

The King James Bible: it's all Greek to Bryan Ross

An exposition of the Greek game of Bryan Ross

Ryan Michael Jones

July 1, 2014

The Greek game..

*"Simply stated, the debate rests upon how one interprets three English words "if so be" and their corresponding **Greek** word" -Bryan Ross¹*

*"Considering the definitions of the English words "indeed" and "since" will help establish the intended meaning behind the **Greek** word" -Bryan Ross²*

*"Once again an investigation into the underlying **Greek** words does not confirm the two inheritance reading of the passage" -Bryan Ross³*

*"All **Greek** arguments aside" -Bryan Ross⁴*

If by this statement made on page 10 of his 2014 paper: *Its, Ands, and Buts: The Two Inheritance Controversy of Romans 8:17*, we are to be informed that Bryan is able to put his self-admitted "Greek arguments" aside (as he well should), then why even make them in the first place? Let's not take a step backward, thereby undermining and devaluing the work Richard Jordan did to champion the worthy cause of defending the authority and sufficiency of the King James Bible. Instead, let us leave the unprofitable and erroneous Greek arguments to the ranks of apostate denominations who welcome such beguiling discussions!

Recently Bryan put out a public statement, presumably in response to criticism of his use of Greek to alter the natural contextual flow and ultimately the meaning of certain verses in God's word for English speakers today, namely the King James Bible:

"A new unsettling trend is emerging within some Grace Circles. It seems that when there is a disagreement over doctrinal issues an easy way to disparage someone's teaching in the minds of others is to question their commitment to the King James Bible. I have seen this happen to others and experienced it myself at least 3 different times in the past 5 years. It behooves all saints to check out such claims for themselves before they accept such accusations as true. Sometimes people do try to get around doctrinal implications they don't like by seeking to alter the King James Bible. Other times people use such charges as rhetoric in an attempt to bolster their own position or tear-down/denigrate someone who does not agree with their doctrine" -Bryan Ross 5/22/2014

He then goes on to say in a subsequent comment:

"Another thing that I hesitate to bring up is the use of the Greek. Even Brother Jordan says in GSB that Bible students should use all the tools at their disposal to UNDERSTAND not CHANGE the KJB. The KJB translators were bound to the text they had in front of them the TR.

¹ pg 5 of "Its, Ands, and Buts: The Two Inheritance Controversy of Romans 8:17"

² pg 9 of "Its, Ands, and Buts: The Two Inheritance Controversy of Romans 8:17"

³ pg 11 of "Its, Ands, and Buts: The Two Inheritance Controversy of Romans 8:17"

⁴ pg 10 of "Its, Ands, and Buts: The Two Inheritance Controversy of Romans 8:17"

They did not just make stuff up or dream things up out of nothing. I get uneasy when believers don't have a balanced approach to these things. The KJB is God's Word for English speaking people because it is a proper translation of the proper text" -Bryan Ross 5/22/2014

With all hesitation aside, Bryan seeks to equate any criticism of his King James undermining Greek game to nothing more than an unrelated ad hominem complaint, as if in reality Bryan's use of Greek manipulation is not intimately related to his doctrinal errors. It is in all actuality, conclusively relevant to call into question Bryan's commitment to the King James Bible when discussing his application of the Greek tactics he repeatedly uses to forge his doctrinal arguments. With this in mind let's put Bryan up to his own test: does he use these Greek "tools" to understand the natural meaning in English or does he indeed seek to change and subvert the meaning and thus flout the authority of the King James Bible? It does behoove the reader to check out for themselves Bryan's use of extra-Biblical "tools" and thereby determine whether or not he is indeed seeking to alter what is described in English in the King James Bible. The following information is submitted to serve that endeavor...

"To understand your Bible you don't have to know anything about Greek or Hebrew. Anybody tells you, you need to understand Greek, or Hebrew to understand the Bible, what you need to do is turn off the T.V., close up the book, get out of the building, 'go fishin'. When you do, put your hand on your billfold real heavy, lock your purse up, 'cause they're after something other than helping you understand God's word" -Richard Jordan (from the Message of Grace program: "Equipping you for Life")⁵

Sadly, Bryan Ross recently spoke at a conference (tragically hosted by Richard Jordan) and put out a paper attacking the truth of the heirs vs. joint-heirs issue as described in the Northern California Grace Fellowship document: "Heirs of God or Joint-heirs with Christ?". In light of this, this present document serves to expose a particular device which has permeated Bryan's impetuous assailment against the truth of the vital doctrinal differences between heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ (Romans 8:17) as affirmed in the original NCGF paper...

Bryan's conference message and paper were riddled with illogical arguments. Some of the most concerning of arguments were comprised of (but not limited to) several implementations of "the Greek game" (a favorite of denominational enemies of the KJB). In the past, Bryan disclosed in his grace history project that he has never taken a Greek class in his life, and yet he trust's his own unlearned and at best novice ability to understand an ancient form of Greek over the King James Bible itself. What's more, he then attempts to pass along his neophyte findings to others under the guise of teaching. He also inherently trusts modern Greek concordance definitions (and whatever other extra-biblical materials he gleans from) over the KJB and its translator's abilities. Whether a rank amateur or a high Greek scholar, this is a common practice of the denominational enemies of the KJB and a practice that was vehemently condemned and warned against in the manuscript evidence section of Richard Jordan's Grace School of the Bible, which Bryan is a graduate of. Grace School of the Bible has a principle standard concerning these Greek matters encroaching upon the sufficiency of the King James Bible. Until recently, everyone has seemingly been willing to agree to that established protocol and stick to it except for Bryan Ross. It's

⁵ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E19_W1btGsc

so sad to see when professed endorsers of the KJB use such an evil and flimsy tactic to try and redefine the word of God to suit an agenda, ignoring all context.

"The differences in punctuation between editions of the KJV makes an argument based upon punctuation less clear than an argument based on the clear cross references" -Bryan Ross⁶

By "cross references" Bryan doesn't mean comparing a particular verse to another verse (in **English**) that discusses the same concept (a form of proper Bible study), by "cross references" he means the employment of his beloved "study" tool of choice: the Greek game of the denominational KJB authority deniers (i.e. bad Bible study).

The fundamental problem with Bryan's habitual use of this bad Bible study technique is that it demonstrates a lack of confidence in the ability of the King James translators to accurately represent the meaning of a given word via their standard operational protocol for translation. Recently someone attending one of Bryan's Grace History Project lessons offered Bryan this insight:

"If you're gonna take a Greek tool, what you're basically gonna do is you're gonna take Strong's interpretation of a Greek word over the (King James) translators. You still have to pick who you're gonna trust. Now you can go to Strong's concordance and try to get a better understanding of what that word means, but I think it's better to go to an English dictionary and see what that word means, then maybe go to the Greek later but you're gonna have to pick who you're gonna trust. Are you gonna trust the King James translators or are you gonna trust the Strong's or Vincent's or Wuest's or whoever the other Greek dictionary comes from, you're gonna have to pick who you're gonna trust, basically".

In response to this very valid point Bryan was suspiciously silent, completely avoiding the claim and awkwardly shifted his attention to a different attendee. That attendee went on to inadvertently sum up Bryan's Greek game with this salient point:

"The other thing that some people noted is when authors or teachers are going to the Greek and correcting the English text, it's because the English text didn't fit the theory they were trying to postulate, which seems like a slippery slope".

In response Bryan said the following:

"And that's what Richard (Jordan) says... that every time he heard one of these men saying a better reading; they made a mistake here; it should be this; that he went and looked at, and the mistake is not in how the word was rendered, the mistake is that they don't like how it matched/jibed with their theology" -Bryan Ross⁷

It is duplicitous that Bryan would make such an observation and yet put out a paper calling into question the validity of a purported pinnacle Pauline doctrine, a paper in which he is so desperately guilty of employing these rightfully criticized Greek techniques!

⁶ pg 36 of "Ifs, Ands, and Buts: The Two Inheritance Controversy of Romans 8:17"

⁷ Grace History Project lesson 137.

Bryan does all this in a bit more circuitous fashion than the typical denominational Greek gamers. He gives a definition from a concordance of the Greek word correspondent to a KJB English word, then he uses an English dictionary to define the new English word (the one he's specifically selected from multiple options) pulled from the Greek definition of the KJB English word. So, he isn't willing to finish it off by saying this KJB word should actually be rendered via this new word etc, but he might as well. I say this because what he's doing is: by filtering the KJB word through a number of sources he then now has created multiple variables to (by using this slight of hand) sculpt the KJB word to now show you what is the "actual intended meaning" of the word. The point is: he's really correcting the English text, because the English text didn't fit the theory he was trying to postulate. He can't serve his agenda by just letting the context of the KJB alone define a given word. He's asking you not to trust the sufficiency and authority of the KJB alone. He's essentially saying that you need the KJB, plus a Greek concordance, plus an English dictionary, plus Bryan himself (with his agenda) to sculpt, mold, and shape all these additional variables to produce the "proper" meaning of the word. This ill-concocted maze does not produce the meaning God intends, it produces the desired meaning of whoever (Bryan in this case) is trying to lead you down that maze, much to the detriment and ruin of the accuracy of your understanding.

Another one of Bryan's favorite ways to use the Greek game (and sadly a common study and preaching technique of his) is to undermine the King James translators method and protocol for translation by using a Greek concordance to look up a given Greek word to find where else in the Bible it is found, and which English words were used to render it throughout the text. Bryan then proceeds to use all the English renderings of a given word interchangeably anytime the Greek word is used (at least whenever it suits his agenda). The obverse is also done, if Bryan finds out (from a Greek concordance) that the same English word is produced via the rendering of different Greek words among the verses, he says they can't have the same meaning, even though they're rendered as the same English word (evidently the concept of synonyms has escaped him). What that fundamentally means is that Bryan trusts the Greek over the English (even though he only speaks English). However, keep in mind that he only does all this when it suits his agenda because if he consistently and rigidly applied this method, he and his custom made Bible would be in a whole mess of trouble.

This is all a very slippery slope indeed. If one were to consistently apply this game of musical chairs to every English rendering of a Greek word in the KJB, a nearly infinite potentiality of Bibles could be created, including a specially crafted Bible to suit the needs of a given agenda. That's the severe danger behind how Bryan the Greek enthusiast handles the word of God and why it must never be done. The translators stuck to a protocol, they put the right word in the verse to serve the CONTEXT. It's never acceptable for Bryan or anyone else to rearrange the words in the Bible.

I for one pick the KJB to trust, if you don't have a standard you have nothing to stand on. Adherence to such, is a basic fundamental practice for rightly dividing students of the King James Bible. It is absurd that Bryan is attempting to base doctrinal arguments on such a poor and detrimentally regressive methodology. First and foremost, you do not need to know, study, or reference Greek to understand the King James Bible. The King James alone is fully sufficient in all authority. If Greek concordances or "tools" are to be used at all, it is only to complement (not to clarify) what the contextual meaning of the verses first reveal. For example, to point out that the Greek word rendered as "rightly dividing" in 2 Timothy 2:15 (*orthotomeō*) shares a common root with the English word orthodontist in order to illustrate the aspect of straightness (like how an orthodontist straightens teeth), is an example of simply

presenting an interesting bit of information about the mechanics of language. This may also serve as a conceptual mnemonic. This is a completely different use than declaring that the unique mechanics of the Geek language's verb tense and grammar (subjunctive/indicative moods etc.) must be understood in order to comprehend the ENGLISH of the King James Bible as Bryan is so often prone to do. A Greek "tool" is not a starting point in the way Bryan routinely uses it and it is most certainly never to be used as the focal point of argumentation concerning a doctrine as Bryan is so brashly endeavoring to do.

Bryan undermines the valuable and commendable work that Richard Jordan did in the late 1980's, standing up for the authority of the King James Bible amidst heavy resistance from C.R. Stam and other dispensational pioneers. Bryan's improper Bible handling techniques consist of elevating the definitions of concordances and dictionaries above the King James Bible's natural ability to define its own terms. In addition and arguably most grievous of all, (at the aforementioned conference and in his paper: *Its, Ands, and Buts: The Two Inheritance Controversy of Romans 8:17*) Bryan also goes on to advocate and utilize the "pick and choose which Bible to use depending on the verse" tactic. Denominational enemies of the KJB use this all the time. Unlike them however, Bryan uses Textus Receptus Bibles (as opposed to Alexandrian versions) as a furtive excuse to further his argument to suit his corrupted agenda rather than to exalt the truth.

The build your own Bible game...

At this point it bears repeating: If you don't have a standard, you have nothing to stand on.

The Greek game is akin to the "other versions render it as" game also often used by enemies of the authority and sufficiency of the King James Bible. This is because both tactics seek to undermine the value of the King James Bible's ability to convey the intended message as a stand-alone resource. Bryan's grasp of proper protocol concerning "study tools" has gone so awry that he operates just like the enemies of the KJB do! As previously stated, Bryan (tragically) also attempts a brand of this kind of multi-version argumentation but using various Textus Receptus Bibles in favor of modern versions. Despite this subtle operational variation, the end result is the same: to pick and chose a different Bible depending on the verse in order to make a Frankenstein Bible to suit a nefarious agenda (ultimately the same thing he's trying to do by choosing which concordance definition of a particular Greek word is "better" when he plays his beloved Greek game). Bryan touts the merits of the superiority of the Geneva over the KJB for one verse, yet Bryan prefers to endorse the inferred more accurate rendering of the Bishop's Bible when it comes to another verse.

These sort of tactics have been vehemently condemned by the likes of Richard Jordan, Rick Jordan Jr., and John Verstegen (to name a few). This makes one wonder how they could in good conscience ever support Bryan's specific position against the joint-heir issue when it is chiefly built upon these shifty red hearing ploys traditionally used by the enemies of KJB authority!

"These early English translations of the TR are very illuminating in terms of helping one understand the concept of joint-heirship" -Bryan Ross⁸

Bryan is saying that you need "help" to understand the KJB and these other versions are gonna provide that! I guess for Bryan's agenda the King James alone just isn't good enough on its own.

⁸ pg 38 of "Its, Ands, and Buts: The Two Inheritance Controversy of Romans 8:17"

Sadly, Bryan's playing the build your own Frankenstein Bible game that Richard Jordan and John Verstegen vehemently condemn six ways to Sunday (and using TR Bibles doesn't make it alright)! If Jordan and Verstegen and the like have no problem with this nasty practice of Bryan's, how can they ever again complain about denominational pastors doing this with modern Bibles? In other words: if Jordan continues to support and endorse Bryan, consistency demands that he needs to either set Bryan straight or jump on the KJB sufficiency bashing bandwagon!

Conclusion...

I submit to the reader that Richard Jordan, John Verstegen, et al did not properly vet the comprehensive beliefs and doctrinal positions of Bryan Ross before hitching their wagon of Grace School of the Bible to Bryan's agenda.

The true seed bed of Bryan's error most likely lies in the origins of his matriculation. As Bryan prates to his public via the pastor's bio on the pastor's page of his church website, he feels he has a "unique perspective" having not only gone through Grace School of the Bible but also having been awarded a "Religious Education Degree" from Grace Bible College (a school of mixed dispensational views).

On Bryan's web page he offers his public this insight about himself:

"In addition to attending Grace Bible College, Bryan also enrolled in Grace School of the Bible with Pastor Richard Jordan. This unique experience provided Pastor Ross with two different perspectives on Grace teaching. Thus having attended both institutions, Bryan is able to speak from an informed position on divergent doctrinal matters, rather than resorting to the hearsay and conjecture that has all too often dominated doctrinal disagreements within the wider Grace movement" -Bryan Ross⁹

According to their website, Grace Bible College's very FIRST doctrinal statement of belief is as follows:

"The verbal inspiration and plenary authority of the Bible in its original writings" -Grace Bible College¹⁰

In other words, Grace Bible College believes that the trustworthy authority of God's Word is contained ONLY within the long lost original writings (e.g. the original Greek autographs).

In light of all this one can arguably make the connection that the inundation of this type of anti-King James authority/sufficiency view that Bryan was subjected to for years at this Bible college has led to the flippant way that he handles the KJB. We are most certainly seeing the fruit of the seeds of error acquired during Bryan's time at GBC being recklessly introduced via Bryan's "informed position" into the fabric of Grace School of the Bible. He's ostensibly doing this in order to liberate GSB from its "divergent doctrinal" predicament. Therein (whether consciously or unconsciously) seemingly trying to legitimize and fuse within GSB, the anti-King James teaching of his Grace Bible College alma mater.

⁹ http://www.gracelifebiblechurch.com/Pastors_Pen.htm

¹⁰ <http://www.gbcol.edu/about-grace/mission-statement-of-faith>

As a symptom of this reality, Bryan seems to be completely oblivious of what he is actually being criticized for concerning his habitual use of the Greek. He tells his listeners that he's been accused of playing Greek concordance tricks and then proceeds to dispel the allegations by doing exactly what he's been accused of: going to the "underlying Greek" to build his arguments. After presenting his extra-biblical labyrinth constructed from grammar websites, English dictionaries, and foremost Greek concordances, he assures his audience that no Greek tricks are in play and that they can consult the authority of a Greek concordance to substantiate and verify this claim!

The critical protest is not that Bryan is playing fast and loose with an otherwise acceptable practice etc, it's that he's using the practice at all, that we at NCGF take issue with. Most likely due to his aforementioned Grace Bible College conditioning, Bryan seems practically unable to comprehend that his deplorable use of Greek (at all) as a basis for his argumentation is indeed the real atrocity.

As a prime example of this particular abject and inconversant oblivion, in his paper: Ifs, Ands, and Buts: The Two Inheritance Controversy of Romans 8:17, Bryan more than once criticizes others for not explaining the "underlying Greek word". For as it's been heretofore established, going to the Greek is the norm for him and sadly (and shockingly), he seems to be boggled by why others aren't interested in employing the improper practice. Again, Bryan is in no way a Greek scholar, he has (admittedly) taken zero classes on Greek and yet he habitually uses Greek concordances to initiate points in his weekly sermons, conference messages, and most tragically of all: his arguments concerning doctrine. For devotees of the KJB such reprehensible behavior is well beyond the pale.

Do we need to argue against such basic fundamentals as calling the King James Bible's authority and sufficiency into question? Do we need to regress our doctrinal development concerning preservation back to the 1980's? The answer is NO.

Bryan's methods are tantamount to the claim that one cannot understand the KJB, God's word available for English speakers today, unless they have access to Greek concordances; and the Geneva Bible; and the Bishops Bible; and whatever extra-biblical additional necessity Bryan will dare to require next.

*"I understand that as I finish (right on time I might add) that not everyone is gonna agree with this, but if you're gonna disagree, your disagreement needs to come from a better explanation of **the textual facts**" -Bryan Ross¹¹*

Bryan is very subtle with the implementation and presentation of his Greek game. Often in order to avoid the red flag of watchwords like "the underlying Greek" etc, Bryan will instead use the loaded term "**the textual facts**", then even switching to simply just "**the facts**". It is what Bryan dubs "**the facts**" (i.e. his Greek labyrinth) that he holds and promotes as the authority as opposed to **the sufficiency of the King James Bible alone**.

It is quite clear that any honest and sound in the faith rightly dividing mid-Acts Pauline dispensational grace believers who are in some way affiliated with Bryan and his KJB undermining tactics would either

¹¹ Bryan's teaching series on the Judgment seat of Christ, presented on 6/22/14 (1:05:12 minute mark)
http://www.4shared.com/mp3/Hpb4AkzDce/062214_Bryan_Ross_-_Judgment_s.html

naturally seek to help him rectify his error or publicly distance themselves from him in order to avoid shared guilt by endorsement and association.

In summary, Bryan's own statements and actions clearly indicate that he is not using the underlying Greek to understand the King James, he indeed seeks to change it in order to suit his indecent agenda, and whether he is oblivious or not, he's certainly not blameless. If the King James must answer to the Greek then the King James isn't the authority, instead the Greek concordances and the wisdom of scholarly men becomes the authority. However, in actuality the word of God for English speakers today (the King James Bible) is all sufficient and is the only authority. The King James is the commentary for the commentaries; The King James is the commentary for the concordances; The King James is the commentary for the wisdom of men, and never the other way around.

Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not; But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. -2 Corinthians 4:1-2

For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ. -2 Corinthians 2:17