

The following are my comments concerning Jeffrey Khoo's response to my former remarks. I omitted some of his statements that needed no comment. You may share this with Mr. Khoo and anyone else at your disgression.

Khoo:

<<

I am quite sure that Price would criticise the Life Church Statement of Reconciliation of January 5—that the KJV is “the very word of God, and fully reliable, ... And thus we should continue to exclusively use the KJV for all ministries of the church and for our members' use, and refrain from all Modern English versions, like the RSV, NASV and NIV. One of the many deficiencies of these Modern English versions is that they are based on the corrupted Westcott and Hort Greek and Hebrew Text; whilst the KJV is based on the uncorrupted family of the Greek Received Text and the Masoretic Hebrew Text.”

>>

Price:

Mr. Khoo is wrong in stating that Westcott and Hort have a Hebrew text. However, he is correct about my disapproval of the new Life Church Statement. I recognize that the Life Church Statement is a recent one that departs from the former statement established by the founders of Life Church. It is the statement of a new doctrine that did not exist in Singapore in earlier decades. That is true because the doctrine is new, having been created in the early 1970s. I'm quite sure that in earlier years the Life Church and the FEBC followed the Westminster Confession of Faith of 1648 that states:

The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic; so as in all controversies of religion, the Church is finally to appeal unto them. But, because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God, who have right unto, and interest in the Scriptures, and are commanded, in the fear of God, to read and search them, therefore they are to be translated unto the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come, that, the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship him in an acceptable manner; and, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, may have hope.

Khoo:

<<

Price is quite adept at confusing and undermining people's confidence on the KJV. He has a list of grammatical, spelling, capitalization, and printing “mistakes” in the KJV. Price is conceited enough to think his command of the English language is superior to that of the King James translators. He wants to correct the King's English of the KJV. He is like a kindergarten pupil trying to correct the university professor.

>>

Price:

The list of mistakes in the KJV came mainly from one compiled by the famous F. H. A. Scrivener, a defender of the Traditional Text and creator of the edition of the *Textus Receptus* that underlies the KJV, the text regarded as authoritative by Donald A. Waite and Jeffrey Khoo. Let Mr. Khoo call that highly respected scholar a kindergarten pupil. Then let Mr. Khoo learn again from his ancestors to respect his elders and behave like a gentleman. Let Mr. Khoo explain why the listed mistakes are correct English when in other passages the KJV has the exact same statements in correct English.

Khoo:

<<

They were so sharp to spot a tiny little gnat and quick to filter it out of their drink, but could not see a huge camel on their plate and were prepared even to swallow it whole.

>>

Price:

I left out much of Khoo's straining at the problem of the gnat, because his above statement indicates that he understands that the problem did not involve sight, and that to "strain out" a gnat is the same as to "filter out" a gnat. The dictionary states that to "strain at" something means to exert much strength to move it. One need not exert much strength to move a tiny gnat. That type of straining has nothing to do with filtering or straining liquids. Mr. Khoo ignored the fact that all translations earlier than and contemporary with the KJV translated the word as "strain out," not "strain at." His unnecessary straining was in vain.

Khoo:

<<

The other "mistakes" Price pointed out like archaic spellings and capitalisations etc, are not "mistakes." The King James translators capitalize certain nouns and adjectives when these nouns and adjective refer to God. In certain places they do not because it could be due to their uncertainty on how the noun/adjective is to be interpreted, or simply because it was an oversight on their part (they were not infallible as translators).

>>

Price:

Simple oversights are still mistakes. If the translators were not infallible, then their translation is not infallible, unless one appeals to unscriptural double inspiration. Oversights ought to be corrected in subsequent editions, not perpetuated to the confusion of the faithful. How can one justify the following: "Then was Jesus led up of the spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil" (Matt. 4:1, Oxford), "And immediately the spirit driveth him into the wilderness" (Mark 1:12, Oxford), and "And Jesus being full of

the Holy Ghost returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness” (Luke 4:1, Oxford and Cambridge). Obviously all three accounts are about the same event, and the Spirit in all three accounts is the Holy Spirit; so the Oxford KJV has a doctrinal mistake in both Matthew and Mark. To say otherwise is to close one’s eyes to the truth. Likewise, there is no excuse for “and take not thy holy spirit from me” (Psa. 51:11 Oxford and Cambridge). Who would deny that this reference is to the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity? Capitalization is important, with doctrinal implications. And modern translations, including the NKJV have justifiably corrected these mistakes.

Khoo:

<<

At times there is a need to return to the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures for certainty and clarity.

>>

Price:

Khoo agrees with me here. The Hebrew and Greek Scriptures must be consulted for certainty and clarity. Thus the KJV must be tested against the Hebrew and Greek, and when the KJV does not conform to the Hebrew and Greek, then it is in error and must be corrected. However, if the English words of the KJV are used to determine the Hebrew and Greek texts to begin with, then one should never need to consult the Hebrew and Greek. Mr. Khoo should decide which is authoritative, the Hebrew and Greek or the KJV English. It cannot be both! If the English words of the KJV determine which Hebrew and Greek words are correct, then Mr. Khoo agrees with Peter Ruckman!

Khoo:

<<

What distinguishes historic and reformed fundamentalists from neo-evangelicals and neo-fundamentalists is this: historic and reformed fundamentalists believe that the Scriptures are preserved in the Byzantine/Majority/Received Text which is the source text of the KJV and all the Reformation Bibles, while neo-evangelicals and neo-fundamentalists believe they are preserved in the Alexandrian/Minority/Westcott-Hort Text, the root of all the modern perversions of the Bible.

>>

Price:

Mr. Khoo is the one who misleads here. He misleads in asserting the equality of the Byzantine (Majority) text with the Received Text (Textus Receptus). The texts are not the same, being different in over 1,500 places. Secondly, the majority of fundamentalists regard the autographic text to be preserved in the consensus of all the manuscript

evidence, not in the traditional text. My earlier list of quotations from prominent historical fundamentalists demonstrated the point.

Khoo:

<<

Price says I misrepresent historic fundamentalism because it never held to the KJV as the best and only English Bible fundamentalists should use. But the following fundamentalists would disagree with Price: (1) Regular Baptist, Dr Robert Gromacki of Cedarville College, in his New Testament Survey textbook, affirmed the KJV “as *the* text of fundamentalism” (*New Testament Survey*, xii).

>>

Price:

Again Mr. Khoo misrepresents the situation. Robert Gromacki is not a KJV-only advocate, nor does Cedarville College (University) support that new doctrine. Gromacki did not say the KJV is the “only” text of fundamentalism. The KJV is the preferred Bible of most Fundamentalists, but most have not regarded it as the “only” acceptable Bible of final authority. Mr. Khoo should be careful when quoting others that he doesn’t read his own view into their words and thereby misrepresent their position. This is an example of quoting a person out of context and contrary to that person’s view.

Khoo:

<<

Dr Ian Paisley, a Free Presbyterian and prominent leader of the World Congress of Fundamentalism, upholds the KJV alone. Without mincing his words, he wrote, “I believe this Authorised Version is unsurpassably pre-eminent over and above all other English translations, ... I cry out ‘There is none like that, give it me,’ and in so doing I nail the Satanic lie that the Authorised Version is outdated, outmoded, mistranslated, a relic of the past and only defended by stupid, unlearned, untaught obscurantists. ... I believe this Book will always be the unsurpassable pre-eminent English version of the Holy Bible and no other can ever take its place. To seek to dislodge this Book from its rightful pre-eminent place is the act of the enemy, and what is attempted to put in its place is an intruder—an imposter—a pretender—a usurper” (*My Plea for the Old Sword*, 10-11). In similar fashion, Dr Carl McIntire and the International Council of Christian Churches (ICCC) in two recent World Congresses, in Amsterdam 1998 and in Jerusalem 2000, affirmed the exclusive KJV and TR stance of historic fundamentalism.

>>

Price:

In my nearly 80 years of life, I have witnessed the birth of the KJV-only doctrine. Until I was nearly 50 years old, I had never heard of such a doctrine. When I first heard of it, I could not believe anyone could be so naïve as to take it seriously. I have been a fundamentalist from my earliest days. My father was a fundamentalist Baptist preacher. Until his death in 1945, I never heard him say anything about such a doctrine; it did not yet exist. In those early years my family was a member of a Baptist church associated the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (GARBC), an association of independent Baptist churches that had withdrawn from the Northern Baptist Convention¹ because of theological liberalism. The King James Version of the Bible was the version used most often by people in those churches for study and for memorizing, and by preachers in the pulpit.

However, the idea that the King James Version was the only Bible one should use was unheard of. Everyone in conservative Christian circles understood that the King James Version was only one of several translations of the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible and that the final authority for doctrine, faith, and practice always has been the original Hebrew words written by Moses and the prophets and the original Greek words written by the apostles. It was not unusual for the pastor and visiting speakers to make reference to the Greek or Hebrew texts from which they derived better wording or more accurate renderings. They made favorable reference to the wording of the Revised Version of 1881 (RV), to the American Standard Version of 1901 (ASV), and to other modern versions of that time. At that time, it was popular to own an American Standard Version of the Bible. My wife still owns the ASV given to her by her parents when she was a teenager.

During the 50s I attended Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary,² a school approved by the GARBC. There, along with Bible, theology, homiletics, church history, and other related subjects, we studied Greek and Hebrew. We studied the principles of textual criticism and how to understand and use the footnotes in the printed editions of the Greek and Hebrew Bibles. These footnotes mark places in the text where the wording differs among the ancient manuscripts, and they identify the various manuscripts that contain the alternate readings. My professors had studied under such great fundamental scholars as G. Gresham Machen and Robert Dick Wilson. My Greek professor always preached directly from the Greek New Testament. No one ever suggested that variant readings in the Greek text were heretical, or that using other versions of the Bible was unacceptable. The only version that was criticized was the newly published Revised Standard Version of 1952 (RSV) because of its theologically liberal bias.³ However, one must not assume that fundamentalists began to preach King James Onlyism because they

¹ Now known as the American Baptist Convention.

² The seminary is now located in Tacoma, Washington, and known as Northwest Baptist Seminary, still approved by the GARBC.

³ This was primarily due to Isaiah 7:14 where the RSV reads *young woman* instead of *virgin*.

rejected the RSV. The rejection was due to a theologically liberal bias in the RSV, not to textual issues or a sudden need to have a final authority in English. Pastors continued to refer to Greek and Hebrew, and to refer to the RV, the ASV, and other acceptable modern versions.

This was consistent with the textbooks used in seminary. For example, well-known conservative theologian, Henry C. Thiessen, wrote concerning the divine inspiration of Scripture:

Inspiration is affirmed only of the autographs of the Scriptures, not of any of the versions, whether ancient or modern, nor of any of the Hebrew or Greek manuscripts in existence, nor of any critical text known. All these are either known to be faulty in some particulars, or are not certainly known to be free from error.⁴

Thiessen quoted from the RV or the ASV whenever that version better reflected the Hebrew or Greek text and provided a clearer statement of the doctrine under discussion. This also was true of Augustus H. Strong,⁵ of Emory H. Bancroft,⁶ of William Evans,⁷ and of other conservative theologians.

During the 60s, while doing doctoral studies in Philadelphia, we were members of another GARBC church in Haddon Heights, New Jersey. There the pastor and visiting speakers followed the same practice we had observed in early decades. No one objected to references to Greek and Hebrew, or to other versions. In fact, the people appreciated the added insight derived from such sources. There was not the slightest hint that anyone thought that the King James Version was the only acceptable Bible to use. During the 50s and 60s we often listened to Carl McIntire, and occasionally to Ian Paisley, along with many other great fundamental Bible preachers. In those days we never heard these great men mention King James Onlyism; it was a non-existent doctrine. If Paisley and McIntire now espouse King James Onlyism, it is because they abandoned the historic fundamental doctrine of Scripture and adopted the new doctrine after its creation.

In 1972, I began teaching in the seminary of Tennessee Temple University, Chattanooga, Tennessee. At that time, Aubrey B. Martin, a blind Ph.D. graduate of Bob Jones University, was Professor of New Testament. While a student at Bob Jones University, Martin had been advised to memorize the ASV because it was regarded as the most accurate translation of the Hebrew and Greek texts. Consequently, he memorized

⁴ Henry C. Thiessen, *Lectures in Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949), 107.

⁵ Augustus H. Strong, *Systematic Theology* (Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1907); of course Strong often made direct reference to the Hebrew and Greek, at times either accepting or rejecting the readings of the Westcott-Hort critical text.

⁶ Emory H. Bancroft, *Elemental Theology*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1945).

⁷ William Evans, *The Great Doctrines of the Bible* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1912, 1939, 1949).

the entire New Testament in the ASV, and all his Bible classes were conducted in the ASV at Tennessee Temple University. Martin was such a popular teacher that the University named a men's dormitory in his honor.

During my first year at the University, my wife and I attended the Sunday School class held in the main auditorium of Highland Park Baptist Church taught by one of the university administrators. The lesson was taught from the King James Version of the Bible, but the teacher often made reference to other versions, such as that of J. B. Philips, for clarification.

It was not until I began to teach that I first heard of the King James Only idea. I could not believe that anyone would propound such a teaching. The first mention of this new doctrine came from some students of Peter Ruckman, and then from his own writings.⁸ Investigation revealed that this idea could be traced to the works of Edward F. Hills⁹ and Jasper James Ray,¹⁰ both written in the 50s. However, these authors do not seem to have had much influence until their torch was picked up by Peter Ruckman and David Otis Fuller.¹¹ Searching back for deeper historical roots, the work of Ray¹² and Fuller was found to be strongly dependent on an earlier book by Seventh Day Adventist Benjamin G. Wilkinson.¹³ Fuller praised Wilkinson's scholarship, and reproduced ten of his sixteen chapters almost word-for-word.¹⁴ However, he concealed Wilkinson's

⁸ Peter S. Ruckman, *The Christian Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* (Pensacola: Pensacola Bible Press, 1970); plus other similar books, and his newspaper *The Bible Believer's Bulletin*.

⁹ Edward F. Hills, *The King James Version Defended!* (Des Moines: Christian Research Press, 1956).

¹⁰ Jasper James Ray, *God Wrote Only One Bible* (Junction City, OR: Eye Opener Publishers, 1955).

¹¹ David Otis Fuller, ed., *Which Bible?* (Grand Rapids: Grand Rapids International Publishers, 1970); *True or False: The Westcott-Hort Theory Examined* (Grand Rapids: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1973).

¹² Ray borrowed Wilkinson's idea that the Waldenses preserved the Old Latin form of the *Textus Receptus* in Northern Italy. On pages 79-80, he quoted Frederick Nolan as the authority for this idea. This quotation was lifted, word-for-word, from Wilkinson's book, pages 40-41. Also Wilkinson led Ray to believe that the Latin Vulgate was not the traditional Latin version until after the Council of Trent of 1546 (pp. 80-81). Thus, Ray asserted that Wycliffe's translation of 1382 (which was translated from the Latin version) "is in agreement with the *Textus Receptus*" (p. 34, see also p. 87). However, I checked Wycliffe's translation against the 162 errors Ray listed as being in modern versions (pp. 35-50) and found that Wycliffe agreed with the Rheimes translation (1609) in all but 3 of the 162 passages. Likewise, Wycliffe agreed with the alleged errors in 65 passages. It is clear that Wycliffe translated from the Vulgate, not from the Old Latin.

¹³ Benjamin G. Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Version Vindicated* (Payson, AZ: Leaves-of-Autumn Books, Inc., 1930).

¹⁴ Fuller, *Which Bible?* 176-318.

connection with Seventh Day Adventism by removing all references to Ellen G. White and to Adventism.¹⁵ Unfortunately, Wilkinson’s work is unreliable in many details, including the claim that the Waldenses preserved the pure text of the Bible.

If Khoo would honestly ask the old men among the Christians in Singapore, they could tell him the same story. The doctrine is new; we witnessed its birth. So we who hold the historic fundamental doctrine of Scripture are the true Fundamentalists, and those who have turned away after a “new” doctrine are the “neo (new)-Fundamentalists.”

Khoo:

<<

When Price fails to understand or answer my arguments, he conveniently distorts my position on divine inspiration and preservation and my view on the KJV/TR. He wrote, “The bottom line ... 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?”

Why mention them? Why mention the Traditional Text? Why the Byzantine Text? Why the Majority Text? Why the Textus Receptus? It is precisely because “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” (“A Plea for a Perfect Bible,” 13). Right at the very outset of my Burning Bush paper, I had made it clear that I was talking about an infallible and inerrant Hebrew and Greek Scriptures on which the KJV is based, and not the KJV per se. There is no “double inspiration” and the KJV is definitely not more inspired than the original language text.

>>

Price:

To mention the various texts as though they are identical is either deception or evidence that Mr. Khoo does not understand the significance of their differences. To quote one of the KJV-only advocates, “Things that are different are not the same.” If that saying is true of English translations, it is also true of editions of the Greek NT. Since those various texts are indeed different, then only one of them can be the true perfect text, and the

¹⁵ Gary Hudson, “The Great ‘Which Bible’ Fraud,” *Baptist Biblical Heritage*, vol. 1, no. 2 (Summer, 1990).

others are errant. Since Mr. Khoo accepts the text of Scrivener's Textus Receptus that underlies the English words of the KJV as the true text, then that text is the only one worthy of mentioning. Mentioning the others just creates a smoke screen of confusion to divert attention from the fact that the English words of the KJV determine the identity of their approved text.

Khoo:

<<

Also, the text underlying the KJV is not a "phantom text." If it is indeed a "phantom" or "intangible" text, then what did the King James translators use to translate their Bible?

>>

Price:

The KJV translators had four or more printed editions of the Greek NT before them, none of which were in perfect agreement, and none of which contained the exact Greek words that underlie the English words of the KJV. The KJV translators did not create a new edition of the Greek NT like Erasmus did, or like Stephanus, Beza, and the Elziver brothers did. If they had done so, surely they would have published their revised Greek New Testament sometime before or immediately after 1611. Instead, the individual KJV translators made individual eclectic textual decisions related to the individual books they translated. There was no textual committee that deliberated on all the textual decisions made. There were no permanent notes that recorded the individual textual decisions. That which exists only in the mind is intangible and a phantom. No new edition was published. The KJV translators did not create the Textus Receptus, they merely make eclectic choices.

Khoo:

<<

Perhaps, Price meant it is a "phantom text" today. But how is it a "phantom" or "intangible" text when it is in print, and used in our Greek classes?

>>

Price:

Scrivener's edition of the Greek NT that underlies the English words of the KJV had no tangible existence until 1898. At that time, using the different printed editions of the Greek New Testament that were available to the KJV translators, F. H. A. Scrivener selected the Greek words that underlie the English words of the KJV. He then assembled those selected words into his newly revised edition of the Greek New Testament, and published it. That revised edition was made almost 300 years after the KJV. Because that is the way Scrivener's text was created, it is clear that the English words of the KJV

actually determined Scrivener's Textus Receptus, and not the other way around. In this round-about fashion, the KJV has become the final authority. Khoo essentially believes that, because he refuses to consider the remotest possibility that the KJV could be corrected, regardless of the providentially preserved evidence.

The exact collection of Greek words in Scrivener's edition never existed in any prior printed edition or individual manuscript for over 1800 years; for all that time, that exact text was intangible. It is hard to explain providential preservation on the basis of a text that had no tangible existence for 1800 years. There must be a better explanation of preservation than that.

Khoo:

<<

The Textus Receptus underlying the KJV is essentially Beza's 1598 TR and the last 2 editions of Stephen's TR, and corresponds with Scrivener's TR that is today published by the Trinitarian Bible Society and the Dean Burgon Society. Price disappoints with his careless and illogical analysis of my paper and serious distortion and misrepresentation of my views.

>>

Price:

That which is merely "essential" is not the exact text. The fact remains that Scrivener's text, the text Mr. Khoo regards as authentic, had no tangible existence until 1898. All prior editions were merely "essential," containing textual errors, when compared with Scrivener's edition as the standard.

Khoo:

<<

Now, what is really a "phantom text" is Price's "autographic text." Where is this "autographic text?" Is it tangible? Who is the publisher? Can Price produce it? I submit to you that Price's "autographic text" is the "intangible text."

>>

Price:

Price's text is as "tangible" as the so-called Byzantine text and the pre-Scrivener Textus Receptus. It is a consensus text. If one acknowledges that the consensus of real witnesses has its own reality, then Price's text is real.¹⁶ The so-called Byzantine text is merely a

¹⁶ The text becomes tangible in the printed editions of the critical text. While fundamental scholars do not necessarily agree with all the textual decisions of the editors of the critical texts, the textual apparatus provides the alternate readings in footnotes, along with a list of the manuscripts that support the

majority consensus of the manuscripts in the Byzantine tradition. But many places of variation have no majority consensus; in those places Hodges used his own textual-critical rules to determine what he regarded as original; Robinson did the same, but with his own, yet different, set of textual-critical rules; and the two “Byzantine” texts differ. Price’s text also is a consensus text; it is based on the consensus among the ancient independent witnesses, including all the evidence, not just the text tradition of the Greek Orthodox Church. The pre-Scrivener editions of the Textus Receptus also are consensus texts, being based on a relatively small number of manuscripts of the Byzantine tradition, some of which are not very typical of that tradition. Scrivener’s Textus Receptus is the one that underlies the English words of the KJV, based on the textual decisions of the fallible KJV translators, regardless of the providentially preserved manuscript evidence.

Khoo:

<<

As regards my attempt at reconciling an apparent discrepancy in the OT, viz, 2 Kgs 8:26 and 2 Chron 22:2, Price was correct to point out the difficulties of my suggested solution if we take Ahaziah to be the actual son of Jehoram.

>>

Price:

It is nice to see that Khoo finally admitted that I am right about something.

Khoo:

<<

Now, I must clarify that I am not saying that the "co-regency" solution is *the* answer for this case; it is simply *one way* of reconciling such apparent discrepancies.

>>

Price:

But the “co-regency” solution is not *one way* of reconciling the apparent discrepancy. It didn’t reconcile anything, but rather created a greater problem.

Khoo:

<<

individual variant readings; fundamental scholars make their own textual decisions based on the available textual evidence.

One possible reply to Price is that Ahaziah might not have been the actual blood relative of Jehoram, but a step-son, a son-in-law, or an adopted son, thus allowing Ahaziah to be about the same age as Jehoram. Another possible solution is to look at 2 Kgs 8:26 as the actual age of Ahaziah when he became king, and 2 Chron 22:2 as the age of his dynasty when he became king.

>>

Price:

The problem with this new attempt to reconcile the discrepancy is that it now involves denying that the text means what it says. The KJV says:

“In the twelfth year of Joram the son of Ahab king of Israel did Ahaziah the son of Jehoram king of Judah begin to reign. Two and twenty years old *was* Ahaziah when he began to reign; and he reigned one year in Jerusalem. And his mother's name *was* Athaliah, the daughter of Omri king of Israel.” (2 Kings 8:25-26)

“And the inhabitants of Jerusalem made Ahaziah his youngest son king in his stead: for the band of men that came with the Arabians to the camp had slain all the eldest. So Ahaziah the son of Jehoram king of Judah reigned. Forty and two years old *was* Ahaziah when he began to reign, and he reigned one year in Jerusalem. His mother's name also *was* Athaliah the daughter of Omri.” (2 Chronicles 22:1-2)

In both parallel texts, the KJV and the Hebrew text say that Ahaziah was the son of Jehoram and that his mother was Athaliah, Jehoram's wife. There is no reasonable way that the text can be twisted to make Ahaziah other than the literal son of Jehoram. The only reason Mr. Khoo refuses to accept a textual variant in 2 Chron. 22:2 is because he must defend the English words of the KJV by any means whatever. But there is no reasonable way that a man can be both 22 years old and 42 years old at the same time and die one year later. The reasonable solution is that there is a textual problem in the Masoretic text in 2 Chr. 22:2 as the textual evidence indicates. The consensus of the textual evidence indicates that 2 Kings 8:26 has the correct reading and that unfortunately the English translation needs correction in 2 Chr. 22:2.

Khoo:

<<

My approach to biblical discrepancies is simple: "Let God be true, but every man a liar" (Rom 3:4). In other words, the Bible must always be right, and I am wrong. We offer possible solutions, but we do not say "This is exactly what happened." We do not have all knowledge, and we do not know enough of history and the background of the times to offer a definite solution. There are certain things we may not be able to solve or understand this side of eternity. But one thing is for sure, such discrepancies are only apparent; they are not mistakes or errors in the Bible.

>>

Price:

Mr. Khoo is correct that there are no errors in the Bible, and that we are fallible. Unfortunately, he has defined the Bible as the English words in the KJV, not the Hebrew words written by Moses and the prophets, and the Greek words written by the Apostles. Otherwise, he would be willing to admit that sometimes the English words of the KJV need to be corrected according to good reliable textual evidence. He should be willing to “Let God be true” in the words He inspired the prophets and apostles to write, and to let men to be wrong when they cannot correctly determine what those words are.

Khoo:

<<

Now, Price offers a solution to the above discrepancy which I find rather troubling. He says that 2 Chron 22:2 should read 22 instead of 42 even though every existing Hebrew manuscript reads 42 (note that Price acknowledges that I was correct to observe this). Price solves the discrepancy by using a non-inspired version/translation, namely, the Septuagint (ie, a Greek version of the Hebrew OT) to correct the inspired Hebrew Scriptures. Price says this is the “scholarly” way to solve a Bible difficulty. This is no different from using the NIV or any of the modern versions, or for that matter the KJV to correct the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. By so doing, Price is in effect saying that the versions (whether ancient or modern) are more inspired than the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. This is Ruckmanism, is it not?

>>

Price:

Again Mr. Khoo misrepresents what I said. I said that the consensus of the Hebrew text in the parallel passage in 2 Kings 8, together with the witness of three independent ancient translations (the Greek LXX, the Syriac, and the Arabic) bear witness to the correct reading in the autographic text. So it is not one translation alone against all Hebrew evidence as Mr. Khoo misrepresents. This means that the translator of the Greek Septuagint had a Hebrew text before him that read 22 in this passage, in agreement with the parallel passage in 2 Kings 8; the same is true for the translators of the Syriac version and the Arabic version. This also means that the Hebrew texts used by those translators were self-consistent, lacking the internal contradiction contained in the Masoretic text. Now, Mr. Khoo and I both believe that the autographic text was internally self-consistent, lacking contradictions, so the Hebrew texts used by those ancient translators were closer to the autographic reading at this place in the text than were the manuscripts behind the Masoretic tradition. The Masoretic Text, after all, is just a consensus of the manuscripts in the Masoretic tradition, not necessarily the autographic text.

One must add to this evidence the good common sense God created us with: A man cannot be two years older than his father. Mr. Khoo wants to retain the impossible reading of 42, just because it is in the KJV, regardless of the reasonable reading of 22 as

found in all the Hebrew manuscripts of 2 Kings 8, together with the confirming consensus of three ancient independent translations and common sense. That's what I call Ruckmanism! I didn't say that any translation is inspired, or that any manuscript is inspired. I said the autographic text is inspired, and that the textual evidence bears witness to the inspired autographic text.

Khoo:

<<

Now this is a fine statement of faith on the perfection of the Bible. But I would like to know this: What and where is the "autographic text?" What does he mean by the "autographic text"? Is this autographic text the same as the Autographs?

>>

Price:

I am surprised that Mr. Khoo doesn't seem to understand plain English. The autographs were the original documents written by the prophets and the apostles. The autographic text consists of the exact words the autographs contained. The autographs have perished but the autographic text has survived, being preserved in the consensus of the many existing witnesses (manuscripts, translations, and patristic quotations). Some use the term "apographs" to refer to the existing witnesses.

Khoo:

<<

Or are they copies of the Autographs? If they are the Autographs, then where are the Autographs? Is it not true that the Autographs are no longer in existence? Are not the Autographs therefore the "phantom" or "intangible" text?

>>

Price:

Mr. Khoo speaks foolishly. The autographs have perished, but they were real tangible documents, so they were not phantoms. Nor are they phantoms today. A phantom is something that exists only in the mind or imagination. Does he call his dead ancestors phantoms because their bodies have perished? Hardly! They were real humans, whether or not he has ever seen them, else how could he explain his own existence. The surviving manuscripts are evidence that the autographs really existed. Without accepting the original existence of the autographs, how can he account for the doctrine of inspiration, infallibility, and inerrancy?

Khoo:

<<

If by "autographic text" is meant the "copies" of the Autographs, then are they not in fact "apographs"? And if they are indeed "apographs", why am I faulted when I say that all the inspired words are fully represented in the Hebrew and Greek apographs underlying the KJV?

>>

Price:

Mr. Khoo is playing word games again. Obviously the autographic text consists of the words contained in the autographs. Manuscripts contain the autographic text to the extent that they contain the original words of the autographs. No existing manuscript is an exact replica of the autograph or of any other. But their consensus bears witness to the autographic text. So the autographic text has been preserved and exists in the consensus of all the manuscript evidence. The term "apograph" must refer to existing copies, or manuscripts, otherwise "apographs" have no tangible existence. So the autographic text is contained in the consensus of all the apographs. Mr. Khoo is faulted because he has subtly shifted the source of knowledge of the autographic text from the consensus of the manuscript evidence to the English words of the KJV. If one uses the English words of the KJV to determine the words of the autographic text, as Scrivener did for his Textus Receptus, then he is using a man-made authority. If one uses the consensus of the existing manuscripts to determine the autographic text, he is using the evidence God providentially preserved.

Khoo:

<<

Perhaps the difference between Price and me is that Price sees the "autographic text" as not just the Hebrew and Greek apographs underlying the KJV but also NIV, NASB, RSV, etc, and that the corrupt apographs underlying the modern versions (ie, the Westcott and Hort Text) could be superior to the preserved apographs of the KJV.

>>

Price:

Price does not use any modern English version to help recognize the words of the autographic text. Price sees the autographic text as the consensus of all the ancient independent witnesses, making use of all the evidence God providentially preserved. Why would one suppose that God's providence is limited to only part of the surviving manuscript evidence, limited to only one segment of Christianity, and limited to only one era of history? Does Mr. Khoo not understand that the ancient manuscripts and translations were the Bibles of the ancient Christians and churches? Does he suppose that those ancient Bibles were not under God's providence? Does he suppose that because those ancient Bibles were less than perfect replicas of the autographs that the people didn't have the Word of God? Why should one suppose that God's providence is less

sufficient today for people who have less than perfect replicas of the autographs and less than perfect translations? That which has survived has been preserved, and that which has been preserved must be under God's providence. Why should one refuse to consider all the evidence God's providence has preserved? Khoo uses the English words of the man-made KJV to judge the originality of the Hebrew and Greek words of the text regardless of the providentially preserved manuscript evidence. That is Ruckmanism pure and simple. That is a new doctrine, recently created and not part of historic fundamentalism.

Respectfully submitted,

James D. Price