knew it. This is the case with wind-generation technology noted in Job, written ~4000 years ago (contrary to scholars - see appendix).

Job 38:24 God's question for Job.

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

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

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

Wind arises as solar energy heats earth's surface, causing heating and rising of air and lateral air flow to fill a void that would be left by rising air. The ancient Job book reveals this "modern" science concept, saying *light scatters (moves) the east wind upon the earth*. Light is correct, conversion of light to heat on absorption by earth's surface being the heat causing wind (conversion of light to heat is seen by burning paper with a lens focusing the sun's light, not its heat – reflects the 1st law of thermodynamics formulated in 1842). The ancient writer couldn't know this technology, so it's due to providential leading. The concept would be hidden from the ancients due to night winds from temperature differences like those prevailing between land and sea after daytime solar heating. Thus the KJB tells us the Hebrew text reveals God as the ultimate writer here, and this must be preserved.

Job gives the basics, and also further technical detail, on the wind-generation mechanism. The clause *by what way is the light parted*, reveals concisely how wind is generated. *By what way*, in reference to *east wind* (long-distance wind), notes the way in terms of the manner and direction involved as sunlight is *parted* (intensity is partitioned or divided) to move air and generate winds of different specific force. Sunlight strikes earth at various

angles from the vertical at various longitudes and latitudes due to the earth's surface curvature, and earth heating varies with the angle of inclination of solar radiation. Due to parting of light intensity with the angle of inclination, variant temperatures arise on earth's surface, creating wind cells in which air moves from a cooler higher-pressure area to a warmer lower-pressure one.

Thus, to the question *By what way is the light parted*, the answer in terms of manner is, by earth's surface curvature, which Job alludes to. The answer in terms of direction is, along curved earth paths on which variant angular directionality of sunlight varies earth heating in adjacent regions to produce wind cells of specific variant ranges of force and direction on a rotating earth (direction is illustrated by east wind, an east-to-west direction). This modern-science knowledge concisely revealed in an ancient bible book can only be due to the Creator's omniscience.

The light/wind connection in this ancient book proves the divine hand on the text, and modern translators break this connection, removing evidence of the divine hand. Hebrew grammar makes *parted* passive voice (light is acted on, it is *parted*) and *scattereth* active voice (light acts on, it *scattereth* wind).¹³ The result is two roles of light in one thought. Modern translators alter grammar to make sense of the verse when missing the light/wind connection. They make both verbs passive, separating the light roles into two thoughts using *or* for *which*. Neither word is in the Hebrew, and grammar/context determining the choice indicates *which/that*.

It's as if modern scholars erased God's signature from the text, distorting Hebrew grammar and altering verse meaning because they didn't know some well-published technology. Despite lack of knowledge of the technology at their time in history, KJB scholars preserved it by honoring the grammar, thus preserving evidence of God's hand on the text. They likely doubted a light/wind connection due to simpler 17th-century science, but Spirit guidance would stir-up in these reverent minds, a reverence for

13. Hebrew for *parted* is niph'al (passive) & for *scattereth* is hiph'il (active).

God's Word that overruled men's opinions and knowledge.

More poor science is seen in the NIV *dispersed* and NKJV *diffused* indicating light scattering. Orderly light parting is what creates winds of specific force, and wind, not light, is scattered.

5. For whose sin did Christ suffer? 1 Peter 4:1,2

Another evidence of providential guidance is avoiding Greek or Hebrew texts distorted by tampering in underlying manuscripts. Often Greek-manuscript tampering attacks Jesus Christ's deity.

KJV: Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin; That he should no longer live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men...

NIV: Therefore, since Christ suffered ? in his body, arm yourselves also with the same attitude, because he who has suffered in his body is done with sin. As a result he does not live the rest of his earthly life for evil human desires...

The KJB teaches that Christ's suffering was for our sin, so we honor His great sacrifice. As Christ was willing to suffer for our sin, we should be willing to endure hardship God brings our way to kill appetites of the flesh. In this way we partake of Christ's sufferings on our behalf (1 Pet.4:12-16) that we might conform to His death (Philip.3:10). We begin to reject sin as it becomes ugly to us by the hardship it brings our way, reminding us of the suffering it brought to the sinless Christ on our behalf.

The NIV follows a Greek text that omits the crucial note that Christ suffered for us. Now when it's not specified that His suffering was for us (for our sin), the logical interpretation is that Christ suffered to be done with His sin and that we should follow the example and suffer to be done with ours. This would make Jesus a mere sinful man suffering to atone for His own sin, and us following His example and suffering to atone for our sin!

This omission, that attacks Jesus Christ's deity, and would

defeat biblical salvation teaching, is one of many such errors the KJB avoids. The Spirit would direct KJB translator reverence in selecting the textual basis, or making distorted texts unavailable (scholars say the Received Text is based on too few manuscripts, and they suggest utilizing Alexandrian-type manuscripts, the type with error like that seen above in the NIV 1 Peter 4:1,2).

Final note: Another evidence of providential KJB guidance is retention of true readings despite minor manuscript support, for a true reading can't be left out of God's true Word. This is the case with the Johannine Comma (1 Jn.5:7-8), authenticated by context and language, plus evidence of a connection to the autographs, plus association with what looks very much like God's plan for a new widened true-text distribution in 16th-17th century Europe.

At times manuscript support relates to church size, and biblical churches that would fully preserve God's Word were small and few in medieval history, so copyists and copies would be few compared with those of large unbiblical churches. A few true readings meant especially for hearts of true bible-believers, and apt to be disdained by irreverent unsaved persons in large inclusive "churches," likely were preserved only in true churches.

But true churches multiplied greatly with revival of God's work at the Received-Text advent. In God's plan, true readings dropped in most Traditional-Text manuscripts would be renewed in the Received Text to extend the inerrant Traditional Text of earlier true churches to later true ones. This subject is discussed in detail in another IFBC booklet by the present writer.¹⁴

Conclusion: The items above are a tiny sampling of providential consistent KJB accuracy that can be presented,¹⁴ and readers are wise to study the issues to ensure they have God's inerrant Word, not men's productions, in order to hear one day, *Well done, thou good and faithful servant...enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.*

14. The KJB and Its Textual Basis: Consistent Accuracy Indicative of Providential Text Inerrancy. IFBC. LawrenceBednar@zoomtown.com

Appendix

Dating of Job: Job was written ~2000 B.C, preceding the Pentateuch, for it doesn't mention Israel, and it shows the man Job personally administering the animal sacrifice of Abel and Noah, preceding a priestly-administered one of Moses. It says nothing of Abraham, greatest figure of his time, and Job was, *greatest of all the men of the east* (1:3), so the book was likely written prior to Abraham's time, ~2000 B.C. The name Uz, Job's land, is very old, deriving from Noah's great-grandson (Gen.10:21-23). Job preceded Abraham in that Job's life span was the 140 years he lived after his trials (42:16), plus preceding years in which he grew to manhood and begat 10 children old enough to sin (1:1-5), for a likely total of ~200 years. This is comparable to the 205 years of Abraham's father, Terah, and greater than the 175 years of Abraham, the 147 of Jacob and the 110 of Jacob's son Joseph. This places Job close to Terah's time in history as the life-span steadily decreased from a near-1000 year pre-flood level.

Yet another indicator that Job is the first book is its description of ancient dinosaurs, a matter discussed elsewhere (ref.14). And logic indicates Job was first, for it deals with the foremost human dilemma, the question of why hurt and evil dominate life, and it presents the solution, the Savior (Job 19:25-27).

Now we must account for the fact that names of Chaldean and Sabean tribes and the tribe of the friend Elihu link to descendants of Abraham and Nahor. Actually the name *Chaldean* preceded Abraham's time, for his first homeland was Ur of the Chaldees (Gen.11:31), and the name *Sabean* originated very early with Seba, Noah's great grandson (Gen.10:1-7). And the Naamathite tribal name of Job's friend Zophar, originated very early with the name of Cain's great granddaughter (Gen.4:22).

We must also account for the fact that Job's friends Eliphaz and Bildad have personal and/or tribal names identified with descendants of Abraham (Esau, Shuah, Jokshan - Gen.25:2) and his brother Nahor (Gen.22:20,21). Actually an inexact genealogy

correlation indicates that names in lines of descent of Abraham and Nahor are repeat uses of names in Job. For example Eliphaz in Job is called a Temanite, while 1 Chronicles 1:36 says Teman in Abraham's line was a son of Eliphaz; a father can't continue a clan of which his son is patriarch, so Eliphaz in Abraham's line is a different Eliphaz. And Elihu the Buzite of Job has a father Barachel not noted in the line of Nahor, father of Buz and Huz (Gen.22:21), and Job's Ram in the line of Buz isn't in Nahor's line, the one other Ram in scripture being in Abraham's line (1 Chron.2:9 - Aram in Nahor's line and Ram are different Hebrew names). And Nahor's Huz and Buz are names likely derived from Job's land Uz, reflecting a trend in Nahor's clan in that his name derived from the name of his town and his brother Haran's name derived from the district of the town of Nahor. Job could be a son of Jacob's son Issachar (Gen.46:13), placing him around 1800-1700 B.C, but this is likely another use of the name Job, for nothing ties this man to Job's greatness in the Job book.

Repeat use of names in descent lines of Job and friends, in a somewhat-similar order, is no surprise. Children have long been named after Bible figures. As Abraham was the greatest man in his age, Job was in his, and children would be named after names in Job, this being the only Bible book at Abraham's time and for the next 500 years. Similar order likely reflects honoring of the first Bible book, and descendants of Abraham and Nahor would likely want their children's names to reflect the Job book due to great faith in God common to Job and Abraham. Inaccuracy in repeating names in a line would be due to conflicting human preferences, very limited Bible-manuscript availability so early in history and human uncertainty in the absence of early initial record-keeping. Chronicles later established record-keeping.