

**The Answer to
70 Apparent Contradictions
In
The King James Bible**

By Gregg Nash

For the most part, the questions listed in this book are the actual word-for-word questions, or the criticism of a skeptic or professed atheist, that was found on the Internet.

We make no apology for using *only* the Bible to answer any alleged contradictions without any use of invented Hebrew/Greek meanings, the ‘best authorities,’ or falsified works like the Septuagint, in an attempt to ‘prove’ the Bible is correct. In addition, there is no regret for any contradictions or errors that actually exist in the modern versions of the bible, forasmuch as there is only one Holy Bible.

Prologue

*“Neither give heed to fables and **endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith: so do**” (1 Timothy 1:4).*

*“But **avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain. A man that is an heritick after the first and second admonition reject: knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself**” (Titus 3:9-11).*

This book is written for those that have placed their faith and trust in the Lord Jesus Christ, and him alone, for eternal salvation. The Bible teaches that when a person becomes “saved” (Rom 10:13), they are born of God **and** of his written word.

Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth...the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls. James 1:18, 21

In a sense, the Bible is the believer’s mother. Accordingly, the apostle tells us, “As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word” (1 Peter 2:2). Since a child of God is birthed through the written word of God, there is instinctively a supernatural drawing unto the Bible. The Bible becomes the believer’s final authority in every aspect of life. It is his or her security that they have been most

assuredly afforded salvation according to what is clearly written.

As a result, it becomes extremely vital for the believer that the Bible remains entirely pure, and that it contains absolutely no mistakes—none whatsoever. If there is any error in the words of God, the believer possesses a false hope. Simply put, if the Bible is not entirely pure, then a Christian no longer can know for sure that they have a home in heaven awaiting them. We cannot pick and choose which portions of the Bible are right, and which ones are not. It is suppose to be the word of **God**—therefore it is **God's** prerogative to decide what is, and what is not, the word of God.

Moreover, if a person has already placed their faith and trust in Christ Jesus, it is because they have, in reality, placed their faith and trust in what is written in the Bible. Therefore, a Christian needs to believe the other truths found in the Bible also. One of these truths is God's promise that he would preserve his words for forever.

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.
Psalm 12:6-7

The miraculous work of the preservation of the Bible is not depended upon man. It is a work of the Holy Ghost. Just as Jesus, *the* Word of God, came through an imperfect woman, so the written word through imperfect man: Both are conceived and preserved through the Spirit of God. God promises that he will keep his words forever.

Again, the only way a Christian can wholly trust God, and really know God, is through the pure and perfect word of God. If the Bible is not pure and perfect like it declares to be, then a Christian is merely living a fairytale just like the other religionists of the world. It is no accident that God completely unites these two thoughts together in the following verse.

Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Proverbs 30:5

It is through the written word of God that we continue to come to him to supply our need. How is it that we can wholeheartedly trust God to supply our need? How is it that we can undoubtedly rest upon the Lord for salvation? How is it that we can really know that we truly know God? We know this since “he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him,” inasmuch as “**every** word of God is pure.”

How many of God’s words are pure? Every single one of them! Are there copyist errors in the Bible? The answer depends on what is meant by a copyist error. There may be times when typos and mistakes occur at the hand of a person or printer. However, **if other various printings of the Bible all contain the same, exact “copyist error,” then IT IS NO COPYIST ERROR!** A copyist error is still an error; and this is all that the critics and professed atheists are concerned about. Any real errors would have been recognized and fixed *long ago* in the majority text received and kept by the priesthood of believers (Compare 1 Peter 2:9a; Revelation 1:6 with Deuteronomy 17:18, 8; 21:5; 31:9). It is time that Christians get back to believing the Bible, and stop being intimidated by so-called scholars, and

skeptics alike. Either the Bible is right, *no matter how apparent the contradiction*, or the Bible is wrong. It was good enough to save you: It must be good enough all the way through. It must be entirely pure just like it says, regardless of any ‘frightening’ and ‘frustrating’ discrepancies, even between number figures.

There is simply no other way to view this. God has clearly promised that he would preserve each word of the Bible. I believe the Bible, and that God most surely has kept his promise. Nowhere does the Bible affirm that God only preserves the *message* and not the *words*, as is so commonly argued today. By adding or diminishing Bible *words*, harm is consequentially committed against the Bible’s *message* (Deu 4:2; Pro 30:6). Besides, the message is quite clear—“Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.” Do you believe this message? Do you believe that “one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law,” and that “heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away” (Matthew 5:18, 24:35)?

Thy word is very pure: therefore thy servant
loveth it. Psalms 119:140

Man shall not live by bread alone, but by **every**
word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.
Matthew 4:4

The following are two reasons why I believe God purposely placed apparent paradoxes in the Bible.

1. To test the faith of his own children

Now the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.
Hebrews 10:38

And when he was come into the house, the blind men came to him: and Jesus saith unto them, **Believe ye that I am able to do this?** They said unto him, Yea, Lord. Then touched he their eyes, saying, According to your faith be it unto you.
Matthew 9:28-29

2. To glorify himself in the face of a foolish world

For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish **the wisdom of this world?**
1 Corinthians 1:19-20

But we speak **the wisdom of God** in a mystery, even **the hidden wisdom**, which God ordained before the world unto our glory: which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.

1 Corinthians 2:7-8

Jesus therefore answered and said unto them, Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come to me, except the Father draw him. John 6:43-44

I hope this small book will be a tremendous blessing to you. There is nothing wrong with a sincere question. That is why I began this study myself in the past. Some of these answers are the result of much prayer and study—the key to understanding the Bible (2 Tim 2:15, Ps 119:18). God is no respecter of persons: He'll do the same for you. God simply allotted me the needed time to put this booklet together. Some of my answers will provide a model or an example for other questions of a similar nature that are not included in this book. I simply do not have time, nor do I care to answer all the “endless genealogies” of “foolish questions” out there (1 Timothy 1:4; Titus 3:9). I did my best to cover the most controversial disputes in the Bible.

I make absolutely no apology for reiterating the truth over and over again throughout the entire book that “every word of God is pure.” This is my faith and the plain response to the skepticism and criticism of our day against the King James Version, the Holy Bible. Scoffers, too, must believe by faith that they are right, and the Bible wrong. It is not my responsibility to “prove” anything. I declare plainly that I believe the Bible to be the absolute truth and the final authority in interpreting itself. And while I may be mocked or jeered for this supposed blind faith, the unbeliever likewise must possess the same sort of faith that what they hold to be true is undoubtedly, irrefutably, unquestionably, indisputably the absolute truth. And remember—

If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing

nothing, but doting about **questions and strifes of words**...from such withdraw thyself.

1 Timothy 6:3-5

1. Does God incite David to conduct the census of his people (2 Samuel 24:1), or does Satan (1 Chronicles 21:1)?

God's anger was kindled against Israel because of their sin. David also sinned, being provoked of the devil, and God used David's disobedience to bring judgment upon Israel. In the story David said, "Even I it is that have sinned and done evil indeed; but as for these sheep, what have they done?" Nevertheless, God knew what his people had done. Thus, God moved David "against" Israel, not because God authored sin, but because God's anger was kindled against his own people. In summary, God used Satan's oppression and David's sin to bring about his will. As a result, Israel was punished, and David was chastened when forced to behold the judgment that fell upon his own people.

2. 2 Samuel 24:9 gives the total population for Israel as 800,000, whereas 1 Chronicles 21:5 says it was 1,100,000.

The account in the book of Samuel specifically reads of "valiant men," whereas the account in the book of Chronicles refers to "all they of Israel." A simple word study of "valiant" will conclude that these were mighty men, the elite of the army (1 Sam 16:18; 31:12; 1 Chr 5:18; 2 Chr 13:3). Hence, Samuel records the number of valiant men, while Chronicles gives the sum total of men.

3. 2 Samuel 24:9 gives the round figure of 500,000 fighting men in Judah, which was 30,000 more than the corresponding item in 1 Chronicles 21:5.

The previous question (2) provides a precedent for this one. The account in Samuel may include the sum total of “men,” whereas the account in Chronicles includes only the “men that drew sword.” The valiant men would have been able to do more than just use a sword—they were “men able to bear buckler and sword, and to shoot with bow, and skillful in war” (1 Chronicles 5:18). It is also possible that the amount in Samuel is merely the rounded figure to the nearest hundred thousand. Simply put, critics must believe by faith that this is an absolute contradiction. For those that believe “every word of God is pure” (Pro 30:5), the above possibilities provide a very feasible answer to the discrepancy.

4. 2 Samuel 24:13 mentions that there will be seven years of famine whereas 1 Chronicles 21:12 mentions only three.

I believe the answer actually lies in the precise wording of each passage. The account in Chronicles reads, “Thus saith the LORD, Choose thee either three years’ famine...” Therefore, we know this is what God said from the mouth of his prophet. The account in Samuel reveals that what God had told Gad to tell David, “Gad came to David, and told him.” Thus, it is *implied* here that Gad said, “Choose thee either three years’ famine,” just as he did in Chronicles. However, for whatever reason not expressly revealed, the book of Samuel declares that Gad told David, “**and** said unto him, Shall seven years of famine come unto thee in thy land. For whatever reason, Gad altered the word of God at some point in the conversation between Gad and David.

It is very possible that there had already been four years of famine. Notice in 2 Samuel 24:1 that the Bible reads, “And **again** the anger of the LORD was kindled against Israel.” Apparently, God had already been angry with Israel prior to this point. This may be a reference to 2 Samuel 21:1 (only three chapters prior) when “there was a famine in the days of David three years, year after year.” While David took care of the cause of this famine, it is quite possible that another year of this famine continued during the time that David numbered the people. As a result, four years of famine would have already taken place. Hence, God told David about the option of the three years of famine, and could have later emphasized the fact that the land had already suffered four years of famine. In other words, this could have been God’s way of encouraging David to choose another form of judgment. God, who cannot lie, is telling us honestly what God really told David at some point in time, forasmuch as “every word of God is pure” (Pro 30:5).

5. Was Ahaziah 22 (2 Kings 8:26) or 42 (2 Chronicles 22:2) when he began to rule over Jerusalem?

Ahaziah was most likely 42 years old when he began to reign in Jerusalem. While both verses declare that Ahaziah reigned one year in Jerusalem, it is quite obvious that he wasn’t both ages while he reigned that one year in Jerusalem. Each writer, writing from God, must be writing from two different perspectives. The younger age is probably the age Ahaziah began to reign, but not as king. This reign would have begun under his father, who was the king in Jerusalem at the time. The older age would then be

the age that Ahaziah began to reign as king in Jerusalem. The subsequent passages of scripture support this:

- A. In **2 Kings 15:5**, “Jotham the king’s son was over the house, judging the people of the land,” even though his father was still alive as king. King Uzziah did not die immediately from his leprosy; so his son had to fulfill some of his father’s kingly duties.
- B. In **2 Chronicles 11:22**, king Rehoboam made Abijah his son to be the chief ruler among his brethren because “he thought to make him king.” Hence, we see the custom of that day inasmuch as a son could begin to rule under his father in preparation for the future reign as king.
- C. Lastly, in **1 Kings 16:23**, we see that Omri began “to reign over Israel, twelve years.” This means that Omri began the twelfth year of his reign here. (If there were not a comma prior to “twelve years,” then this would mean that Omri began to reign for twelve years; but this does not coincide with 16:28-29.) He began his twelfth year, and then “six years reigned he in Tirzah.” Why the switch to Tirzah in his twelfth year? At this time in history Tirzah was sort of the capital city of the northern kingdom of Israel just as Jerusalem was for the southern kingdom. This is when Omri must have begun, as king, “to reign over **all** Israel in Tirzah” (1 Ks 15:33).

In summary, God must be telling the truth from two different perspectives. Critics are forced to believe by faith that this is an absolute contradiction. They cannot prove that the aforementioned passages are not precedents for the

discrepancy of the Scripture. I believe that “every word of God is pure” (Pro 30:5).

6. Was Jehoiachin 18 (2 Kings 24:8) or 8 (2 Chronicles 36:9) when he became king of Jerusalem?

(See point number 5.)

7. According to the author, did Baasha, the king of Israel die in the 26th year of king Asa’s reign (1 Kings 15:33), or was he still alive in the 36th year (2 Chronicles 16:1)?

If “every word of God is pure” (Pro 30:5), then both passages are correct. The difference here must be the perspective of the writer, writing from God. The lesser year could be the year of Asa’s reign as king in Jerusalem, while the greater year the sum total of Asa’s reign, which would include the number of years that he ruled under his forefathers in Jerusalem. (See Point 5) This type of numbering is not uncommon *even in the very same book of the kings* (Example A: 2 Kings 15:30-33. Example B: 2 Chronicles 21:20-22:2). Either the writers were absurdly contradictory, or God has truly kept his promise. When comparing scripture with scripture, it becomes quite apparent what is NOT meant. Hence, the above-mentioned response provides a very feasible answer.

8. Did king Jehoiachin rule over Jerusalem for three months (2 Kings 24:8), or for three months and ten days (2 Chronicles 26:9)?

Critics must believe by faith that this is an absolute contradiction of the Bible. For those who believe “every word of God is pure” (Pro 30:5), the book of Kings obviously records the amount to the nearest month. If Jehoiachin reigned “three months and ten days,” then he evidently reigned for “three months.” We still speak in this manner today.

9. Did the chief of the mighty men of David lift up his spear and kill 800 men (2 Samuel 23:8) or only 300 men (1 Chronicles 11:11)?

I really believe that the writers are writing, from God, the truth regarding two separate instances. A critic may charge me as being a fool for this so-called blind faith, but just how foolish would the critic be if the word of God were true? Even under conjecture, *if* the Bible were true, the honest critic would be forced to confess that he or she would be playing the fool. The difference merely lies within the person’s faith. Critics and professed atheist do not believe the Bible, whereas I believe wholeheartedly that “every word of God is pure” (Pro 30:5).

10. Was Noah supposed to bring 2 pairs of all living creatures (Genesis 6:19-20), or was he to bring 7 pairs of clean animals (Genesis 7:2, 9)?

Genesis 6:19-20 clearly defines what the “two of every sort” is—the “male and female.” God told Noah that, “two of every sort shall come unto thee.” Why? “To keep them alive.” The two here are the male and the female so that they could reproduce. In Genesis 7:2, God tells Noah to take the

clean animals “by sevens, the male and his female.” In other words, Noah was to take the male and the female (two) of the clean animals, seven times. Those animals that were not clean, he was to take only “by two, the male and his female,”—just one pair. Again, Genesis 7:9 reiterates this: “there went in two and two unto Noah into the ark, the male and the female.” Accordingly, if the animals were unclean, only one pair was brought in. If the animals were clean, seven pairs were brought in. There is no contradiction: only a critic’s fumbling over words out of a predisposition to find fault.

11. Did David capture 700 of king Zobah’s horsemen (2 Samuel 8:4), or was it 7,000 (1 Chronicles 18:4)?

If “every word of God is pure” (Pro 30:5), then BOTH are correct. The writers, writing from God, must be writing from two different perspectives. It is interesting to note that the account in 2 Samuel, with the lesser number of 700, contains a fact that is not included in the book of Chronicles. I believe God includes it on purpose to suggest what must have happened with the horsemen. If you’ll notice, 2 Samuel 8:2 declares, “And he smote Moab, and measured them with a line, casting them down to the ground; **even with two lines measured he to put to death, and with one full line to keep alive.**” Initially, David could have taken 7,000 horsemen, but 90% of these men were then “put to death,” whereas the remaining tenth were “to keep alive.”

How is it even possible that two different books written by two different people tell the same event in the same precise wording apart from these two numbers? I wholeheartedly

believe that this is no accident, and that, indeed, “every word of God is pure” (Proverbs 30:5).

12. Did Solomon have 40,000 stalls for his horses (1 Kings 4:26), or 4,000 stalls (2 Chronicles 9:25)?

Take careful notice of the particular wording in these passages. Notice in the book of Kings that Solomon had 40,000 stalls “**of horses** for his chariots.” The book of Chronicles reveals that Solomon kept 4,000 of his stalls “for horses **and chariots.**” Most of his stalls were of horses for his chariots, whereas a tenth of these were for both.

It is also interesting to note that this question and the previous one both deal with 10% of a greater number. 10% of 7,000 is 700; and 10% of 40,000 is 4,000. I truly believe that these numbers are no accident, and that “every word of God is pure” (Proverbs 30:5).

13. Did Solomon appoint 3,600 overseers (2 Chronicles 2:2) for the work of building the temple, or was it only 3,300 (1 Kings 5:16)?

The book of Kings declares there were 3,300 “**beside** the chief...which were over the work.” The book of Chronicles gives the total number of overseers while the book of Kings excludes the chief overseers.

14. Did Solomon build a facility containing 2,000 baths (1 Kings 7:26), or over 3,000 baths (2 Chronicles 4:5)?

Take careful notice of the wording in each passage. The account in Kings reads, “it **contained** two thousand baths,”

whereas the account in Chronicles reveals further information in that it “**received and held** three thousand baths.” One passage tells how much it held, while the other passage tells how much it altogether received and held. In whatever way untold, the facility not only held 2,000 baths, but could also receive an additional 1,000 baths of water.

15. Are the numbers of Israelites freed from Babylonian captivity correct in Ezra (Ezra 2:6, 8, 12, 15, 19, 28) or in Nehemiah (Nehemiah 7:11, 13, 17, 20, 22, 32)?

Some suggest that Ezra may contain a simple head count, whereas Nehemiah may contain the official register with the needed changes added later on. I am not opposed to this view at all. It is very apparent either way that all the differences in the totals could not be copyist errors. This would be absurd.

It is also quite possible that Ezra contains the correct number since the Bible plainly reads that, “these are the children of the province that went up out of the captivity, of those which had been carried away” (Ezra 2:1). The Bible tells us that Nehemiah “found a register of the genealogy of them which came up.” Nehemiah then declares what he “found written therein” (Neh 7:5). If what was written was really an error, this would not be an error on God’s part, but on man’s part. God is honestly telling us what the register that Nehemiah found read. The register even declared, “The number, **I say**, of the men of the people of Israel was this” (Neh 7:7)—almost as if it was alluding to the differences in the numbers. Once again, both are the pure word of God in that one is surely the true record, and the other is *truly* what

someone actually recorded. Thus, there is no contradiction on behalf of God.

16. Both Ezra 2:64 and Nehemiah 7:66 agree that the totals for the whole assembly was 42,360, yet when the totals are added, Ezra—29,818 and Nehemiah—31,089?

Did 200 singers (Ezra 2:65) or 245 singers (Nehemiah 7:67) accompany the assembly?

As discussed in the previous point, Nehemiah simply read what was recorded in the register that he found. Nevertheless, this does not prove there is an error on behalf of God. (See Point 15.)

17. Was king Abijah's mother's name Michaiiah, daughter of Uriel of Gibeah (2 Chronicles 13:2) or Maachah, daughter of Absalom (2 Chronicles 11:20)?

Michaiiah and Maachah are the same women. It is not uncommon in the Bible for one person to have different names or variations of a name. For instance, Maachah's father was Absalom, also called Abishalom in 1 Kings 15:2. Joshua the son of Nun was also called Oshea and Jehoshua in Numbers 13:8, 16.

Furthermore, Uriel is most likely Maachah's immediate father while Absalom her grandfather. Absalom had only one immediate daughter, Tamar (2 Sam 14:27). It is not uncommon in the Bible to consider a person the son or daughter of one that was not really the immediate father. For example, in 2 Kings 20:5, David is called Hezekiah's father;

and in Matthew 1:1, David is called the son of Abraham. The key to understanding the Bible is the Bible itself.

18. Was Jacob (Matthew 1:16) or Heli (Luke 3:23) the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary?

Jacob was Joseph's real father, while Heli was Joseph's father-in-law, Mary's real father. The book of Matthew reveals that Jesus would have inherited the throne being a direct descendant of King David through the lineage of his earthly father, Joseph. The book of Luke reveals that Jesus would have inherited the throne being a son of Mary who was also a descendent of King David. Luke 3:23 reads, "Jesus...being **(as was supposed)** the son of Joseph," pointing to the fact that Joseph was really his father-in-law (or, father by law). This is exemplary of Joseph as actually being the son-in-law of Heli.

19. Did Jesus descend from Solomon (Matthew 1:6) or from Nathan (Luke 3:31), both of whom are sons of David?

Joseph, Jesus' earthly father, was a descendent of David through Solomon. Mary, Jesus' earthly mother, was a descendent of David through Nathan. Jesus would have inherited the throne from his earthly father since Joseph was a direct descendent of David, and through Mary since she was also a descendent of David. (See Point 20) And since Jesus was born of Mary, the apostle Peter could rightly declare that King David, being a prophet, knew beforehand "that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, [God] would raise up Christ to sit on his throne" (Acts 2:30).

20. Was Joram (Matthew 1:8) or Amaziah (2 Chronicles 26:1) the father of Uzziah?

Was Josiah (Matthew 1:11) or Jehoiakim (1 Chronicles 3:16) the father of Jechonias?

Both examples are correct inasmuch as it is not uncommon for the Bible to call a grandfather a father. For example, in 2 Kings 20:5, David is called King Hezekiah's father; and in Matthew 1:1, David is called the son of Abraham. In this case, Amaziah is obviously the immediate father, whereas Joram a great-great grandfather.

21. How did Absalom rebel "after forty years" (2 Samuel 15:7) when his father's entire reign was only forty years?

Despite what the margin of your Bible may read, or what the 'best authorities' teach, the Bible declares that, "every word of God is pure" (Pro 30:5). If this was really a copyist error, (that it should perhaps read "four years" instead of "forty years"), then the believers would have *long ago* recognized the error, and would have changed it in the keeping of the word of God. However, all the various printings of the Bible preserved today all contain the alleged error: This means it is no error! This applies to all alleged errors that would have been fixed long ago in the majority text received and kept by the priesthood of believers (Compare 1 Peter 2:9a; Revelation 1:6 with Deuteronomy 17:18, 8; 21:5; 31:9).

The statement—"And it came to pass after forty years"—is most likely referring to a point in time *prior* to when David

began to reign as king in Hebron (2 Sam 2:11; 3:2-3). It is very probable that God is referring to the time when David was first anointed by Samuel to be king. This happened approximately thirteen years before David finally replaced Saul on the throne. This would mean David would have been about fifty-seven years old when Absalom rebelled, and would have still had thirteen years left in Jerusalem; and Absalom would have been in his late-twenties. This is very compatible to the story and events. The point is, one can prove that the critics *can't* prove that this is an absolute contradiction in the Bible.

22. Who was the father of Shelah, Cainan (Luke 3:35-36) or Arphaxad (Genesis 11:12)?

Arphaxad was Shelah's immediate father, whereas Shelah (Sala) was the son-in-law of Cainan, who was the son-in-law of Arphaxad.

The very same chapter of Luke presents this type of relationship by law as the Bible considers Jesus to be the son of Joseph *by law* while applying the pinpointing phrase—"as was supposed" (Luke 3:23). Likewise, Joseph is considered to be the son of Heli, when Joseph is actually the son-in-law of Heli—Heli being Mary's actual father. Hence, the early portion of Luke 3 provides a precedent for this present discrepancy.

In addition, there are other places in the Bible that further corroborate this case. For instance, Jair, who was of the tribe of Judah, is called "the son of Manasseh" (Nu 32:41). In reality, he was the son-in-law to Manasseh (1 Chr 2:21-23)

since Jair's grandfather "went in to the daughter of Machir," who was the immediate son of Manasseh (Nu 27:1).

Possible scenario:

- Suppose Arphaxad had a daughter when he was 25 years old. This is not far-fetched, as Genesis 11 reveals the earliest recorded age of 29 (11:24). In addition, all the recorded ages in Genesis 11 are only for sons. Therefore, the fathers listed in Genesis 11 could have had daughters at even an earlier age. Once more, suppose Arphaxad had a daughter when he was 25 years old.
- Then, suppose Arphaxad's daughter also had a daughter with Cainan when she was 20 years old. At this time Shelah (Sala), her brother, would be 10 years old (Gen 11:12).
- Next, suppose Shelah, at 30 years of age, had Heber with Cainan's 20 year old daughter (Gen 11:14).

As a result, this would make Shelah the son-in-law to Cainan, who would also be son-in-law to Arphaxad; and Shelah would still be the son of Arphaxad in accordance to Genesis 11:12. This type of intermarrying would not have been extraordinary during this period of history.

23. Were there fourteen (Matthew 1:17) or thirteen (Matthew 1:12-16) generations from the Babylonian exile until Christ?

There were fourteen just as the Bible declares. Matthew 1:17 reads, “and from David until the carrying away into Babylon...and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ.” Notice carefully that the verse does NOT say, “and from David until Jechonias; and from Jechonias unto Christ.” The time of the carrying away into Babylon actually involves two individuals, not just Jechonias. The Babylonian captivity began during Jechonias’ father, Jehoiakim (2 Chr 36:5-6). Josias is actually Jechonias’ (Jehoiachin’s) grandfather. (See Point 22) The time of the carrying away into Babylon includes BOTH Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin. As a result, when each division of fourteen years is divided into three sections, fourteen people are counted once each time.

1) Abraham	Solomon	Jechonias
2) Isaac	Roboam	Salathiel
3) Jacob	Abia	Zorobabel
4) Judas	Asa	Abiud
5) Pharez	Josaphat	Eliakim
6) Esrom	Joram	Azor
7) Aram	Ozias	Sadoc
8) Aminadab	Joatham	Achim
9) Naason	Achaz	Eliud
10) Salmon	Ezekias	Eleazar
11) Booz	Manasses	Matthan
12) Obed	Amon	Jacob
13) Jesse	Josias	Joseph
14) David	Jehoiakim	Christ

Someone may make a case that it wouldn't be fair to include Jehoiakim since there were many other names not included in the genealogy. However, God obviously did not intend to take everybody into consideration anyway when he divided the list into only fourteen generations. In addition, Matthew 1:11 specifically declares that this was a period “**about** the time they were carried away into Babylon.” Therefore, this time of “the carrying away into Babylon” (1:17) would naturally call for both Jechonias and Jehoiakim.

24. John the Baptist was (Matthew 11:14; 17:10-13) or was not Elijah to come (John 1:19-21)?

John the Baptist was John the Baptist, not Elijah. John plainly declared that he was not Elijah (John 1:19-21). However, the Bible reveals that John *did* come in the spirit and power of Elijah to do precisely what Elijah shall one day come to do (Luke 1:17). The Jews knew something of the prophecy of Elijah's coming as stated in Malachi 4:5-6. Jesus made a point by asserting that what they did to John the Baptist is precisely what they would have done to the renowned Elijah—kill him, and reject his preaching. Jesus declared that Elijah would come someday, but that another in his stead suffered of them. Accordingly, Jesus also said, “**And if ye will receive it**, this is Elias, which was for to come.” Why did Jesus say this? The violent (Herod, the scribes and Pharisees etc.) were taking the kingdom by force, not through faith in their Messiah. Just as Elijah shall come before that notable day of the Lord, John the Baptist likewise came to prepare the first coming of the Lord; and they abused him and rejected his preaching. Once more, Jesus was uncovering the fact that what they did to John is

precisely the way these wicked men would have mishandled Elijah, no matter how notable and famous Elijah was in these men's eyes. Moreover, this is the way men *will* mishandle Elijah when he comes to fulfill the prophecy of Malachi 4:5-6. In Revelation 11:7-10, Elijah and one other are killed and despised for their preaching of the truth.

25. Jesus rode into Jerusalem on one colt (Mark 11:7), or a colt and an ass (Matthew 21:7)?

Jesus rode into Jerusalem upon the colt as agreed upon in Mark, Luke, and John. The account in Matthew simply reveals that the colt came along with another, most likely its mother, while Jesus obviously could not have sat on both of them at the same time. May this point demonstrate the nature of the gospels inasmuch as one may record a small, peripheral detail that is not explicitly mentioned in another gospel, yet is implied. Critics must believe by faith that the exclusion of a particular detail is absolute proof of an error in the Bible. This is an example of a critic desperately picking at words to "find" fault with the word of God.

26. When Jesus met Jairus, his daughter 'had just died' (Matthew 9:18), or was 'at the point of death' (Mark 5:23)?

Both must be correct. Most likely, he made the statement in the book of Matthew after the one in Mark. This was probably his way of conveying the urgency of the matter, his yearning for Jesus to come heal his daughter who may have even died by the time he found Jesus. If you put the two together, Jairus may have stated for emphasis, "My little

daughter lieth at the point of death, [and] is even *now* dead.” Once more, may this point, and the previous one, demonstrate the nature of the gospels, as one may record a small, peripheral detail not explicitly mentioned in another gospel, but clearly implied. I wonder how many times the skeptic has re-told a particular story while including a slight variation without changing the truth of what happened. Why can’t God do the same? Critics cannot prove that the Bible is not its very own commentary. By faith, they must believe this to be an absolute error. I believe the Bible.

27. When Paul was on the road to Damascus he saw a light and heard a voice. Did those who were with him hear the voice (Acts 9:7), or did they not (Acts 22:9)?

The account in Acts 9 does not necessarily state that the voice they heard was the voice from heaven. It could have been Paul’s voice that they heard conversing with one whom they could not see, except for the light that shone round about. This would be enough to terrify anyone—including any supposed atheist.

28. When Paul saw the light and fell to the ground, did his traveling companions fall (Acts 26:14), or did they not fall (Acts 9:7) to the ground?

First, they immediately fell at the brightness that shone from heaven. It is quite possible when the Lord told Paul to stand upon his feet, that his traveling companions followed suit, and then stood speechless as Paul conversed with one whom they could not see.

29. Did the voice tell Paul what he was to do on the spot (Acts 26:16-18), or was he commanded to go to Damascus to be told what to do (Acts 9:7; 22:10)?

Acts 9 & 22 reveal that he was to go to Damascus to be told what to do. Nevertheless, Paul, in Chapter 26, is simply reiterating the events that took place without any concern for the precise time and place of events.

30. Did 24,000 Israelites die in the plague in ‘Shittim’ (Numbers 25:1, 9), or was it only 23,000 Israelites who died (1 Corinthians 10:8)?

The book of Numbers reveals the sum total that died, whereas the apostle Paul states the amount that died *in one single day*. The remaining 1,000 could have easily passed away the following day or at some point thereafter.

31. Did 70 members of the house of Jacob come to Egypt (Genesis 46:27), or was it 75 members (Acts 7:14)?

There are differences of opinion as to the answer of this question. I’ll simply present what I personally believe to be the answer in all honesty.

First, let’s begin with the 70 souls of Genesis 46:27. The previous verse declares that there were 66 souls “besides Jacob’s sons’ wives.” I believe the total number of 70 souls in 46:27 includes Joseph and 3 of the sons’ wives. I don’t believe this includes the two sons of Joseph since they were already “born” in Egypt, rather than coming “into” Egypt as their father and those “of the house of Jacob” did.

Second, 70 souls is also mentioned in Exodus 1:5. This is the actual amount of souls “that came out of the loins of Jacob.” This means the number does *not* include Jacob or the sons’ wives, but *does* include those who didn’t even enter into Egypt (Er and Onan died in Canaan). The total coincides with the figures of Genesis 46:15, 18, 22, and 25. When these numbers are tallied up, there are 70 souls “that came out of the loins of Jacob.” In this case, the two sons of Joseph would be included (Genesis 46:20).

Third, I personally believe that the 75 souls of Acts 7:14 is a simple mistake on behalf of Stephen. God is merely telling us what Stephen could have mistakenly declared during his sermon. This would not mean there is an error in the Bible. Both would remain to be the pure words of God in that one reveals the true number, while the other reveals what a person stated incorrectly. In this case, God would be lying if he told us that Stephen quoted the correct number. Again, I really believe this is a real mistake on Stephen’s part. This is no different than when the Bible elsewhere records the mistake that a person did or said—this doesn’t mean that God is at fault just for telling us what happened.

Moreover, I believe Stephen made a further mistake in the very next two verses (Acts 7:15-16) of his message. Stephen stated that Jacob was carried “over into Sychem, and laid in the sepulcher that Abraham bought for a sum of money of the sons of Emmor the father of Sychem.” This is partly true, as Jacob *was* carried over into Shechem in the said sepulcher. However, *Jacob* bought this parcel of ground—

not Abraham (See Genesis 33:19, Joshua 24:32). Abraham bought the field of Ephron of the sons of Heth (Genesis 23:17-20). It is very possible that Stephen confused the two incidents.

32. Did Saul reign for 40 years; and how could the time of the judges have been 450 years (Acts 13:20-21)?

There are differences of opinion here, so I'll simply present what I personally believe to be the answer to this question. I really believe Paul made some simple mistakes (just like Stephen probably did, as we covered in the previous point). These would not be errors on behalf of the Bible. God is merely re-telling the stories in second person while recording what Paul actually said in his discourse, and while having provided the real answers elsewhere in the Bible. This is much different than when Paul writes elsewhere, in first person, the truths of God in his epistles. In that case, the words of God in his writings are to be taken exactly for what is stated. Again, God is merely telling us here what a person really stated. This doesn't mean it was right. This would be no different than when the Old Testament re-tells an event along with what was said by the person(s) of the particular episode. It doesn't necessarily mean that what was stated or done was appropriate or right. It is up to the believer to search the scriptures to see what God's mindset is on the subject matter.

A. I believe a 40-year reign for Saul is highly unlikely. 1 Samuel 13:1 tells us that after two years, Saul rebelled, and God "sought him a man after his own heart" (13:14). At this time, most would agree that young David was

probably around the age of 17 or so. He took over the kingdom at the age of 30 (2 Sam 5:4). If this is true, the reign of Saul would have amounted to approximately 15 years or so—far from 40 years.

- B. I believe 450 years for the time of the judges is not possible when examining the Old Testament. First, this seems very far-fetched when looking at the genealogy in Ruth 4:20-22. Salmon, along with Rahab (Matthew 1:5), lived during the time of the wilderness wanderings. This is prior to the time of the Judges. Therefore, 450 years is an immense stretch of time to span from Boaz to Obed to Jesse, and then to a small part of David's life.

Second, when tallying the presumed number of years associated with the judges (from the book of Judges), 350 years seems much more feasible.

Othniel (3:10-11)	40	
Ehud and Shamgar (3:30-31)	80	
Deborah (5:31)	40	
Gideon (8:28)	40	
[Abimelech] (9:22)	3	
Tola (10:1)	(10)—not listed	actually
Jair (10:3)	(10)—not listed	actually
Jephthah (12:7)	6	
Ibzan (12:8-9)	7	
Elon (12:11)	10	
Abdon (12:13-14)	8	

Samson (16:31)	20	
Eli (1 Sam. 4:18)	40	
Samuel listed	(40)—not	actually
<hr/>		
		354 years

Perhaps the most persuasive point is found in 1 Kings 6:1. The verse reveals that Solomon began to build the temple “in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt.” The following list provides all the possible deductions to this amount.

The exodus to Solomon’s fourth year	480
Subtract Solomon’s first four years	476
Subtract 40 years of David’s reign	436
Subtract Saul’s approximate reign (15)	421
Subtract Joshua’s presumed reign (30)	391
Subtract time spent in the wilderness (40)	351
<hr/>	
The approximate years of the judges	350

33. Was David, being the youngest, the eighth son of Jesse (1 Samuel 16:10-11, 17:12) or the seventh (1 Chronicles 2:13-15)?

The book of Chronicles clearly reveals that David was the seventh of Jesse. Nevertheless, this doesn’t mean that Jesse could not have had another older son from a different wife, or one adopted, or perhaps even a grandson since the Bible often considers a grandchild as being a son.

34. Did Judas buy a field (Acts 1:18) with his blood-money for betraying Jesus, or did he throw it into the temple (Matthew 27:5)?

The book of Matthew states quite clearly that Judas threw the money in the temple. God declares that Judas purchased the field because it was with Judas' very own betrayal money. Another example of God's mindset in a similar matter can be found in Exodus 32:35. Even though it was Aaron that made the golden calf, in God's view of things it was also the people that made it since it was with their very own contributions. Thus, the verse reads, "And the LORD plagued the people, because **they** made the calf, which Aaron made." In one more example, since David ordered the battle, God told David that he himself killed Uriah even though it was actually the Ammonites (2 Samuel 12:9).

35. Did Judas die by hanging himself (Matthew 27:5) or by falling headlong and bursting open with all his bowels gushing out (Acts 1:18)?

The gospels clearly reveal that Judas hanged himself. The account in Acts does not say that Judas died from this falling headlong. Simply put, Judas died from his hanging, and someone else must have cast his body over a steep rising on the property. Again, the critics must believe by faith that both events did not actually take place. I believe the Bible and its own testimony that "every word of God is pure" (Pro 30:5).

36. Apart from Jesus there was no one else (John 3:13) or there were others (2 Kings 2:11) who ascended to heaven?

Elijah was taken up, whereas Jesus truly ascended in the true sense of the word. He arose, and entered heaven in his very own resurrection power! Elijah, indeed, did not ascend up to heaven, but was rather taken up. Yes, “no man hath ascended up to heaven,” save the Lord Jesus Christ.

37. Did Nebuzar-adan, captain of the guard, besiege Jerusalem on the seventh day of the fifth month (2 Kings 25:8) or on the tenth day of the fifth month (Jeremiah 52:12)?

Take careful notice of the specific wording of the Bible here. The account in Kings says that Nebuzar-adan came “unto” the city on “the seventh day,” whereas Jeremiah says he came “into” the city three days later on “the tenth day of the month.” At the end of the verse in Kings, there is a **colon** to stop the flow of thought before the actual day of entering into Jerusalem. At the end of the verse in Jeremiah, there is only a **comma** as there is merely a pause, because the entrance into the city immediately follows on the same day.

38. Was the chapter at the top of the pillar three cubits (2 Kings 25:17), or was it five cubits (Jeremiah 52:22)?

In the account in the book of Kings, there is a **semicolon** after the number of cubits. This creates a stop in the flow of thought that excludes the amount of cubits in the wreathen work and pomegranates upon the chapter. In Jeremiah,

there is only a **comma** after the number of cubits. This is merely a pause in the flow of thought, and the number of cubits here actually includes the network and pomegranates upon the chapter. Here, the verse reads that the height of the chapter is “with” the additional work upon the chapter, whereas the other account is the chapter’s height without the additional work.

39. Were there five men (2 Kings 25:19), or were there seven men (Jeremiah 52:25) in the king’s presence?

After reading carefully, the Bible concludes that there were, in total, seven men that were “near the king’s person,” whereas only five of these men were actually “in the king’s presence.”

40. Did Evil-merodach king of Babylon bring Jehoiachin out of prison on the 27th day of the month (2 Kings 25:27) or on the 25th day of the month (Jeremiah 52:31)?

The account in the book of Kings gives the selfsame day that Jehoiachin was brought out of prison, whereas the book of Jeremiah gives the day that the king of Babylon released him, but was not yet brought out of prison. In Jeremiah’s account, notice particularly the comma (,) and the conjunction (“and”) after the initial fact. The verse in Jeremiah simply gives the extra fact that he was eventually brought out of prison after the king lifted him up. Nevertheless, this did not take place until two days after the king of Babylon “lifted up the head of Jehoiachin.”

41. Did Israel spend 40 years in the wilderness (Numbers 14:33-34) or only 38 years (Deuteronomy 2:14)?

When you carefully analyze the word of God by conference of places, the conclusion is that one year and nine months elapsed from the exodus until the Israelites finally reached Kadesh-barnea (Ex 19:1; Deut 1:2, 2:14)—about two years. After the Israelites refused to go up into the land of Canaan, they spent an additional thirty-eight years in the wilderness to make it a total of forty years. Again, Deuteronomy 2:7 declares that it was a total of forty years, while 2:14 clearly reads, “And the space in which we came **from Kadesh-barnea, until we were come** over the brook Zered (just prior to entering Canaan), was thirty and eight years.” There is no contradiction.

42. Did the children of Israel spend 400 years in Egypt (Genesis 15:13) or 430 years (Exodus 12:40)?

Contrary to what is usually perceived or taught, the answer is neither of the above. However, let us learn the meaning of the above figures, and then we will find out how many years were actually spent in Egypt.

First, Galatians 3:17 states that the Law of Moses came 430 years after God made a covenant with Abraham. Remember, the Law was given the very same year that Israel left Egypt (Exodus 19:1). Therefore, the children of Israel could NOT have spent 430 years in Egypt. Isaac and Jacob (Israel) were not even born yet: neither the twelve sons of Jacob and their sons, to initially enter Egypt.

God told Abraham in Genesis 15:13, “Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs.” Abraham’s seed began first with his son Isaac; then, Isaac begat Jacob; and Jacob begat his twelve sons. Each one was “a stranger in a land that [was] not theirs.” This included the time spent in the land of Canaan prior to entering Egypt. God also stated in the same verse, “And they shall afflict them four hundred years.” Again, this affliction involved more than just Egypt. The very next verse is where Egypt is finally implied. God stated, “**And also** that nation (Egypt), whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance” (Gen 15:14). However, the four hundred years began with Isaac. From the birth of Isaac until the exodus was four hundred years.

The additional thirty years included in Galatians 3:17 and Exodus 12:40 are the years **prior** to Isaac’s birth. Abraham had Isaac when he was a hundred years old. This means he was seventy years old when the covenant was first made with Abraham. Thus, from the initial covenant until Isaac’s birth is 30 years, and from Isaac’s birth until the exodus are 400 years. (400 + 30 = 430 years) This total is what Exodus 12:40 is referring to. While the verse *does* mention the children of Israel as those “who dwelt in Egypt,” it does NOT say that they dwelt in Egypt for four hundred and thirty years. The “sojourning” is in reference to the entire timeline from the Abrahamic covenant all the way to the very day of the exodus. This 430th year was the culmination of the covenant that God made with Abraham—that his seed would possess the promised land. (And had the children of Israel believed and obeyed God, they would have entered Canaan that very year.) Accordingly, Israel was given the

Law of Moses the very same year of the exodus—three months later (Exodus 19:1): Hence, Galatians 3:17 stands correct.

Then how many years did the children of Israel really spend in Egypt? First, we know that from Isaac until the exodus is 400 years (Gen 15:13). Genesis 25:26 states that Isaac was 60 years old when his son Jacob was born. Genesis 47:9 states Jacob was 130 years old when he entered Egypt. (60 + 130 = 190) Thus, from Isaac's birth until the initial entrance into Egypt is 190 years. Subtract 190 from the total number of 400 years, and you get 210. The children of Israel spent approximately 210 years in the land of Egypt.

43. Matthew 21:19 says that the tree which Jesus cursed withered at once, whereas Mark 11:20 maintains that it withered overnight.

Accusations like this are the end result of the rashness and desperate hope within the unbeliever's heart to find something wrong with the Bible. The answer is clear when particular attention to the wording is given, rather than coming to conclusions with what is not actually stated. The passage in Mark does not say that it withered at once the next day. The tree was already withered. Matthew says quite clearly, "And **presently** the fig tree withered away." Nevertheless, it wasn't until the following morning that the disciples actually noticed that it had been dried up. The record in Matthew does not say the disciples immediately noticed that the fig tree withered away. It says, "And **when** the disciples saw it, they marvelled, saying, How soon is the fig tree withered away!" Only a day later was soon enough.

44. Did Peter deny Christ three times before the cock crowed (John 13:38), or three times before the cock crowed twice (Mark 14:30, 72)?

For those who believe “every word of God is pure” (Pro 30:5), one passage of Scripture automatically explains the other. God’s record of Jesus’ statement in the book of John is obviously in reference to the cock’s second crow as revealed in Mark. Why would God set himself up for a fall by placing four different accounts of the same event within the Bible, as this would multiply the chances of there being a contradiction? God can do so, because he knows he is right, and men are wrong. Again, it is not my responsibility as a believer of God’s word to ‘prove’ that this is not a contradiction. I have presented a reasonable answer using the Bible’s own rules of interpretation, not man’s. It is the critic’s responsibility to prove that this is absolutely a contradiction of the Bible.

May this discrepancy be an example for the many other alleged contradictions in the four Gospels. Not one of them can be *proven* to be mistakes, only *presented* as mistakes. The unstable soul then reads the critic’s interpretation into the Bible. Even if an alleged contradiction could be proven false, many would still reject the truth because of the hardness of their heart. The word of God is quick and powerful, and an apparent contradiction will not keep a person from the truth if God is drawing them (John 6:43-44).

45. Was the exact wording on the cross, as (Matthew 27:37, Mark 15:26, Luke 23:38, John 19:19) all seem to have different wordings?

When you place them together the exact wording is this: “THIS IS JESUS OF NAZERETH THE KING OF THE JEWS.” For those who believe “every word of God is pure” (Pro 30:5) each Gospel is obviously not giving the full wording of the cross.

46. Did Jesus appear to twelve disciples after his resurrection (1 Corinthians 15:5), or was it to eleven (Matthew 27:3-5; 28:16; Mark 16:14; Luke 24:9, 33; Acts 1:9-26)?

The answer is eleven since Judas had died. 1 Corinthians 15:5 doesn't say that Jesus was seen of twelve disciples after his resurrection. It states that he was seen “of the twelve.” This phrase is undoubtedly an expression, and in reference to those disciples present that were “of the twelve.” It simply tells us who was there.

47. Is God good to all (Psalm 145:9), or just a few (Jeremiah 13:14)?

The Bible states quite clearly that he good to all—this means he is good to all. The incriminator here is trying to put God's goodness on trial because of the horrible and graphic description of the destruction of the children of Israel. God did not intend for it to be pretty. The context of Jeremiah 13 reveals that the children of Israel, not only abused God's goodness and mercy, but became proud, evil,

and walked in the imagination of their own heart. God is most certainly good, but God is also just, and sin must be punished. The very same chapter also conveys the heart of God: “But if ye will not hear, my soul shall weep in secret places for your pride; and mine eye shall weep sore, and run down with tears, because the LORD’s flock is carried away captive.” Nevertheless, this does not change the harsh reality of the judgment of God upon sin. *Now* is the time to receive salvation and mercy from God, because the day will come when no tears will be shed and no remorse felt upon those that abide under the wrath of a holy God (Pro 1:22-33). Once more, the critic cannot discern between God’s goodness and God’s holiness, neither of which contradict the other.

48. Is God a God of war (Exodus 15:3) or a God of peace (Romans 15:33)?

First, there can be no peace without war. However, in answer to this alleged discrepancy, God is the God of both. God’s peace rests upon those who possess his eternal salvation. In answer to Exodus 15:3, God used his people, Israel, to judge the vile Canaanites for their depravity and utter wickedness. God had demonstrated his longsuffering for hundreds of years upon these Canaanites. About 450 years prior to this, God had told Abraham that his seed would not leave Egypt until the fourth generation. Why did God decide to wait so long? God said, “The iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full” (Gen 15:16). When their sin finally reached its full, God brought his people out of Egypt to destroy the Amorites and Canaanites because of their debauchedness. Had any one of these Amorites turned to

God for forgiveness and salvation, God would have demonstrated his goodness and mercy upon that individual, as he did for **the harlot Rahab** and her family during the destruction of Jericho, a city of Canaan. Again, the incriminator here is placing God on trial because of their own perverted view of God and justice, or their own sinful heart.

49. Can God be seen (Exodus 24:9-10; Genesis 26:2) or not be seen (John 1:18; 1 Timothy 6:16)?

It is the responsibility of the critic and the professed atheist to prove that there is an absolute contradiction here. For those who believe the Bible, these apparent contradictory verses automatically provide the obvious meaning and intent of what is stated. Those persons who saw God did not actually see the very image and glory of the Father. They could not, or they would have died. Even Moses was forbidden to see God's face. In Exodus 24:9-10, the people most likely saw a reflection of some sort "as it were a paved work of sapphire stone" under God's feet, and "as it were the body of heaven in his clearness." Jacob, when wrestling with the angel, witnessed an Old Testament appearance of Christ Jesus. When John states, "No man hath seen God at any time" (1:18), it is plainly manifested what is meant here. First, the book of John reveals the nature of Jesus, portraying him as God, even in the very same chapter (1:1, 14). If Jesus is God, then people surely saw God in the flesh. However, John is referring to the very person of God the Father (John 6:46). John further stated in 1:18 that, "The only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of **the Father**, he hath declared **him**." This declaring of the Father is what is

clearly meant by ‘seeing God’. The point of truth John is making is that not one person, except the Son of God, has ever declared the Father from the very standpoint that the Son has—coming straight from the very bosom of God. Hence the Lord’s statement: “Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father” (John 6:46).

50. Why are there two conflicting accounts of creation (Genesis 1 & 2)?

There aren’t. There are merely conflicting interpretations of these two chapters. Genesis 1 lays out the chronology of the creation, while Genesis 2 merely reiterates the aforesaid events within the purpose of the chapter. Simply put, the critics cannot prove that they are contradictory rather than rearranged to fit the context. For those who believe the Bible is pure, Genesis 1 automatically clarifies that Genesis 2 is merely a narration of the said creation according to the Author’s purpose. Let us analyze this purpose while answering the exact words of a professed atheist.

A. In Genesis 1:20 & 21, “every living creature” is brought forth from the waters, including every winged fowl.” But in 2:19, God brings forth “every beast of the field and every fowl of the air” from dry ground.

When critics and atheistic commentators write in this fashion, the unstable soul will read their statements into the passage. First, while Genesis 1:21 reads “every living creature,” the context also reveals that every one of these living creatures are those “which the waters brought forth.”

Hence, it is automatically understood that the land animals, apart from “every winged fowl,” are not accounted for yet.

Next, the critic quotes Genesis 2:19, and conveniently excludes a single comma. The comma puts a pause in the flow of thought so that the truth of events will be rightly discriminated. In Genesis 2:18-25, the entire context is dealing with finding Adam a help that is suitable and meet for him. Hence, God is not dealing with chronology of events inasmuch as he is dealing with finding Adam’s soul mate. Accordingly, in the event of making “him an help meet for him,” God brings the land animals and fowl of the air to Adam so that he would name them, and thereby see that none of them could fulfill his need for companionship. The comma rightly separates the events previously affirmed in Genesis 1. Genesis 2:19 does not actually say that God made every fowl of the air “out of the ground.” God is merely stating that, while he formed every beast of the field out of the ground, he also wanted to include the fowls so that Adam could name them altogether, even though they came from the waters.

B. In Genesis 1:2, earth comes into existence on the first day, completely underwater. Only by the 3rd day were the waters of the deep collected, and dry land formed. But in Genesis 2:4, 5, & 6, earth on the first day was dry land, unwatered.

In Genesis 2:4, the phrase “in **the day** that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens” is not in reference to a single day. First, Genesis 1 automatically clarifies this for those who believe the Bible. Second, “the day” in Genesis

2:4 contains no numeral as the single days of Genesis 1. In other words, 2:4 does not explicitly read that this is “the first day.” Therefore, it is clearly understood that “the day” mentioned here is not a single day of creation, but a period of time as “the day of the Lord” found elsewhere in the Bible. In summary, God is merely reiterating the creation to suit the purpose of the text. What is the context of Genesis 2:4-9? There was not yet “a man to till the ground,” so God himself made everything to grow.

C. Version one teaches man was created after all beasts. The second is clear: Adam was created before beasts. (Genesis 1:25, 27 versus 2:7, 19)

Once more, the entire context of Genesis 2:18-25 deals with finding Adam a help that is suitable and meet for him. Hence, God is not dealing with chronology of events inasmuch as he is dealing with finding Adam’s soul mate. Accordingly, in the event of making “him an help meet for him,” God brings the land animals and fowl of the air to Adam so that he would name them, and also see that none of them was meant to fulfill his need for companionship. Genesis 2:19 reads, “**And** out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them.” Contrary to the rules of contemporary English grammar, the word “And,” in the Bible does not always necessitate a chronological course of events. This can be easily seen throughout the Bible: for instance, the Gospels and portions of the Revelation. Therefore, the Bible contains its very own rules of grammar and interpretation. God is

merely telling the events to fit the context of this portion of Chapter 2—finding Adam “an help meet for him” (2:18).

51. If the Bible is true, why does it contain the long discredited description of the heavens as a “firmament” when this is a fundamental contradiction of the known realities of astronomy today? Why are Biblical stars, sun, and moon all embedded “in” this firmament (Genesis 1:14-17)?

Contrary to what modern dictionaries declare to be fact regarding the meaning of the word “firmament” during Biblical times, the Bible clearly defines the word as a place for fowls to fly—“the open firmament of heaven,” (Gen 1:20) or “the air” (Gen 1:28); not a solid body. The firmament is the first heaven (the sky). The heavenly bodies (sun, moon, and stars) are actually in “the heavens,” plural, which lie beyond the first heaven. When God said, “Let there be lights **in** the firmament,” and, “God set them **in** the firmament,” this is merely a figure of speech. We still use these idioms and expressions today—“Look at the stars **in** the sky,” or, “Look at the moon **in** the sky.” While the sun, moon, and stars are not literally in the sky itself, it is clearly understood what is meant, for it is through the sky, the firmament, that the heavens are viewed. This is why the psalmist wrote, “The heavens declare the glory of God” (Psalm 19:1). Why the heavens (plural)? Because “**thy heavens** [are] the work of thy fingers, **the moon and the stars**, which thou hast ordained” (Psalm 8:3). And it is through the firmament that these heavens are viewed, insomuch that “the firmament sheweth his handywork” (Psalm 19:1).

In summary, the critic and supposed atheist must believe by faith that this is an absolute contradiction, and that there are no idioms and figures of speech in the Bible. The Bible contains its own rules of interpretation, and the Spirit of God is quite capable of discerning for the believer what is outright fact and what is merely an expression (John 14:26; 1 John 2:27). For instance, God told the Israelites, “I bare you on eagles’ wings, and brought you unto myself” (Exodus 19:4). Jesus declared, “I am the door of the sheep” (John 10:7) Job said, “I am escaped with the skin of my teeth” (Job 19:20, an expression still used today. Jesus stated that the believer would have in them “a well of water springing up into everlasting life” (John 4:14). Jesus further stated, “Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life” (John 6:54). Hosea commands us to “break up your fallow ground...till he come and rain righteousness upon you” (Hosea 10:12). Simply put, there are idioms in the Bible, and we are to rely upon God’s own rules of interpretation, not man’s.

52. Why are we told that there are waters below the firmament, and told waters are “above” it, too (Genesis 1:7)?

While these waters are no longer above the firmament, this does not change the fact that there were at one time waters above the firmament. God collapsed this canopy of water during the great Flood that destroyed the entire world (Gen 7:11). In addition, the Bible makes a pointed statement in regards to those that scoff at the idea of a worldwide flood. 2 Peter 3:5-6 reads, “For this **they willingly are ignorant of**, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the

earth standing out of the water and in the water: whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished.”

53. In Genesis 9:3, “Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat” for Noah, whereas Deuteronomy 14:7-21 gives a list of things not to be eaten.

Both of the above passages are dealing with entirely different periods of time. This reveals the importance of understanding Scripture with Scripture. While everything was permitted for Noah, God eventually placed restrictions upon what he considered to be unclean on behalf of his covenant with his chosen people, Israel. In addition, Christ eventually nailed this ordinance to the cross; therefore, we are presently permitted to eat “every creature of God” in this present church age “if it be received with thanksgiving” (Col 2:14-17; 1 Tim 4:3-5).

54. Why is circumcision required (Genesis 17:10, and useless (Galatians 5:2)?

Both of the above passages are dealing with entirely different periods of time. Circumcision was required for Abraham and his seed as a physical token of the covenant made between God and his chosen people. It was meant to be symbolic of the righteousness of faith within the heart of the believer (Deu 10:16; 30:6, 14). Later on, many of the Jews were still relying upon the rituals and rites of the Old Testament law for their spiritual salvation, even though Christ nailed this ordinance to the cross (Col 2:14). The apostle Paul declared the truth, that when a person is trying

to keep the law in the area of circumcision, they are also obligated to keep the whole law, and thereby remain under the curse of the law (Gal 3:10). In this case, Christ would profit them absolutely nothing, for salvation is entirely by grace, without works, through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Once more, this is clearly a misunderstanding of scripture on behalf of the unlearned and unregenerate critic.

55. Abraham had two sons, Ishmael and Isaac (Genesis 16:15 & 21:3), yet Isaac was Abraham's "only" son (Genesis 22:2, 12 & Hebrews 11:17)?

Isaac was the chosen seed, not Ishmael. Isaac was the child by promise, whereas Ishmael was the child of the flesh (Gal 4:21-31). For this cause, it was *God himself* who decided to call Isaac the "only son," forasmuch as Isaac was the chosen seed according to God's personal covenant made with Abraham. Hebrews 11:17 calls Isaac Abraham's "only **begotten** son." The very next verse reveals why: because "in Isaac shall thy seed be called" (11:18). The lineage of Christ and God's chosen people would come from the very loins of Isaac, not through any other son of Abraham. Likewise, while God has many sons, it is through "the only begotten Son," Jesus, that we are saved (John 1:18). Isaac is a type of the Saviour in that Isaac was the only son of Abraham born with enough credentials to be called of God according to the promise. While believers "become the sons of God" (John 1:12), we as natural born sinners must go through the only begotten Son for this birth into the family of God. Again, the wording is demonstrating the spiritual application behind the story.

The believer is completely aware of what God said; and it becomes apparent what God meant. For those who disbelieve the Bible, they must believe by faith that God did not really say this to convey an essential point. The difference is simply in where a person has placed their faith. I believe the Bible.

56. Why was death granted to those who curse their parents (Leviticus 20:9), yet we are enjoined to hate our mother and father in order to become Jesus' disciples (Luke 14:26)?

For those that believe the Bible, it becomes apparent what Luke 14:26 does NOT teach. It is extremely important to define Biblical words using the Bible, not contemporary English and semantics. The word "hate" has different variations in the Bible, and the right one is to be understood within the context. This is no different than the Bible word "wine" and "strong drink." A cursory study will reveal that there are two entirely different kinds of wine and strong drink in the Bible—one is non-alcoholic and permitted (Deu 14:26), whereas the other is alcoholic and forbidden (Pro 20:1). Likewise, there are different kinds of hate in the Bible. A perfect representation of the hate implied in Luke 14:26 can be found in Genesis 29:30-31. Here, Jacob married two wives, Leah and Rachel. The Bible says that Jacob "**loved...Rachel more than Leah.**" The very next verse reads how the Lord saw "that Leah was **hated.**" Why was she hated? Jacob loved Rachel **more** than Leah. Similarly, to become Christ's disciple, we must love him first and foremost above our own family. Obviously this does not mean we aren't to love our family, which would be

contrary to the revealed will of God in other portions of scripture. Once more, it is extremely vital that Bible words are defined according to the Bible, not semantics and modern usage.

57. If there is a resurrection, why does Job declare that “he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more” (Job 7:9)?

There is clearly a resurrection of the just and the unjust according to the Bible (Revelation 20:5-6), and those that believe otherwise are called a “fool” in 1 Corinthians 15:35-36. Job’s statement is clearly a figure of speech from an earthly perspective of time. Job wholeheartedly believed in a physical resurrection (Job 19:25-26)! Job was trying to convey the earthly view of death, as life is “a vapor, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away” (James 4:14). Within the context of Job’s statement, he similarly declared, “My days are **swifter** than a weaver’s shuttle”; “O remember that my life is **wind**,” and “as the cloud is consumed and **vanisheth away**: so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more.” In other words, every thing that pertains to this life is over at death. Nevertheless, this doesn’t negate those things that pertain to the next life in the resurrection of both the just and the unjust.

58. Do children suffer for the sins of their parents (Exodus 20:5), or just their own (Ezekiel 18:20)?

Both are entirely true depending upon the circumstance and condition of the children. While Exodus 20:5 is a promise of God’s judgment upon sin, the judgment is furthermore upon “them that hate him” (20:5). Any person that loves God,

having turned to him for salvation and forgiveness of sin, evades the holy wrath of God regardless of the generation. This is precisely what the prophet Ezekiel is told of God. Those that turn to God would escape the coming judgment of Babylon. Those that refused to turn from their wickedness, that soul would die whether saved or lost. Once more, if any of the children of Israel turned to God, the Lord would have saved them from death and the Babylonian destruction, regardless of the sins that their fathers committed. The same rule applied to those fathers whose children were living in sin. If any would refuse to turn from their wicked ways, that soul would die while concurrently receiving the promise of Exodus 20:5 if they were not saved.

59. Are we not to judge (Matthew 7:1), or are we suppose to judge (1 Corinthians 6:2-4)?

Matthew 7:1 is in reference to the type of judging that is hypocritical and concerned more about another's flaws rather than our own. Howbeit, the type of judging in 1 Corinthians 6:2-4 is in relation to civil cases that are to be resolved amongst the brethren, and not before the unbelievers. The critic here is clearly carping and picking at words without any understanding of the spirit and intent of the Bible.

60. According to Luke, Christ ascended in the flesh, yet the apostle clearly states that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven" (Luke 24:39-51 & 1 Corinthians 15:50).

First of all, when Christ physically ascended up to heaven, he did so with a bloodless body since he had previously shed his blood on the cross. Christ's sinless flesh also contained no corruption, and was already the incorruption mentioned in 1 Corinthians 15:50. Thus, the context is dealing primarily with sinful men. Nevertheless, the life of our resurrected bodies will also consist of our own spirit, and no blood, just like Jesus. The believer's body will be changed into incorruption in the form of a new body, and eventually will be glorified just as the spirit body of Christ (Dan 12:3 & 1 Corinthians 15:41-42, 49).

61. Does God tempt (Genesis 22:1), or not tempt (James 1:13)?

Both are two entirely different forms of temptation. The critic is desperately picking at Bible words here. The tempting of the book of James is clearly the enticement of our sinful flesh, whereas the tempting of Genesis 22 is merely the trying of Abraham's faith. The critic is forced to believe by faith that there cannot be different usages of a particular Bible word. Again, the Bible has its own rules of interpretation and grammar.

62. Is it right to have one's sister (Genesis 20:11-12; 17:15-16), or is it wrong (Leviticus 20:17; Deuteronomy 27:22)?

Here, the critic takes the rules and dispensation of one period of time, and misapplies them to condemn another to put God and his Bible on trial. Simply put, there was obviously a time when intermarrying was not only

permitted, but was the only way of reproducing. Nevertheless, at some point in time God prohibited the practice, and clearly stipulated to his people what was henceforth to be the pure and proper behavior. The Law of Moses, which deems this as wickedness, came 430 years after the covenant was first made with Abraham (Gal 3:17), who married his half-sister.

63. Are all things possible with God (Matthew 19:26), or not (Judges 1:19)?

The Bible clearly says that all things are possible with God. This means all things are possible with God. God was with Judah as stated in Judges 1:19; therefore, Judah had no acceptable reason why he could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, especially when God commanded him to do so. Obviously, the problem rested upon Judah, not God. The book of Judges further points out the problem in the people of Israel. God clearly stated: “And ye shall make no league with the inhabitants of this land; ye shall throw down their altars: but ye have not obeyed my voice: **why have ye not done this? Wherefore I also said, I will not drive them out from before you;** but they shall be as thorns in your sides, and their gods shall be a snare unto you” (2:2-3).

64. Should we or should we not keep the Sabbath day (Exodus 20:8 & Romans 14:5)?

The Sabbath was a specific token between God and the children of Israel (Exodus 31:13, 16-17). We are no longer obligated to keep the Sabbath inasmuch as the Lord nailed this ordinance to the cross (Col 2:14-17). This is another

example of the lack of knowledge and understanding of Scripture on behalf of the critic.

65. Is God against human sacrifice (Leviticus 18:21), or is he for it (Judges 11:30-31; Genesis 22)?

God is absolutely against it, and considers it murder (Genesis 9:6; Numbers 25:33). First, God stopped Abraham from sacrificing his own son. Notwithstanding, the story cannot be misconstrued to impute sin unto God, as it is *his* book and *his* rules. Therefore, God can do and say as he pleases without committing sin or conflict. God gave *Abraham* a specific command to try his faith, and God has given *us* one also.

The sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter was clearly contrary to the will of God. Jephthah was at fault, whereas "every man did that which was right in his own eyes" in those days of no king (Judges 17:6, 21:25). Jephthah was not the only judge of Israel that committed wrong—so did Samson and Gideon. All three men are mentioned in Hebrews 11 as a testimony of God's grace. God uses sinners to bring about his will despite their shortcomings and mistakes. He used Jephthah's faith in a great way to deliver the people of Israel.

Furthermore, just because the Bible records an event does not mean that God necessarily condones the matter. Such is the case of Abraham and Hagar, Judah and Tamar, David and Bath-sheba, Noah and drinking, Solomon and the multitude of wives etc. God is simply giving you his word that this is what really happened. It is the believer's responsibility to utilize the mind of Christ by "comparing

spiritual things with spiritual” to see what God’s mind is in a particular matter. The unbeliever does not possess the mind of Christ; and consequently, he or she cannot rightly discern Scripture (1 Corinthians 2:13-14).

Moreover, Leviticus 27:28-29 does not permit the sacrifice of people as is wrongly asserted by a few. The context of this passage also involves the “beast,” “the field,” and “all that he hath.” We wouldn’t conceive putting something “of the field” or “all that he hath” to death. The literal putting to death is in reference to the “beast.” Otherwise, this is a figure of speech for those things devoted, as they cannot be retracted. The story about the boy, Samuel, is a perfect example of one devoted unto the Lord. Samuel was not put to death, but remained wholly consecrated in the service of the tabernacle notwithstanding the fact that he wasn’t even a Levite. God heard Hannah’s vow and took her at her word, and she followed through in her devotion.

66. Did Michal, the daughter of Saul, have children (2 Samuel 6:23), or no (2 Samuel 21:8)?

Michal had no children of her own as clearly stated in 2 Samuel 6:23, but helped raise five sons for another. These were as adopted sons, and most likely the result of not being able to have her own.

67. Does every man sin (Ecclesiastes 7:20), or no (1 John 3:9)?

The Bible is very clear that all of us sin. In fact, the very same epistle of John that contains the misunderstanding

clearly states, “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us” (1:8). The third chapter of John is clearly referring to a believer’s new nature in Christ Jesus. God cannot sin: As a result, anything that is come from God cannot sin either. Jesus came from God, and cannot sin. When a person trusts in Jesus, they are made a new creature **in** Christ, and are placed **in** Christ. As a result, the new and real nature of the believer comes from God, and cannot sin. This is precisely why a believer is eternally secure. Your new nature couldn’t sin if it wanted to. This is why the apostle stated, “Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me” (Romans 7:17). Now, the reality is, we still have to dwell in this sinful flesh for the time being. This is why Paul further stated, “For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing” (Romans 7:18). However, the new creature of Paul and the believer is not in the flesh, he is in Christ. “Therefore, if any man be **in Christ**, he is a **new creature**: old things are passed away; behold, all things become new” (2 Corinthians 5:17). John also stated that “in him (Jesus) is no sin” (3:5). And since the believer “abideth in him” (3:6), he too cannot sin. Simply put, the new creature does not, and cannot, commit sin because he is born of God who likewise, does not, and cannot, commit sin. When the believer gives in to their own flesh, the sin is really in their flesh, not in Christ where the believer spiritually resides. For this cause, God chastens his own children when they are not living up to what they truly are in Christ Jesus—a pure and perfect child of God.

68. Should we, or should we not, do good deeds before others (Matthew 5:16 & Matthew 6:1)?

Neither of these verses is contradictory to the other. The difference is contingent upon the motives within the person's heart. Matthew 5:16 tells us that our behavior and conduct should bring glory to God. The context of Matthew 6 then deals with the issue of doing things highly esteemed by man only for selfish gain and glory, not for the glory of God as stated in Matthew 5:16. Simply put, Christians are commanded to conduct themselves in such a way that brings honor and glory to the name of Christ; not so everybody can see what a "great" Christian they are, but what a great God he is.

69. The bat is not a bird (Leviticus 11:13-19).

This is an example of the critic taking Bible words and ascribing a contemporary meaning to a particular word. In many cases, the critic redefines a Bible word according to the supposed Hebrew meaning, thereby remolding the word as clay in the potter's hands. The word "bird," according to the infallible Bible (not the fallible lexicon) is synonymous with the word "fowl". Both include the bat since the bat possesses wings, and flies.

70. The rabbit does not chew the cud, nor do they have a hoof (Leviticus 11:6).

Rabbits do re-eat a particular part of their own waste that has been partly digested, a process known as "refection". The critic may quibble over the supposed Hebrew meanings of Bible words, but this does not disprove the Bible's definition of the word "cud." Many will undoubtedly believe a corrupt lexicon over the infallible Bible, but they must

believe by faith that their Hebrew/Greek Dictionary is absolutely right. I believe that “every word of God is pure” (Pro 30:5).

In addition, the verse does not state that a rabbit has a hoof. It is simply asserting the pertinent fact that it is an unclean animal since it does not divide the hoof, obviously because it does not have one to divide.