

The Sharpest Sword

Copyright © 2025 by Sawyer Barnes

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

You are free to share, copy, and redistribute the material in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit, and do not use the material for commercial purposes.

Website: thecrosswalkpodcast.com

Email: thecrosswalkpodcast23@gmail.com

Podcast: The Crosswalk Podcast

Printed in the United States of America

Acknowledgments

While my name alone is written on the cover of this book it has been far from a solitary effort.

There are so many people I want to give thanks too but since I know nobody reads these anyways I'll keep it brief.

My mother, Stephanie Barnes who graciously volunteered to sacrifice of her time to edit *The Sharpest Sword*.

Some people who greatly helped me in the writing of this book whether they knew it or not: my brother Tyler Barnes, my grandfather Frank Owen, and my partner in ministry Riley Warren.

Other special thanks are due to many people, but I would like to mention a few here; my father Eric Barnes, my younger sister Ava Barnes, my older sister Brianna Cargo, and finally my grandmother Jean Owen.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
-------------------	---

Part One: Necessary Groundwork

Chapter One: Why All of This Matters	7
--	---

Chapter Two: Defining a Few Terms	15
---	----

Chapter Three: A Vital Explanation of Four Doctrines	19
--	----

Part Two: The Superiority of the King James Bible

Chapter Four: The Old Testament Text of the King James Bible	37
---	----

Chapter Five: The Old Testament Text of Modern Versions	45
--	----

Chapter Six: The New Testament Text of the King James Bible.....	53
---	----

Chapter Seven: The New Testament Text of Modern Versions.....	63
--	----

Chapter Eight: Two Streams of Texts.....	75
---	----

Chapter Nine: Translators and Translation.....	93
---	----

Chapter Ten:	
The Theology.....	111

Part Three: Problems, Claims, and Lies

Chapter Eleven: 'Problem Passages'.....	139
Chapter Twelve: Claims, Lies, and Questions	167
Chapter Thirteen: Conclusion.....	199
Appendix: A.....	204
Appendix: B.....	206
Endnotes.....	207
Bibliography.....	213

Introduction

The purpose of this book is quite simple, to outline in simple terms the reasons why I believe the King James Bible is the very Word of God, preserved for English-speaking people. This belief was once taken for granted, countless people across the globe all held to the KJV without wavering simply because there was no alternative. No matter what church you went to, no matter what denomination they were, almost all of them used the KJV. The King James Bible is by far the most influential Bible translation ever produced, and by the 18th century was almost exclusively the Bible that was used by all of Christendom. But in 1888 two men named Westcott and Hort helped produce a new translation of the Bible called the Revised Version. This paved the way for the flood of modern translations we see today. Now, in the last century, we have seen the production of literally dozens and dozens of translations all competing for the spotlight. The world of fundamentalists, who once all held to the KJV have even largely abandoned it for modern translations such as the New International Version, and the New American Standard Version. This move away from the KJV is concerning, to say the least,

and it seems that with each passing day, fewer and fewer people are willing to stand for the Bible that has so shaped our country, our language, and our faith. These pages are meant to be a testament to the superiority of the KJV. But, this alone is not enough. Proving the reliability of the KJV isn't enough alone, so I will also be presenting the evidence that shows the corruption of modern versions, and why they shouldn't be used. This book will be divided into three sections. The first will lay some necessary groundwork to set the foundation for what we will be examining in the rest of the book, the second will address the superiority of the King James Bible in four different areas, and the third will be dedicated to answering some common questions and objections regarding the Bible translation controversy. As you read the following pages my prayer is not that you will blindly take my word for it, but look carefully at the evidence I present and the conclusions I draw from it. I pray that those who read these pages will continue to examine the subject of Bible translations and that they will come to their own conclusions based on the evidence presented here. I hope that this book will be read by many and that it will lead God's children to the truth.

The title of this book "The Sharpest Sword" is taken from two different verses in the Bible, Ephesians 6:17 "And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God:" and Hebrews

4:12 “For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” God's Word is a sword, our offensive weapon against Satan. But, sadly, many Christians today are using dull swords. When you are preparing for battle, you don't just want a sword, but you want a sword that is balanced, and sharp, a strong sword. The King James Bible is this sword, but sadly the modern versions being produced today are equivalent to a dull sword. Is it a sword? Yes it's a sword, but it's so dull and weak that it hardly has any value. As Christians our offensive weapon needs to be sharp, strong, and balanced. As we will show in the following pages, the King James Bible is far superior to all modern versions and as you read this book ask yourself the question, am I using the sharpest sword?

Part One: Necessary Groundwork

Chapter One

Why All of This Matters

Before we can dive into this most fascinating subject there are a large number of things we must first examine, and explain. The subject of Bible translations is immense and varied. There are almost as many views on the subject as there are people in the world, so it is sometimes difficult to find objective information on the subject. The goal here is to be as objective as possible, but I understand that this goal is not necessarily easy so I implore the reader to check out everything I say for themselves.

The first thing that we need to explain is very simply the reason the Bible is so important. The subject of Bible translations is quite often seen as a “secondary issue” but in reality, it ought to be at the forefront of Christian discussion. The message of the Bible is the basis upon which Christianity is built, and as such the discussion of what God's Word is, is anything but secondary. Throughout history. The Bible has managed to survive whatever Satan and the world have thrown at it. From the serpent in the garden

saying “yea, hath God said?” through Jeremiah 36:23 when Jehoiakim cut God's Word with a penknife and burned it. Then on through the Middle Ages, when the wicked popes and priests fought to keep God's Word hidden from his children. Despite all of these attacks on His Words, the Bible remains alive and well, the same perfect and inerrant Word it always has been. Later on, we'll look more at some of the attacks and corruptions that God's Word has faced, but what we've seen here should be enough to show that God's Word has survived the worst Satan could throw at it. From the deception in the garden, the fire of Jehoiakim, the suppression of the middle ages, all the way to the intellectual attacks of the present age, God's Word still stands. The Bible is the most important book ever written, and we must not lose sight of that, for without it, our lives would have no foundation. Andrew Jackson famously said, "That Book [the Bible] is the rock on which our Republic rests." How true is that statement! Without the Bible, our nation would never have existed, and life as we know it wouldn't have ever existed. The Bible truly is the most important book ever written, it is the very Words of God given for our learning. There is nothing that can compare.

The second thing we need to look at is the very reason why all of this matters. Countless people have asked the question “Why does it matter what Bible translation I use?” They take a position of apathy, they see how technical the subject can get, so they just decide to take the words of their favorite Bible teacher

as the truth and use whatever translation they do. This, however, is not how Christians should treat a subject as important as this.

The Latin phrase *Sola Scriptura* was one of the five main teachings of the Reformation. It means Scripture Alone, this doctrine was one of the cornerstones of the reformation, it emphasizes that the Bible alone is God's Word and as such is the final authority in all subjects. But, I must then ask, how could the Bible be the final authority if we aren't sure what truly belongs in the Bible? For those that reject the King James Bible the doctrine of *Sola Scriptura* cannot stand, the modern versions that the Bible teachers of today are propping up as God's Word are all drastically different from each other. How can the Bible be the final authority if nobody even knows what does and doesn't belong? The King James Bible is God's Word, and to reject that is tantamount to rejecting the doctrine of *Sola Scriptura*. Think about it this way, if, as so many Bible teachers claim, all modern Bible versions are God's Word, then how exactly can any of them be trusted? The New International Version has 64,000 words less than the King James Bible, which is equivalent to completely deleting the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The English Standard Version has 25,700 words less, which is equivalent to deleting the whole book of Isaiah. Does that sound like God's Word? 1 Corinthians 14:33 says, "For God is not the author of confusion". How can it be said that God is not the author of confusion if there is so much confusion about His Word? Psalm 138:2 says, "thou

hast magnified thy word above all thy name.” If God's Word is so important to Him then why would He allow there to be such confusion abounding in it? To deny the King James Bible and side with modern versions is very destructive, and as I have shown, requires that you abandon one of the most important doctrines of Christianity.

Ultimately, if you take the word of so many Bible teachers and say that all translations are God's Word, then that makes you the final authority. Let me explain, if you have five Bible translations, and they all translate a verse completely differently, which one will you choose? In that situation, God's Word is no longer the final authority, but you are because you are the one deciding what God said in that verse. A real-world example of this can be found in Deuteronomy 32:8. Here is the verse in a few different translations.

KJV- “When the most high divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number **of the children of Israel.**”

NRSV- “When the Most High apportioned the nations, when he divided humankind, he fixed the boundaries of the peoples according to the number **of the gods**”

NLT- “When the Most High assigned lands to the nations, when he divided up the human race, he established the boundaries of the peoples according to the number **in his heavenly court.**”

RSV- “When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of men, he fixed the bounds of the peoples according to the number **of the sons of God.**”

NET- “When the Most High gave the nations their inheritance, when he divided up humankind, he set the boundaries of the peoples, according to the number **of the heavenly assembly.**”

Did you catch the differences? They aren't subtle. This is the kind of difficulty you face when you adopt the philosophy that all translations and versions are God's Word. Which is it? What did He number the bounds of the people according to? Was it the number of the Children of Israel? The number of the gods? The number in his heavenly court? The number of the sons of God? Or maybe, the number of the heavenly assembly?

This is just one of the countless places where using multiple translations would make the reader the final authority as to what God said.

This shows that only one translation can be God's Word. Having countless different translations that all vary greatly from each other creates much confusion and necessarily demolishes vital doctrines of the Christian faith, such as Sola Scriptura. Furthermore, modern translations do more than just have different words, in countless places, they completely delete words, phrases, and even whole verses and

passages of Scripture. The NIV for example, omits at least 16 entire verses. How can the Bible be our final authority if we don't know which verses belong and which don't? Sola Scriptura requires that only one translation can be God's Word, and this translation is the King James Bible.

Many seem to have forgotten just how important the Bible is, they say that it doesn't matter which translation you use, and don't ever take the time to look into whether the book they hold in their hands is the Bible. But, as I have shown, only one Bible can be God's Word, because to say otherwise would destroy vital doctrines. Another consideration when talking about why all of this matters is the differences between translations. When it comes to the Bible there is great controversy about its translation. depending on which Bible you use it could be based on one of many different Old and New Testament texts, not to mention that different translations use different translation methods. We will talk more about all of that later, and why the King James Bible is superior in its text and translation. Suffice it to say, that another reason every Bible translation can not be God's Word is the simple fact that they are different in their textual basis. The King James Bible uses something called the Textus Receptus for its New Testament, while modern versions almost all use the Critical Text. Just to show how different they are, D. A. Waite wrote¹ that the Critical Text disagrees with the Received Text 7% of the time! That may not sound like a lot but let's look at it in perspective,

Pastor Jack Moorman² counted the words in the Textus Receptus and found the number 140,521, that's a lot of words! Now, if the Critical Text disagrees with the Textus Receptus 7% of the time, that means that out of those 140,521 words, it changes around 9836 of them! For even further perspective, the average verse length in the KJV is 25 words long, using this number we find that the changes in the Critical Text amount to over 393 entire verses! This is certainly a great level of difference.

How can both the KJV and the modern versions be God's Word if they don't even use the same text, especially if those two different texts are so incredibly different? The answer is that they can not. No matter how you look at it, only one Bible can be God's Word. The modern Bible teachers who proudly proclaim that all translations are God's Word are either mistaken or deliberately misleading countless Christians. But, if only one Bible can be God's Word, then which translation could that be? That is the question that this book hopes to answer.

Chapter Two

Defining a Few Terms

This chapter is going to be rather short, the goal is to explain in simple terms several phrases and ideas that are necessary when discussing this subject. The first thing that needs to be recognized is the fact that truly there are only two Bibles, the King James Bible, and all modern versions. This may at first sound ridiculous, and surely now you are thinking, but there are dozens of Bible versions out there. That is correct, there is the NIV, ESV, NASB, NLT, NRSV, LSB, NAB, and the NKJV, the list goes on, and on, and on, and on. There are so many different English Bible versions out today that it would take quite a while just to list them all. But in reality, there are really only two. God's Word, and Satan's counterfeits. It is vital that this be understood clearly for any of this to make sense. Since Satan said, "yea hath God said?" in the garden, there has been a battle raging on throughout history. God's perfect inerrant Words and Satan's corrupted counterfeits.

Now that we have seen there are truly only two Bibles, we can look at some other things that must be explained. The next thing that we must do is simply explain what I mean when I am talking about a

manuscript. As a general rule, I will abbreviate the word manuscript as ms, and abbreviate the plural form of manuscript as mss. But, before we can go further, it is necessary that I explain exactly what I mean when I use the word manuscript. Now, the fact that there are two texts may not make sense to some who don't understand the nature of the biblical text, but let me explain. When the Bible was originally written, it was written on papyrus or parchment, (which I'll explain shortly) the only problem is that these materials are fragile, and as they were used they became worn and eventually were completely lost. These are called the original autographs, or autographa. The exact pieces of papyrus or parchment that Paul, Luke, and John physically wrote on have been lost, we don't have any of these autographa. This may seem like a death blow to the validity of the Bible but never fear, before these autographa were lost, scribes made copies which were then distributed. Then as these copies became worn, they would make copies of these. The constant wear of fragile pages of parchment or papyrus, (which are what I'm referring to when I use the word manuscript) and the desire of more and more Christians and churches to have their own copy of God's Word meant that copies were made in great quantities, which is what we have today, copies of copies of copies, etc. So, when I am referring to an ms, I am referring to these pages of parchment or papyrus that contain a copy of God's Word.

Now, I have given an abridged definition of what a manuscript is, but I'm afraid the term still needs some further clarification. As any student of history knows, the printing press wasn't invented until around 1440 A.D. which means that any book written before that had to be written by hand. A Bible manuscript is quite simply a handwritten copy of God's Word. Of the New Testament mss, we have approximately 5,800 Greek mss, 10,000 Latin mss, and 9,300 mss in other assorted languages. This all adds up to a grand total of 25,100 mss, this is an unprecedented amount of mss, so astronomically more than any other ancient writing that it is almost laughable.

Now, I want to dedicate a short space to explaining what different kinds of manuscripts we currently have. Primarily mss were written on one of two different types of materials, either Papyrus or parchment. Papyrus is a reed-like plant that grows in marshy areas around the Nile River and elsewhere and was one of the primary materials used for writing for a long time. The Papyrus reeds would be cut into wide strips then laid side by side, then would lay a second layer of papyrus strips perpendicular on top of those and glue them together to form a single page. These pages would then be sewn or glued together to form a scroll. Parchment, however, was also used for the copying of the Scriptures. Parchment was far more expensive and was made by taking the skin of an animal such as a sheep or cow, then stretching it out and scraping it repeatedly until it was smooth. These were the primary materials used for copying the

Scriptures, and their inherent fragility is partly responsible for the wear and tear we see on many ancient Bible mss.

Now that we know what mss were made of we can briefly look at what kinds of manuscripts we actually have. The mss we have are generally divided into four groups, Uncials, Cursives, Papyrii, and Lectionaries. Uncials, also known as majuscules, were quite simply mss which were written in the uncial form, this means that they were written in all capital letters and generally had no spaces, as of now we have about 322 of these. Cursives, also known as minuscules, were simply mss written in the cursive form, which looks similar to modern-day cursive in its flowing style, as of now we have about 2,907 of these. Papyri were just mss that were written on papyrus, which we explained earlier, as of now we have about 124 of these.

The final type of mss we have are Lectionaries. In the early church parchment and papyrus were expensive, so very few churches had their own Bible, instead they passed around these mss called lectionaries. Basically, a lectionary was just a portion of Scripture that had a date assigned to it, so when that date came, that was when you would read that portion of Scripture in your church. These four types of mss are what we have, and now that we have gone over what mss are and what kinds we have, we can move on.

Chapter Three

A Vital Explanation of Four Doctrines

Now, the title of this chapter might sound intimidating, but is truly quite simple. We will be looking at the doctrines of Inspiration, Preservation, Infallibility and Inerrancy. At first, they may not seem like they have much to do with the subject of Bible translations but by the end of this chapter, you will see how they all have great bearing on this most important subject. When you're looking at these four doctrines it must be remembered that one leads into the other. God inspired the Scriptures, then preserved them from the time of their creation to this day, and kept them completely inerrant and infallible. These doctrines are inseparable and vital to the Christian faith.

Let's look at these four doctrines in order, starting with the key Doctrine of Inspiration. There has been a lot of debate over this doctrine and truly what it means. There are many different interpretations of the Doctrine of Inspiration, but truly only one fits the Scripture.

There are only a few verses that directly relate to the Doctrine of Inspiration, and we'll focus mainly on two: 2 Timothy 3:16 and 2 Peter 1:21.

2 Timothy 3:16 says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:"

2 Peter 1:21 says, "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

There are mainly only four different views of inspiration, and as we examine them keep those two verses in mind.

1. The neo-orthodox View
2. The partial inspiration view
3. The dictation view
4. The plenary verbal inspiration view

These four views represent almost all of Christendom, but in reality, only one of them is correct. So, let's look at all four views briefly and see which one makes the most sense.

1. The neo-orthodox view

This view is probably the most distant from the truth that is taught in the Scriptures. Basically, they believe

that the Bible is a fallible book written by fallible men and that God did not “inspire” it in any sense. They believe that the true Word of God isn't the written Scripture, and that the Bible is only a mediator or witness to the true Word of God, Jesus Christ. The only “inspiration” that it has is that occasionally God may use it to speak to people and influence them. As a man named Deolito Vistar wrote,

“Orthodox theology holds that the Bible is the revealed Word of God, given of inspiration by God...neo-orthodoxy denies this orthodox approach of Inerrancy and inspiration, saying that inspiration was not given verbally, but that the authors of the Scriptures interpreted the events or Word of God, thus writing their own interpretations. Neo-orthodoxy teaches that the Bible is not the revelation of God but a witness to God's revelation.”³

This seems to be a pretty good summary of the Neo-orthodox view of inspiration, and it even further shows the error of it. It's simple, this view does not believe in the inspiration of the Bible, despite the verses that attest to it. Both of the verses we looked at earlier are completely contrary to this view. This view is clearly not accurate.

2. The partial inspiration view

This view is definitely closer to the truth but is still almost completely false. Basically, this view is that the

Bible was written by fallible men and that God only inspired a portion of it. This view holds that while the Bible is inspired and infallible when it comes to faith and morals, other portions of it may be completely and utterly false, specifically in the areas of history and science. This view also has very serious flaws. One major flaw is, how could we trust the Bible in the areas of faith and morals if we can't trust in the areas of history and science? Half inspiration is equivalent to no inspiration. God was clear that the Bible came from Him, so if it has errors and contradictions because God only Inspired half of it that means God Himself sanctioned and gave us those errors. This view is completely debunked by one of the two verses we looked at earlier, 2 Timothy 3:16 starts with the phrase, "All Scripture is given by inspiration." This verse is clear, *all* Scripture is inspired, not just a portion of it.

3. The dictation view

This view is notably less common than the others because of its clear flaws. However, despite its clear flaws, it is still far closer to the truth than the other two views we have looked at. The basic tenets of this view are that every single word of the Scripture is perfectly inspired, which I agree with entirely. However, the actual authors had absolutely nothing to do with it. This view states that the human authors worked as secretaries or amanuensis (someone who would write while another dictated) while God dictated and that there is no human element whatsoever. However, I

believe that this view also has serious flaws, the main flaw being its complete denial of any human element in the Scriptures, 1 Corinthians 7:25 definitely seems to prove this theory wrong, it says, "Now concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord: yet I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful." In this verse, Paul basically says, 'Look this is me saying this not God. Here's my opinion'. How can there be no human element in the Scriptures if Paul said right here that what he is writing is from him and not God? It's not that Paul was saying what he wrote there wasn't inspired, but that it wasn't a command from God. This verse, and the fact that different books of the Bible have different writing styles all attest that while this view is close to the truth, it still isn't quite there. Just look at the book of Romans and the book of John, there is a clear difference in word choice, grammar, and composition that indicates different authors. Things you wouldn't find if there was no human element in the Scriptures.

4. The verbal plenary inspiration view

This is the view that I, and many other King James Bible defenders hold to. This is the only view that not only accounts for all of the facts, but actually has countless Bible verses to back it up. This view is quite simple to explain, every word, letter, and syllable is one hundred percent inspired by God and is therefore inerrant. However, even though every word is inspired by God, the original authors' individual personalities are still preserved in what they wrote. Paul doesn't

write in the same style as Moses, David doesn't write in the same style as James, and John certainly does not write in the same style as Luke. These clear differences in writing style, word choices, and similar things are what separate this view from the dictation view. The way I heard one preacher illustrate this was as follows. He took a piece of paper and then wrote five different sentences. The first time with a pencil, then a pen, then a marker, then a crayon, and then a paintbrush. Then he asked "Who wrote these sentences?" Of course, everyone responded that it was him. Then he said "But, don't they all look different? Even though they're written by the same person, me, they still reflect the characteristics of the writing tool. Even though God wrote the entire Bible, it still reflects the individuality of the human author". This seems to be a pretty good illustration of inspiration.

Now that we have seen what the four views are, and which one is correct, we can look a little bit more specifically at the Doctrine of Inspiration. First of all, let's talk about what the term verbal plenary inspiration actually means. The word plenary means full, and the word verbal means words, so an accurate summary of the meaning of this term could be; the full inspiration of all the words of the Bible. This is the orthodox view, with most Christians seeing that it is far more accurate than the other three. I also want to make clear that inspiration was a one-time event, it's not something that has ever happened again. The King James Bible is not a re-inspiration, a second

inspiration, or some sort of advanced revelation. God inspired the Scriptures once, and instead of re-inspiring them he simply preserved them for us today, which is a subject we will look at momentarily. I also wanted to clear up another misconception, God did not inspire the authors, only what they wrote. For instance, God didn't inspire Paul, not everything Paul ever wrote is Scripture. God only inspired those specific writings of Paul which He chose to be Holy Scripture. We know of at least two other letters that Paul wrote that weren't included in the Bible, the first is mentioned in 1 Corinthians 5:9 which says, "I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators:" This seems to indicate that he wrote at least one other letter to the Corinthian church, with a possible second reference to it being in 2 Corinthians 2:3. The second letter of Paul we know of that wasn't included in Scripture is found in Colossians 4:16, "And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea." These are just two examples of other writings

of Paul that were not inspired. This is possible because the authors who penned the Bible were not inspired, only the Scripture they wrote.

Now, let's look at the second of our four doctrines, the doctrine of Preservation. Of all three doctrines that we are covering in this chapter, this one is by far the most attacked of them all. For centuries this doctrine was widely accepted by the church, but only in recent

years, specifically in the late 19th century under the guidance of two men named Westcott and Hort (we'll see a lot more on them later) has it come under such vicious attacks. However, the Bible still greatly supports this most important doctrine, regardless of what modern scholarship attempts to claim. Now, as far as differing views go, I suppose that you could say there are three, although great variation exists among the adherents of each view. The three primary views that I have found are as follows.

1. Preservation does not exist
2. God preserved His Word imperfectly
3. God preserved His Word perfectly

These three views seem to characterize almost all of Christendom, but as I stated there exists variation among these views adherents. Let's start by looking at these three views in order. However, this will be different from the section on inspiration in that there are far too many passages and verses that have a bearing on the subject to properly expound upon them all. Instead, we will look at a few of the most important passages pertaining to this doctrine and see which view best fits the Scriptures. The first view is that there is no such thing as divine Preservation, that God inspired the Scriptures, then left them to the winds of time. The second view is that while God did preserve the Bible He only preserved the ideas in it, not the actual words. So while the general message

of the Bible is preserved, you can't put faith in the exact wording of this message. The third and final view is that God providentially and divinely preserved every single word and letter of the inspired Scriptures and that they were transmitted through time perfectly without error.

To start, I want to look at three statements Jesus made regarding the doctrine of Preservation. After all, what better place to start than what Jesus Himself said on the subject?

The first statement is: Matthew 24:35, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." This verse alone should silence those who deny Preservation. Jesus says His Words will not pass away, to me it seems completely obvious what this verse is saying, but let me explain it. First, we need to ask the question, what does the phrase "my words" actually mean? While some have argued that this only applies to the gospels, I believe that in reality, it can apply to the entire Bible. As we saw in the first part of this chapter God divinely inspired every single word of the entire Bible, Old and New Testament alike. This means that since God inspired the entire Bible, and Jesus is God which is attested countless times throughout the Scriptures, the entire Bible falls under the category of "my words". But, some even attempt to argue about the meaning of the phrase "shall not pass away" So, let me explain what this phrase means. The entire Bible, as being the Inspired Preserved Word of God shall not pass away,

even though Heaven and Earth themselves will. This verse is a clear and concise presentation of the doctrine of Preservation, that the Bible has been preserved perfectly, without error throughout all of history.

The second statement is: Matthew 5:18, "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Now, this verse is even clearer than the first. The first thing that needs to be examined in looking at this verse is what Jesus was referring to when He used the word law. Traditionally the word law represented the first five books of the Bible, known as the Pentateuch. However, the word law actually can refer to the entire Old Testament, which is evidenced by Jesus' usage of the term in John 15:25 and John 10:34 to refer to the book of Psalms, in this specific passage I believe that Jesus was using the term law to refer to the entire Old Testament. Now, what exactly are jots and tittles? Well, a tittle is the smallest letter in the Hebrew alphabet, and the jot is the smallest pen stroke that would differentiate between different letters that were similar. What Jesus was saying here is one of the strongest pieces of evidence for Preservation, He's saying that divine Preservation is so perfect, that not one letter, or even one part of a letter would be lost until either heaven and earth pass away, or all of the Old Testament be fulfilled which can't happen until the end of time. There are loads of prophecies concerning the end times in the Old Testament, so not until the end of all time will it be

fulfilled completely. This is arguably the greatest statement of Preservation in the Bible, Jesus said that no matter how much time passes, not a single letter of the Bible will be lost. This verse demonstrates the exactness, and perfection of divine Preservation.

The final statement of Jesus I want to examine on the subject of Preservation is found in John 10:35, "If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken;". This passage essentially just reiterates what the previous two statements were saying. The Scriptures are infallible and invincible. No matter what so-called modern scholarship says, or does, they can do

nothing to harm the words of Scripture. No matter what Satan or the world throws at it, God's Word will still be preserved perfectly, without error.

So, we could go on for pages and pages exhaustively going over every single verse on Preservation, but instead, I think we'll just look at a few more. Countless passages speak of this doctrine, but these next three should show what the Bible has to say on the subject.

The first of these passages I want to look at on the topic of Preservation is Psalm 12:6-7, "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." This is quite possibly the most commonly used passage in regards to Preservation, because of

its clear message about Preservation. This verse literally couldn't be clearer, God said in this verse that He would preserve His Words. Not only that He would preserve His Words, but that He would preserve them purely, without error. This certainly demonstrates that Preservation applies to every single word in the Bible. Not just the "thoughts" or "meaning" but the actual literal words and letters

The second passage is Psalm 119:89, "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." This passage is just as clear as the previous one. God's Word is settled. But, what does the word settled mean? According to Merriam-Webster's dictionary, the definition of the word settle is "to establish or secure permanently." This certainly sheds some light on Preservation, God's Word is established permanently, and it is not changing or fading. It will stand forever, settled. No amount of time or attacks from Satan can unsettle it.

The third and final passage we will look at regarding the doctrine of Preservation is Ecclesiastes 3:14, "I know that, whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever: nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it: and God doeth it, that men should fear before him." This verse is just one more demonstration of biblical Preservation. Nobody in all of Christendom disagrees with the fact that the Bible comes from God. But, what they refuse to accept, is the message of this verse. That God inspired the Bible, and that because it came from God, it is unchangeable, permanent, unyielding.

I wanted to draw special attention to the wording of this verse, often scholars today will say that the Bible contains small errors, just one or two letters added or removed, but this verse completely refutes that, it says nothing can be added or taken from anything God does, it's not possible. Not one sentence, not one word, not one letter, not one part of a letter. God's Word is perfectly preserved in every single letter.

Well, now that we have looked at six different passages on the subject of Preservation, we have seen that of those three views, clearly only one of the three views fits the Scriptures, and that is the view that God Preserved His entire Word, perfectly, without error.

The third and fourth doctrines we will look at in this chapter are probably the easiest to defend. Since Scripture was first inspired by God, most Christians have believed in its Inerrancy and Infallibility. In recent days, however, many Christians have been abandoning these doctrines which are most vital to the Christian faith. The doctrines of Scriptural Inerrancy and Infallibility are attacked like never before in our modern culture, and so it requires space here in this book to vindicate this doctrine that is so important.

So, in all honesty, there are only two views of Inerrancy that have many adherents. That the Bible is inerrant, or that it's not. There is the view that it is limited in its Inerrancy, but we won't even take the

time to deal with this view because of its clearly contradictory nature. How can something be mostly inerrant? It can't, inerrant means without errors, saying that it's mostly inerrant is like saying that it only has a few errors, which would make it errant, therefore it can't be inerrant because it's errant. There are a lot of verses we could turn to when looking at Inerrancy, but first, I want to make a distinction. Two doctrines are of equal importance and are generally confused. These doctrines are Infallibility and Inerrancy. While they are quite similar they are different. The doctrine of Infallibility teaches that the Bible cannot contain errors. While the doctrine of Inerrancy simply teaches that it doesn't. These two doctrines go hand in hand, and as we examine the doctrine of Inerrancy, we will see what the Bible says about the doctrine of Infallibility as well.

The first passage I would like to look at is 2 Timothy 3:16 which says, " All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:". Now, at first it may not be clear how this teaches Inerrancy, but let's look at this verse logically. God is perfect, and cannot err, therefore nothing He does can err either. Logically it follows then that since God Inspired the Bible, and it's His Word, it cannot err. This makes it inerrant. This applies also to the doctrine of Infallibility, if nothing God does can err and the Bible is something God did, then the Bible simply can't have errors, it's an impossibility. God is perfect, and all He does has to be perfect, or He Himself cannot be

perfect. Therefore, the Bible must be perfect, and in order to be perfect it must be inerrant and infallible. Further, the doctrine of Inspiration requires Infallibility and Inerrancy. Further, the doctrine of Preservation also requires these two doctrines. As we saw, the only biblical view of the doctrine of Preservation is that God preserved His Word perfectly, inerrant, and infallible. This means that the exact words that God inspired have been inerrantly preserved for us throughout history. This doctrine also requires Inerrancy and Infallibility.

Let's look at one more passage regarding the twin doctrines of Infallibility and Inerrancy. This is found in Matthew 4:4, "But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." If we look at this verse logically we can only come to one conclusion, if we are to live by every Word of God, then we have to have access to every Word of God. The book of Proverbs says "Every word of God is pure". So now I ask, how can one live by every pure Word of God if he has no idea what those pure words are? These verses are clear demonstrations that Inerrancy and Infallibility are highly important doctrines, and that rejecting them is contrary to both Scripture and logic.

Now, we looked at four doctrines, Inspiration, Preservation, Inerrancy, and Infallibility. But, by now surely you're wondering why we would spend so much time looking at these doctrines, and what they

have to do with the subject of the authority and superiority of the King James Bible. Well, it truly is simple. God inspired the Bible, and every single word of it is perfect, and from Him. Then, once He Inspired it, He Preserved it all the way down to today through the Hebrew Masoretic Text, and the Greek Textus Receptus. Which were then translated into the KJV. Then, because of the perfection of Preservation, the preserved texts are both inerrant and infallible. This Inerrancy carries along to the King James Bible we use today which was accurately translated from these Inspired, Preserved, Inerrant, and Infallible texts. These doctrines are vital to this discussion because without them the subject of Bible translations would be irrelevant.

Part Two: The Superiority of the King James Bible

Chapter Four

The Old Testament Text of the King James Bible

As we just saw, the Bible is our sword, our offensive weapon in spiritual warfare. However, a sword has to have a few different qualities to be usable in battle. One of these is that it has to be made of the proper material. Traditionally swords were made from steel, this was because it was stronger than other metals. It was more durable and if bent in combat it could simply be bent back. This made it superior to other metals. If you were sent into battle with nothing but a sword, you would want that sword to be made of the right materials, otherwise your sword would inevitably fail you. This same principle applies to the Bible translation issue, if the Bible is our sword, then I suppose the text it's translated from would be the material it's made from. If your sword isn't made from the correct materials, it will fail. So, in this and the following chapters we will be looking at the textual basis of the King James Bible, and why it is superior to that of modern versions.

Now, we can begin to talk about the first area in which the King James Version is superior, its Old Testament textual basis.

The King James Bible stands on a far superior Old Testament text. It was translated from what is known as the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text, which is not only different from the basis for modern Bibles' Old Testaments but is also superior to them.

First however, let's look at how God wanted the Old Testament text to be preserved. Unlike the New Testament text, which we will look at in the next chapter, God specifically appointed one people group, the Jews, to safeguard the Old Testament text. Romans 3:1-2, "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." These verses clearly show us how God wanted to preserve the Hebrew Old Testament text. God never appointed Gentiles to preserve His Hebrew Old Testament text, He "committed" the "oracles of God" to the Jews!

"The 'oracles of God' are the very 'utterances' or Words of God. Unto them (the Jews) 'were committed the oracles of God.' This is why we place so much confidence in the traditional Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament text that those

Jews guarded and kept for us. That is why the KING JAMES translators used this text as the basis for their Bible”⁴

God ordained the Jews alone to the task of keeping the words of the Old Testament safe, and they certainly never failed that duty. Modern versions repeatedly ignore this and use countless other sources to “correct” the Masoretic Text, which we will look at later. But first, I think that it would be helpful to look at the extreme care the Jews took in copying the Scriptures.

In his book, General Biblical Introduction, H. S. Miller lists eight rules that the Jews followed in copying the Synagogue Rolls of the Old Testament. These rules are also mentioned in the Talmud.

“1. The parchment must be made from the skin of clean animals; must be prepared by a Jew only, and the skins must be fastened together by strings taken from clean animals.

2. Each column must have no less than 48 nor more than 60 lines. The entire copy must be first lined...

3. The ink must be of no other color than black, and it must be prepared according to a special recipe.

4. No word nor letter could be written from memory; the scribe must have an authentic

copy before him, and he must read and pronounce aloud each word before writing it.

5. He must reverently wipe his pen each time before writing the word for "God" and he must wash his whole body before writing the name "Jehovah" lest the Holy Name be contaminated.

6. Strict rules were given concerning forms of the letters, spaces between letters, words, and sections, the use of the pen, the color of the parchment, etc.

7. The revision of a roll must be made within 30 days after the work was finished; otherwise it was worthless. One mistake on a sheet condemned the sheet; if three mistakes were found on any page, the entire manuscript was condemned.

8. Every word and every letter was counted, and if a letter were omitted, an extra letter inserted, or if one letter touched another, the manuscript was condemned and destroyed at once."⁵

These eight rules show the meticulous care the Jews took in fulfilling this command God gave them to take care of His words. This is how the Traditional Hebrew Masoretic Text came down to us. Further, along with counting the exact number of the words and even the letters, they also took note of the middle word and

even the middle letter of each manuscript. Then they would check to make sure the middle word and letter of the copy matched the original. This is an unprecedented amount of care in copying. The Masoretic Text was begun in the 6th century and finished in the 10th by scholars at Talmudic Academies in both Babylonia and Palestine. The text derives its name from the editors who established it, a group of Jewish scholars known as the Masoretes, who in turn got their name from the Hebrew word masora which means 'tradition'. Now, we must make a distinction. You see, there are actually two different texts that both take the name 'Masoretic', the Ben Chayyim text, and the Ben Asher text. While these two texts both take the name 'Masoretic Text' they are not entirely the same. The primary difference between the two texts is that the latter of the two, the Ben Asher text, is based heavily upon the Leningrad cCdex. Although, the differences between these two texts are small, so we won't spend any great deal of time discussing them.

The King James Bible used the Ben Chayyim edition of the traditional Masoretic Text. In 1516-17 The Daniel Bomberg edition of the Masoretic Text came out, this was called the First Rabbinic Bible. Then, in 1524-25, Bomberg came out with a second edition edited by Jacob Ben Chayyim Iben Adonijah. This was called the Second Great Rabbinic Bible, this was the Ben Chayyim text, the basis for the KJV. After its publishing, the Ben Chayyim text became the standard Old Testament text for the next 400 years.

This long-standing text is abandoned by modern translations; they ignore the 400 years of acceptance that this text has had and instead use the Ben Asher text.

In 1937 a man named Rudolf Kittel, who was an apostate German rationalist, came out with his own edition of the Ben Asher text, it was called the *Biblia Hebraica*. This edition followed the Leningrad codex. Then, a further edition of Kittel's text came out in 1967/77 in Stuttgart Germany, this edition was called the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, these are the Hebrew texts used by modern versions, texts produced by the apostate Kittel. Besides Kittel's editions following a different text, the Ben Asher version, with various changes throughout the text, he also included footnotes at the bottom of the page that "suggest from 20,000 to 30,000 changes throughout the whole Old Testament."⁶ This certainly doesn't sound like a trustworthy text to follow. The traditional Masoretic Text followed by the King James Bible has been established for over 400 years, it is certainly far more trustworthy than a text that has between 20,000 and 30,000 changes suggested in the footnotes! Not only do modern versions use this false text, but at times, they even insert the footnotes into their translation and pretend that they belong! Even Kittel, who was an apostate, mostly left the text alone, instead inserting his corruptions into the footnotes, but modern version translators care so little for God's very words that they include these erroneous footnotes into their translation as if they were a part of the text,

this is a gross corruption of God's Word. The Old Testament text of the King James Bible was longstanding, and had unrivaled acceptance, to throw it out in exchange for a Hebrew text doctored by an apostate German Rationalist is truly unacceptable.

Chapter Five

The Old Testament Text of the Modern Versions

Now, one thing is undeniable, the differences between the Ben Chayyim and Ben Asher Masoretic Texts aren't inherently that big. While there are differences, they aren't as numerous as the differences between the two New Testament texts we will look at in the next chapter. However, one of the biggest problems with modern Bible Old Testaments is simply the use of external corrupted documents, used to 'correct' the Masoretic Text. So, while their text may not be quite as different from what some may think, they take this slightly altered text and then introduce further corruption through their use of extra sources. In his book, *Defending the King James Bible*, D. A. Waite also lists 19 other erroneous documents that modern version translators use to 'correct' the Masoretic Text. We will look at 6 of them. Out of 103 examples, he gives the following statistics for how often they use these other documents to alter the Hebrew Masoretic Text.

1. The Septuagint (LXX),

The Septuagint is a Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament, 73 (35% of the 103 departures) of the departures from the Hebrew Masoretic Text followed this corrupted text. The Septuagint is a highly untrustworthy text, D. A. Waite even goes so far as to say “In many books and places, it is just like the LIVING VERSION. It is a paraphrase, a perversion.”⁷

The Septuagint is not a trustworthy translation of the Hebrew Old Testament, and as such should never be used as the basis for our Bibles. Now, before going further, I think that it would be beneficial to briefly discuss the Septuagint and the exact details of its corruption because so many of the changes modern Bibles introduce are based on the authority of this ancient translation of the Hebrew Scriptures.

However, once we look at the questionable circumstances regarding its supposed “creation” I think everyone will agree to its corruption. Scholars love to make statements that aren't supported by facts, perhaps not all scholars, but it seems a good percentage of them do. There is one such statement that many Christians have heard because it is so often repeated. This statement is, that “Jesus and the disciples read the Septuagint.” At first glance this may seem like a pretty good argument, but as we will see it is not supported by the facts. First, was there a B.C Septuagint? Let's take a look, It needs to be said that there isn't really any one document that just is the Septuagint, but it is contained in many different manuscripts, so when scholars today refer to the

Septuagint what they actually mean is a blend of the Greek Old Testaments found in three manuscripts: the Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus. But, did it truly exist in Jesus' time? The evidence says no. First of all, we don't have a single scrap of the Septuagint from before the first century. If it truly was written when they claim it was, in the 3rd century B.C., then it seems we would have at least one scrap from near that date. So what do they put forth as evidence for a B.C. Septuagint? Well, they usually put forward something called the letter of Aristeas. Basically, it's a letter, or more of a book really, that is supposedly written by a guy who claims to have lived during the reign of the second Ptolemy over Egypt,. However, we quickly learn that this is a clear lie and that this letter cannot be trusted. First, as you read through the letter it constantly seems as though he is looking back over a long line of Ptolemys, but there had only been two, this would be suspicious enough even if it was the only problem, but it's not. He also says that this king, Philadelphus, had a friend named Demetrius and that Philadelphus put Demetrius in charge of the great Alexandrian library, and that Demetrius helped the king in commissioning the Septuagint. But, there's a problem. Demetrius got exiled and died of a snake bite in northern Egypt around 283 B.C. This would mean that he had been dead for 7 years by the time the Septuagint was supposedly translated. This letter's claim that he helped cannot be true because this letter has all of its history wrong. Further, Aristeas says that Eleazar was high priest at the time, but this

too is inaccurate. The Hebrews' and Historian's list of High Priests have Eleazar becoming High Priest 16-23 years later. Aristeeas clearly didn't live when he said he did.

If Aristeeas had truly lived when he claimed, then he wouldn't have made such obvious historical mistakes, and if he lied about what century he lived in, then how can we trust anything else written in the letter? Odds are, that Aristeeas never even existed, that whoever forged the letter just made the name up. But why does this matter? Because the only link the Septuagint has to a B.C. creation, is a forgery, a fake. Now, if the Septuagint wasn't created before Jesus' time then when was it created? Simple, we just need to figure out who actually created it, then we will know. We don't have space in these pages to go over all of the different aspects of this discussion, so instead I will point you to another book, where I got much of the information used in this brief section on the Septuagint. David W. Daniels wrote a book titled *Did Jesus Use the Septuagint*, and in it, he goes over each and every witness that is used to try and support a B.C. Septuagint, and shows all of them wrong. Ultimately he concludes that the Septuagint was originally translated in the 1st century by a heretic named Philo of Alexandria. This fits all of the facts. For a more in-depth discussion, I would highly recommend his book, but hopefully, this has proved that the Septuagint is not an accurate source for an Old Testament text and certainly is not trustworthy enough to correct the Masoretic Text. There is much

more that could be said about the Septuagint, but this should be enough to demonstrate its inherent corruption.

2. Conjecture, no reason given,

In 67 of the 103 examples (32% of the time) they followed “conjecture”. This means that they decided to insert words into the text based only on their own opinions; this means that they had no Hebrew, Greek, or Latin text to base their changes on, only their own opinions. They make these changes with absolutely no sources. It shouldn't take long to show the folly of this. It's simple, these men have so little respect for God's Words that they mix their own in there and say they are from God. Tell me, do you trust these translators to write your Bible? Because if they are going to start inserting their own words into the Bible, then who knows how much they could change. These translators have no manuscript evidence for these additions, basically, they just say, “You know what, I think this would look better if we added a few words here, and

maybe took some out over there”. Is that how you want your Bible translated? This is certainly not a reliable source for correcting the Masoretic Text.

3. The Syriac version,

In 20 examples out of the 103 (10% of the time), these modern versions followed the Syriac version of the Old Testament instead of the Traditional Masoretic

Text. Again I must stress, why would anyone want to translate their Bible from a translation? The Syriac version is simply a translation of the Hebrew, why would you want to use a translation of the Hebrew when you have the Hebrew right in front of you?

4. The Latin Vulgate,

Sometimes they even used the Latin Vulgate (a Latin translation of the Bible) to correct the Traditional Masoretic Text. This certainly is not a trustworthy translation of the Old Testament. Most everyone is familiar with, or at least is aware of the Latin Vulgate. This Latin translation of the Bible was translated from the corrupted Septuagint to be the official Roman Catholic Bible. Do you trust a Roman Catholic puppet to translate your Bible? Granted, they didn't use the Latin Vulgate as much as some of the others, but regardless the fact that they used it at all is a clear testament to their mishandling of God's Words.

5. The Dead Sea Scrolls,

In 8 of the examples (4% of the time) modern versions go with the Dead Sea Scrolls instead of the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text. D. A. Waite lists two reasons why we shouldn't trust the Dead Sea Scrolls to have any part in the text of our Bibles.

“The Dead Sea Scrolls...Were preserved by the Essenes...These Essenes fled from Jerusalem...and took some of the Hebrew Bible scrolls they had. But, why would

we use the Dead Sea Scrolls instead of the Masoretic Text which the Hebrews in Jerusalem had so carefully guarded? These Essenes left the Hebrew synagogue in Jerusalem. They left the Jewish beliefs their fathers had. They were an offshoot and a false, heretical cult. There are two reasons for questioning these Dead Sea Scrolls where they might differ from the Masoretic Hebrew text: (1) They might have had corrupt Hebrew texts that they began with, at least in some places; (2) They might have been careless in the transmission of these texts. These are both unknown, hence, they should never be used to replace the Masoretic Hebrew text. They could have changed the text in a hundred different ways.”⁸

6. Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus

These are three Greek translations of the Hebrew Old Testament, sometimes these were followed instead of the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew text. A translation of the Hebrew Bible should never be trusted over the Scriptures that the Hebrews so carefully guarded. These three Greek translations all were included in Origen's Hexapla, (more on that later) which is how they survive today, albeit only in fragments. These three translations certainly cannot be taken as reliable, we know very little about their origin or how they were translated. All we know about them is who translated them and the fact that a man named

Origen, who was an apostate and heretic, thought they were accurate. This certainly doesn't make them trustworthy.

These are just six of the many erroneous documents used by modern versions to “correct” the Traditional Hebrew Masoretic Text. As we have seen, Modern versions not only use a different, more untrustworthy text but also “correct” this text with many other corrupt sources, even going so far as to incorporate footnotes added by an apostate into their translation! The KJV is certainly based upon a superior Old Testament Text, and modern versions that depart from that text are all the more corrupt, both because of their uncaring attitude towards God's Words, and also because of their use of such clearly corrupt and untrustworthy documents to ‘correct’ the traditional Masoretic Text that the King James Bible stands upon.

Chapter Six

The New Testament Text of the King James Bible

As we saw in chapter one God promised to preserve His Words, and that we would always have them. This is extremely important when it comes to the text of the Bible, and here's why, modern pastors, theologians, and even so-called "scholars" are beginning to abandon the doctrine of Bible Preservation because God's promise to preserve His Words completely discredits the philosophy behind modern Bible versions. Those who are translating modern Bibles are doing so with the mentality that we don't currently have God's perfect, preserved Word, and so we need to continually keep translating, and retranslating it, even relying upon corrupted texts, in the hopes that someday we might be able to finally have God's Words. This is an extremely unbiblical belief, as we showed in the first chapter. God said that He would preserve His Words, so who are we to say that He was wrong? The entire philosophy behind modern Bibles is based on an unbiblical belief, that directly contradicts the very Words of God, this alone should be enough of a reason to avoid many modern

translations. The reason this affects the biblical texts is because if God is going to preserve His Words, He has to do so through manuscripts, and biblical texts.

Now, we need to discuss the two different New Testament texts. The Textus Receptus, (the basis for the KJV) and the Critical Text (the basis for almost all modern translations). The Textus Receptus has its official beginning with a man named Erasmus. In 1516, after a lifetime of outstanding scholarship, and studying the New Testament text, Erasmus came out with his own edition of the Greek New Testament, side by side with a Latin translation. After the original printing of Erasmus's 1516 text, it went through many editions by Erasmus himself, Stephens, and Beza. Finally being used as the text for the New Testament of the King James Bible. The Critical Text, though, had its beginning in 1881 with two men named Brooke Westcott, and Fenton Hort. Since it had come out in 1516 the Textus Receptus had become the standard New Testament text, and Westcott and Hort decided that they could do better. So, they began in 1853 to work on their own text of the New Testament, finally finishing it in 1881. They named their new text, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, and they almost exclusively relied upon two manuscripts named the Sinaiticus, and the Vaticanus (both of which are corrupt, which we will see later), for their text. Although the Critical Text of today bears a different name, it still follows the same methodology, and manuscripts, and is almost exactly the same as Westcott and Hort's original text.

The evidence for the superiority of the Textus Receptus is generally divided into two sections. The historical evidence, and other evidence. Let's begin by looking at the first of those, the historical evidence.

The Historical Evidence:

In light of what we have learned about Bible Preservation, there are several conclusions about the Bible texts that we can draw. The first is this; if God promised that we would always have His perfect Word, then it logically follows that the text we use can be traced back to the original autographs. So which text fulfills this requirement? I believe that the Textus Receptus fulfills this requirement to the fullest, while the Critical Text is hopelessly unable to make this claim.

The Textus Receptus has a strong claim for historical evidence. As stated, God's promise to preserve His Words requires that the Bible we use can be traced all the way back to the original autographs. Which is a claim that is unique to the Textus Receptus. While it had its official beginning in 1516, the Textus Receptus, or received text, actually already existed and had existed since the original autographs were penned.

Scholars who advocate modern translations will often claim that the Critical Text is superior to the Textus Receptus because the Critical Text is based on "older and better" manuscripts. While this argument is highly

flawed for many reasons, to begin with, it needs to be said that just because something is older doesn't mean that it's better, which is the entire basis of much of the Critical Text, and further, even if that were true, the Textus Receptus fulfills this requirement of age that liberal "scholars" claim makes a text reliable. As we will see, the text behind the KJV, the Textus Receptus, can be traced all the way back to the originals.

The first historical evidence of the Textus Receptus is its acceptance by the early churches. As I have said, if the Textus Receptus were truly God's preserved Words, then it would have to have existed as far back as when the Bible was written. Something clearly illustrated by the acceptance of the early church. So, the following information proves not only that the Textus Receptus type text had existed, but was actively in use since the Bible was originally penned.

(33-100 A.D.)

All of the apostolic churches used the Textus Receptus, the churches in Palestine used the Textus Receptus, and the Syrian church at Antioch used the Textus Receptus.

(100-312 A.D.)

The Italic church in Northern Italy (157 A.D.) used the Textus Receptus, The Gallic church of Southern France (177 A.D.) used the Textus Receptus, the Celtic church in Great Britain used the Textus

Receptus, the church of Scotland and Ireland used the Textus Receptus, the Pre-Waldensian churches used the Textus Receptus, and the Waldensians (120 A.D. and onward) used the Textus Receptus.

(312-1453 A.D)

The Greek Orthodox church used the Textus Receptus, and, according to Dr. D. A. Waite, the present Greek church still uses the Textus Receptus.

(1453-1831)

The churches of the Reformation all used the Textus Receptus, and, as can be seen by the many Bibles that were produced during this period that all used the Textus Receptus, it was almost completely accepted. Some of these Bibles included: Martin Luther's German Bible (1522), William Tyndale's Bible (1525), The Coverdale Bible (1535), the Matthew's Bible (1537), The Great Bible (1539-41), the Geneva Bible (1557-60), the Bishops Bible (1568), and finally, the King James Bible (1611). These countless Bibles are strong evidence for the Textus Receptus, proving that it has been widely accepted by Christians of the past.⁹

Before we go further I want to point something out, the Textus Receptus type text has existed since the original autographs where it originated, and since that time this text has persisted. But, as miraculous as this would be alone, it becomes even more incredible when you consider the atmosphere that this text survived in. These churches that all used the Textus

Receptus weren't without enemies. Looking down through the history of these churches you will find hundreds of years of persecution, where they were extensively slaughtered for what they believed and the Bible they defended. These Christians weren't just using their Bibles every day living happy lives, they were forced to protect their Bibles, laying down their lives to protect the text that still endures today through the Textus Receptus. To me, this is the strongest evidence that the Textus Receptus is the true Bible. Even though Satan did his best not only to destroy this text but also those who believed in it, it still survived, still endured. This surely could only have been accomplished by providence. To make it understood just how many gave their lives for this Bible, let's look at one group, the Waldenses. They were simply a small group of Christians who rejected Catholicism, and stood for the true Word of God. According to the World History Encyclopedia, in one month alone, the Catholic church was responsible for the burning of 900 houses, the complete destruction of 24 villages, and the slaughter of 3000 Waldenses. This violence included women and children alongside the men who fought in vain to protect them. The few men who survived were put in prison, the few women who survived were sold into slavery, and the surviving children were imprisoned and put up for ransom. The cruelty of Satan's attacks on God's people and His Word is unimaginable for most people today. This one event should be enough to demonstrate just how bad it was for those who stood for God's Word and what it

taught. This kind of persecution is why the Textus Receptus type text is certainly God's Word. For if it was not, then it certainly would have ceased to exist under persecution of this kind. Only God could have preserved this text under this kind of opposition.

The second historical evidence for the Textus Receptus is its acceptance by the early church fathers. This is called patristic evidence and is very strong proof for the Textus Receptus.

Before he died in 1888, a man named John William Burgon and his staff had amassed more than 86,000 quotations or allusions to the Scripture by the early church fathers. These quotations and allusions show what kind of Greek text these early church fathers were using, so the question then is, what kind of text were they using? If you ask a modern "scholar" they will tell you that the Textus Receptus didn't exist before 400 A.D. but this certainly doesn't fit with the facts. Of the 4,383 quotations from 76 church fathers who died before 400 A.D., not only were there references to the Textus Receptus type text, but this was actually in the majority! Over 60% of the Scripture quotations and allusions from these church fathers who all died before 400 A.D. were from the Textus Receptus, while only 40% agreed with the Westcott-Hort type Critical Text. Pastor Jack Moorman did a similar study, except he examined quotations from 86 church fathers who died before 400 AD. He found that of these 86 quotations they quoted the Textus Receptus text type over 69% of the time! As

can be seen by the preceding information, the majority of the early church fathers who lived before 400 A.D. used the Textus Receptus. This is powerful evidence for its reliability.¹⁰

The Textus Receptus, the basis for the King James Bible, goes directly back to the original autographs and has been accepted by the church all throughout history. The Textus Receptus is highly attested by the historical evidence, in its acceptance by the church all throughout the centuries, and its acceptance by the early church fathers, as I believe I have shown. But, what do these pieces of evidence show? They prove beyond doubt that the Textus Receptus has been accepted all throughout history and that, unlike the Critical Text, it has withstood the test of time and survived whatever persecution was thrown at it, perfectly fulfilling God's promise to preserve His Words.

God promised over and over again that He would preserve His Words, and as I stated before, this means that for a Bible to be God's preserved Words, it would have to have existed relatively unchanged from the time of the Apostle's first writing the New Testament, all the way to the present. The Textus Receptus and the King James Bible fulfill this criterion like no other "Bible" ever could. The fact that the Textus Receptus has been accepted all the way from the early churches, to the Reformation, and the King James Bible of today, is undeniable evidence that the

KJV is God's perfect Words preserved in the English language.

The Other Evidence:

Now that we've seen some of the historical evidence supporting the Textus Receptus, let's look at some of the other evidence.

First, let's look at the manuscript evidence for the Textus Receptus. According to Dr. D. A. Waite¹¹, and Pastor Jack Moorman¹², the manuscript evidence for the Textus Receptus is overwhelming. According to Pastor Jack Moorman over 99% of all Greek manuscripts that we have agree with the Textus Receptus. Over 85% of the Papyri manuscripts agree with the Textus Receptus, over 97% of the Uncial manuscripts agree with the Textus Receptus, Over 99% of the Cursive manuscripts agree with the Textus Receptus, and 100% of the Lectionary manuscripts we have agree with the Textus Receptus. As you can see, the manuscript evidence for the Textus Receptus is astounding. This leaves less than one percent of manuscripts that agree with the Westcott- Hort type Critical Text. This is truly some of the strongest evidence supporting the Textus Receptus, and also some of the strongest evidence proving the unreliability of the Critical Text.

Second, let's look at the ancient versions. The ancient versions are another strong form of evidence for the Textus Receptus.

Ancient versions are simply copies of the Bible that were translated into other languages such as Coptic, Gothic, and Latin, in the early church. From looking at these ancient Bibles we can see what kind of New Testament text they were using in their translations. So do these ancient versions support the Textus Receptus? Absolutely! For instance, of the 33 copies of the old Latin Bible we have, many of them agree with the Textus Receptus, the Waldensian Bible (120 A.D. and onwards), the Peshitta Syriac version (150 A.D.), the Italic Bible (157 A.D.), the Gallic Bible (177 A.D.), the Gothic Bible (4th century), the Armenian Bible (400 A.D.), and the French Bible of Oliveton (1535 A.D.). These are only a few of the ancient versions that agree with the Textus Receptus, and while not all of them do, the evidence of the ancient versions clearly shows us that the Textus Receptus has not only been in existence but has been in use since the beginning of the church.¹³

This is only a small portion of the vast amount of evidence for the Textus Receptus' superiority to the Critical Text, but I believe that this is more than enough to show that the evidence highly attests to the validity of the Textus Receptus. However, showing the reliability of the Textus Receptus isn't enough to prove that it's the best, before we can say for certain that it is the most reliable we must look at its chief opponent, the Critical Text.

Chapter Seven

The New Testament Text of Modern Bibles

When looking at the Critical Text several things need to be examined. The first is the two people who originated the text, and the second is the method they used to create the text.

In his fantastic book, *The Revision Revised*, Dean John William Burgon said “For if the underlying Greek Text be mistaken, what else but incorrect must the English Translation be?”¹⁴ This is the principle that we will look at in this chapter. If the Greek text is corrupt, then surely the Bible that they translate from it will be corrupt as well. Keep this in mind as we look at the heavily corrupted Greek text that underlies modern versions such as the NIV, ESV, NASB, LSB and NLT.

When you're talking about the Critical Text and its flaws, the first thing that the liberal "scholars" point out is that they don't actually use Westcott and Horts text, they use the UBS text or the Nestle-Aland text (both of which are nearly the same). However, the Critical Text of today is almost identical to the Westcott and

Hort text. Bruce Metzger, one of the most prominent textual critics of our day, said “The International committee that produced the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament, NOT ONLY ADOPTED THE WESTCOTT AND HORT EDITION AS ITS BASIC TEXT, BUT FOLLOWED THEIR METHODOLOGY IN GIVING ATTENTION TO BOTH EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL CONSIDERATION”¹⁵

As Bruce Metzger's quote clearly states, the UBS text adopted not only Westcott and Hort's methodology for their Greek New Testament but also adopted the Westcott and Hort text, to be the base for their new Greek New Testament. This should be more than enough evidence to show that the Critical Text of today is the same as the Critical Text of Westcott and Hort.

Why does this matter? Well, to begin to answer that question, let's look at the first of the two points we'll look at concerning the Critical Text, the manuscript basis for the text.

In 1853 Westcott and Hort decided to make their own Greek text; they believed that it was time for the Textus Receptus to be dethroned and that they could do better. We'll look at the reasons they thought they could do better later, but now let's look at the texts they used to form their Greek text.

Westcott and Hort had decided from the beginning that they would rely on two specific manuscripts almost entirely. These two were named Aleph and B (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus). These two manuscripts formed the basis for their text, and consequently every other text since then which has borrowed from Westcott and Hort's work. These two manuscripts that the Critical Text is based upon are unreliable, and corrupted. As I showed before, the majority of the manuscripts (99%) agree with the Textus Receptus, while the minority (1%) agree with the Critical Text. Strangely enough, the Critical Text is also called the minority text, named after its characteristic of being based on the minority of the manuscripts. Meaning, that of the nearly 6000 New Testament manuscripts we have, almost all of them agree with the Textus Receptus, while next to none of them agree with the minority text. How did Westcott and Hort get around this fact? It's simple, they didn't! Hort came up with a fictitious story (that has since been proven false), and then they rejected out of hand over 99% of the manuscripts, instead relying on only two. This is the foundation for modern Bibles, a text that relied on two manuscripts that have highly questionable characters, justified by a lie. Does this sound like how God would preserve His Word? Through only two manuscripts that were hidden away for none to see until the 19th century? If that were true then that would mean that nobody before the discovery of Aleph and B would even have had access to God's Word! Surely God would not have left His people without a true Bible for

1000 years. To say that would be equivalent to calling God a liar, that He simply wasn't telling the truth when He told us that He would preserve His Words.

First, let's look at B, also known as the Vaticanus manuscript. As for the history of this manuscript, we know nothing. Its first appearance was its listing in the Vatican Library's first catalog in 1475, but we know absolutely nothing of its history before then. Scholars assign it a date of around the 4th century, but seeing as we don't actually know its history this is nothing but conjecture. Besides its mysterious unknown history, it needs to be noted that as long as we have known about this manuscript it has been in the hands of the Vatican, hardly the people we should trust to take care of God's Words.

It should also be taken note that it is widely known that the text of the manuscript has been almost entirely mutilated, with almost every letter over-written with pen and ink (believed to have occurred in the 10th or 11th century) not to mention breathing marks, accents, and corrections from the 8th, 10th, and 15th centuries. This is hardly the type of manuscript that can be trusted as the foundation for our New Testament. That's not even mentioning that in the Gospels alone it leaves out 237 words, 452 clauses, and 748 whole sentences.¹⁶ Many even believe that these omissions were intentional on the part of the scribe, due to the fact that the manuscript was found with no pieces missing, and there was often a blank space on the page where the missing text belonged.

Another interesting piece of evidence to prove the complete and utter unreliability of the Vaticanus manuscript is found in the Book of Hebrews. In Hebrews chapter one, in between the first two columns (each page had three columns of text) a scribe of the past had evidently erased a word in verse three and replaced it with a new one. However, a later scribe that found this change of wording erased the new word, and wrote the old word back in the text! After changing the word back to what it was originally, he wrote a note in the margin that said, "Fool and knave, leave the old reading, don't change it!"¹⁷ This is incredibly interesting because this is documented evidence that at least one of the scribes that was correcting the Vaticanus manuscript was intentionally changing, and corrupting the manuscript! That's hardly the type of manuscript that should be the foundation for our New Testament. Remember, this was one of the manuscripts that Westcott and Hort based their Greek New Testament off of, and that text that they based on this heavily corrupted manuscript is the same text that is used in modern Bibles today.

Second, let's look at Aleph, also known as the Sinaiticus manuscript. While we know a little bit more of the history behind this manuscript, it is certainly just as, or more corrupt than B. As far as this manuscript's history goes, we won't attempt to go back any farther than its discovery in 1844 by a man named Constantin Tischendorf. According to Tischendorf, he was visiting St. Catherine's monastery when he noticed a basket

filled with ancient-looking papers, when he enquired about them the monks told him that they had been consigned to be burned and that several baskets full had already been burned. Upon investigation, he discovered that among them were 43 of the oldest manuscripts of the Greek Bible that he had ever seen. He took them with him and gave them the name Codex Frederico-Augustanus. He returned a second time, to look for more manuscripts, but had to go home empty-handed, then a third time he returned he managed to come into possession of the rest of the codex, which would later be named Codex Sinaiticus. This is a very condensed version of the story of its discovery but I think it's sufficient for our purposes here. What I want to highlight about this story is that this manuscript that Westcott and Hort held in such high esteem and based their text on was found in a waste paper basket. Does that sound like the kind of manuscript you would want to base your Bible on? Of course not! This manuscript was so corrupt that the monks who owned it were burning it. They didn't esteem it as some sacred treasure, they saw it as trash! Aside from the history of the manuscript, there are countless other reasons to reject it. The first of which is the simple corrupted character of it. For example, not only has a significant portion of the text been overwritten, but it is estimated that since its original creation, the manuscript has been corrected or altered over 27,000 times¹⁸, for those of us who like numbers, there are only about 31,000 verses in the entire Bible, meaning that there are almost as many

corrections as there are verses! This fact raises the obvious question, was the text so incredibly corrupted when it was first written that over 27,000 different things needed to be changed, or was it only corrupted later as scribes corrected it again, and again? Not to mention that it is generally held that the original manuscript was written by no less than three different scribes, and has been corrected by no less than 7. Surely this is more than enough evidence to show that the Sinaiticus is a highly untrustworthy document.

You may be wondering why we should spend so much time looking at these two manuscripts, I believe that I have already shown all this, but it's simple, Westcott and Hort based their text almost exclusively on these two corrupt manuscripts, and modern Critical Texts (from which Bibles like the NIV, ESV, NASB etc. are translated) are based on their text. Psalms 11:3 says "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" The foundation of the Critical Text is these corrupt manuscripts. After seeing the faulty foundation of this text, how can anyone trust it, or the Bibles that are translated from it?

The next thing we'll look at is the originators of the Critical Text, their lives, beliefs, and heresies. The two men I'm referring to are, of course, Westcott and Hort. Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort are two names that haunt those who support the Critical Text, many even try to cut ties with them, pretending these two men who are the confessed founders of their text have had no influence in their

translations of the Bible. But, ultimately anyone who uses a Bible translated from the Critical Text uses a Bible whose New Testament originated with these two apostate heretics. I know that it is a huge claim to call someone an apostate and a heretic, but after seeing what they believed I think that anyone would come to the same conclusion. Remember, as I've already shown the Critical Text of Westcott and Hort is the same text still used in modern Bibles today, so when we look at the lives of these two heretics, we are looking at the lives of two men who shaped modern Bibles like no other, two men who formed the very foundation of almost all modern versions.

Fenton John Anthony Hort, and Brooke Foss Westcott, these two men who so shaped modern Bibles were entrenched in things such as spiritism, witchcraft, and evolution. For instance, in 1845 as a Cambridge undergraduate, Westcott formed something called the Hermes club.¹⁹ According to Greek mythology, Hermes is the Greek god of magic, the Lord of death, cunning, and trickery. That's just the tip of the iceberg. Later, in the 1850s Westcott and Hort helped create something called "the ghostly guild" also known as the "ghost club" It promoted channeling by which spirits spoke through a medium.²⁰ Does that sound like the kind of people that you would want to create the text for your Bible?

These two men were involved in more heresy than these pages could contain, so we'll just focus on a few. Aside from their belief in mediums, spiritualism,

ghosts, and the like. These two men espoused innumerable theological heresies as well. For the sake of space we won't go into too much detail, but suffice it to say that these men were severely impaired theologically.

1. They denied that the first three chapters of Genesis were literal history. Westcott wrote, on March 4, 1890 "No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history -- I could never understand how anyone reading them with open eyes could think they did"

2. They both denied the substitutionary atonement of Christ, according to Benjamin Wilkinson "Both rejected the atonement of the substitution of Christ for the sinner, or vicarious atonement; both denied that the death of Christ counted for anything as an atoning factor. They emphasized atonement through Incarnation."

3. Hort even went so far as to say that he agreed with Charles Darwin's evolutionary theory, he wrote "But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with... My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable"

4. Hort didn't believe the Garden of Eden ever existed. He even denied Adam's fall! He wrote "I am inclined to think that no such state as "Eden" (I mean the popular notion) ever existed, and that Adam's fall

in no degree differed from the fall of each of his descendants,"

5. Hort blatantly called the doctrine of substitution "immoral" when he wrote "The popular doctrine of substitution is an immoral and material counterfeit"²¹

These are the men who formed the Critical Text. This list we have looked at is only a few examples of the countless heresies they propagated. Here are a few more;

- 1, they denied that Cain was a real person,
- 2, taught that men could be "divine" in some ways,
- 3, they taught "universalism" (that all will go to Heaven regardless of whether or not they are saved),
- 4, they both refused to affirm the reality of Satan, instead only calling him "a power",
- 5, they believed in regeneration through baptism,
- 6, referred to *the* Holy Spirit, as *a* Holy Spirit,
- 7, taught that Heaven wasn't a place, but merely a "state",
- 8, attempted to spiritualize hell,
- 9, denied the second coming,

10, claimed salvation is an ongoing process, not a finished work,

11, denied the pre-existence of Christ,

12, denied the deity of Christ,

13, they even seemed to imply that Jesus Christ sinned just like everyone else.²²

This is only a short list, it could certainly go on for much longer, but for the sake of space, I have decided to only list some of them. As you can see now by what they believed these two men certainly were apostate heretics. Should men who denied many of the basic doctrines taught by the Bible be trusted to create the Greek text that underlies the Bible we use? Obviously not! After learning of the beliefs of these men, how could one ever trust the Greek text they originated or the Bibles that are translated from it? These men could hardly even take the name Christian, why then are so many people today blindly trusting their work?

Some may be wondering why we should devote so much space to listing these men's heresies. I believe that I have already shown this but it bears repeating. The Greek text these men created is the very foundation of modern Bible translations. The heresies espoused by these men are truly shocking indeed, certainly not the type of people that should be trusted to form the FOUNDATION of your Bible.

Remember that quote from Burgon that we started off this chapter with? He said, “For if the underlying Greek Text be mistaken, what else but incorrect must the English Translation be?”²³ When we started this chapter I said that we would be examining this principle. Now, we have looked through an entire chapter full of evidence showing that the Greek text underlying modern Bibles is corrupt. So, as Burgon so insightfully stated, if the Greek text is corrupt, then the Bible translated from it can be nothing but wrong.

Chapter Eight

Two Streams of Texts

Now, we have already spoken of the fact that there are really only two Bibles; the true, inspired, preserved, inerrant, infallible Word of God, and Satan's infinitely corrupted counterfeits. Now we turn our attention to the manuscripts that these Bibles are based on. If you look carefully at history, and how our Bible came down to us, you will find two distinct different streams of manuscripts. These are called the Alexandrian line (the ones the Critical Text- the textual basis of all modern versions- is based on) and the Antiochian line (the one that constitutes the Textus Receptus- which the KJV is translated from). These two lines represent the majority of manuscripts. As we already saw, the far majority of manuscripts support the Textus Receptus, this massive body of manuscripts represents the Antiochian line. While the far minority of manuscripts (less than 1%) represent the Alexandrian line. This is an unknown reality to many Christians. They are unaware that the Bible they use will directly reflect these two lines. If they use the KJV then they are using a Bible translated from

the Antiochian line, untainted by Alexandrian heresy. But, if they use a modern translation then they are using a Bible that is directly and clearly influenced by the heretics that lived in Alexandria Egypt. We have already seen the differences between the Textus Receptus and the Critical Text, but now let's look at the differences between the kinds of individual manuscripts that these texts are formed by.

It's interesting when you consider the facts, that the Septuagint, which modern translators use to 'correct' the traditional Masoretic Text, originated in Alexandria Egypt. Then, the two primary manuscripts they use to alter the New Testament are the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, both of which originated in Alexandria Egypt as well. The third manuscript they like to use to 'correct' the Textus Receptus is literally called the Alexandrinus, can you guess where it came from? Yeah, Alexandria. It seems clear that this is no coincidence that both the Old and New Testaments were both corrupted at Alexandria and that both of these corrupted texts are now being heralded as the best. Since the Garden of Eden, Satan has been attacking God's Word, it only seems natural then that he would have some long-term plan to corrupt the Scriptures. Which he fulfilled in Alexandria when the heretics of Egypt corrupted God's Word. Then, later, he used the Roman Catholic church to try and destroy the Bible through force when the Popes ordered the destruction of all pure Bibles, and the death of all those who believed them. After that didn't work, and the Bible endured the repeated attacks of the roman

catholic church, Satan again revived the old corruptions of Alexandria, through Tischendorf's 'discovery' in 1844 of the Sinaiticus, and the rediscovery of Vaticanus in the Vatican Library. Alongside the modern obsession with the Septuagint, Satan's plan to destroy the Bible is still in action today, just in the guise of modern "Bibles". This is why this issue is so important, and why it is absolutely vital to understand the difference between the Antiochian and Alexandrian text lines.

Before going further, I wanted to clarify that the Antiochian text line is also known as the Byzantine text. The term Majority Text is also sometimes used to refer to the Antiochian text-type, but not exclusively.

Now, before we start, let's look at how this applies to the doctrines we looked at in chapter three. Basically, there are two groups, those that believe in the Antiochian line, or the Byzantine line, and those that believe in the Alexandrian line. So, how do these two views look at these doctrines? Basically, those who hold to the Antiochian line believe that God Inspired the Scriptures inerrantly and infallibly, and then perfectly preserved those words through the Antiochian text type and that through this text it is still preserved today. Those who believe in the Alexandrian text type however view all four doctrines differently. Basically, they believe that God inspired the original autographs and that they were inerrant and infallible, but that God did not perfectly preserve His Words. That they were basically lost completely

until the 19th century when two men named Westcott and Hort began the 'science' of textual criticism, and that not until then did we truly have God's Word. They then also state that the handful of manuscripts that come from Alexandria Egypt are better representatives of this Scripture than any other. So, basically, those who hold to the Alexandrian text type are forced to almost completely reject the doctrines of Preservation, Inerrancy, and Infallibility, which we clearly see are taught in the Bible.

Before we go further, I simply want to see what the Bible has to say about these two locations, Alexandria and Antioch. First, let's look at what the Bible says about Alexandria. The city of Alexandria is only mentioned in the Bible four times, the first in Acts 6:9, "Then there arose certain of the synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen." In the following chapters do you know what we find? We find these people who have a connection with Alexandria directly supporting and causing the stoning of Stephen. It is certainly not a good start for Alexandria. The second passage is Acts 18:24-25, "And a certain Jew named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man was instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John." This passage shows another side of Alexandria, a side that many have heard but few have

taken note of. What do we see in this passage involving Alexandria? We see that Alexandria is where Apollos came from before he was saved, teaching only a partial gospel; a gospel that doesn't save. This may not exactly be as bad as the first one, but it certainly shows that Alexandria was no place to get doctrine. The second passage is Acts 27:6, "And there the centurion found a ship of Alexandria sailing into Italy; and he put us therein." Paul was sentenced to death in Rome, so he needed to be transported there to be put to death. So, how do they transport him? They find a ship coming from Alexandria. This is certainly not a positive representation of the kind of place Alexandria was. The final instance of Alexandria appearing in the Bible is Acts 28:11, "And after three months we departed in a ship of Alexandria, which had wintered in the isle, whose sign was Castor and Pollux." Well, now after being shipwrecked and bitten by a venomous snake and surviving, again he finds himself sailing to be executed, again on a ship from Alexandria! It seems that those in Alexandria greatly enjoyed carrying those set to be executed. From these four passages, we get a very small picture of what Alexandria was like, which we will expand upon in a little bit. But, what can we learn from these passages? In truth, there isn't much we can learn about Alexandria from its scarce amount of mentions throughout the book of Acts, but here is what we find.

1. The religious leaders of their synagogue assisted in the violent martyrdom of Stephen, whom the Bible refers to as "full of faith and power"

2. We see that Apollo who came from Alexandria had an incomplete knowledge of the gospel and that those in Alexandria must not have been aware, possibly due to the rampant heresy taking place which we will look at later.

3. We see two different ships from Alexandria both transporting the apostle Paul to execution.

This may not show us all we need to know, but as we will see momentarily, Alexandria was a hotspot for heresy and apostasy and these different passages just reinforce that fact. Before we look at some more evidence of Alexandria's apostasy, let us briefly look at four passages that speak of Antioch, where the Byzantine text line originated. (This is where the Textus Receptus came from). So, first let's look at Acts 6:3-5, "Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the Word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch" So, while in the first instance of Alexandria being mentioned in the Bible, we see a group of people from there causing the martyrdom of Stephen, in the first instance of Antioch in the Bible we see a man from there being referred to as a man of "honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom." That certainly sounds

better than stoning a man who in this passage is called “a man full of faith” The second passage we will look at regarding Antioch is Acts 11:19-21, “Now they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen traveled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the Word to none but unto the Jews only. And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord.” So, in the second mention of Alexandria, we can see where the bad theology comes from. But in this second mention of Antioch, we see that they were highly receptive to the gospel, and that when it was preached there “a great number believed”. This too is a positive reference to Antioch. The third passage I want to look at is Acts 11:25-26, “Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus, for to seek Saul: And when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch. And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people. And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch.” Here we see two interesting things, Barnabas sought out Saul, (Better known as Paul) and when he found him he brought him to Antioch. Where Saul and him taught a church for a whole year. This passage also says that Antioch is where the name Christian originated! The name Christian literally means, “follower of Christ” This might seem insignificant, but actually I think it tells us a great deal

about this church at Antioch. These Christians were so sincere in their walk with Christ, that they were given the name, “followers of Christ”. This certainly shows their godliness. The fourth and final passage we will look at in regards to Antioch is Acts 13:1-33, “Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.” Now, while we saw Alexandria sending out ships to carry Paul to his execution, Antioch is actually where Paul was sent from on his first great missionary journey. Incidentally, while Paul was carried to Rome for execution on two different ships from Alexandria, Antioch also sent Paul on his second missionary journey. Now, this is not to say that Antioch was perfect, or even that every mention of it in Scripture is positive, Paul says of Antioch in 2 Timothy 3:11 that he received persecutions and afflictions there, but despite its flaws the Bible mostly does speak positively of Antioch and the people there. So, based on what the Bible has to say about these two places, it certainly seems that Alexandria is not the type of place from which to get your Bible, while Antioch seems like the perfect place for God to use to preserve His Word.

Before we get into more of the historical evidence for the heresies of Alexandria, I wanted to go over something that I feel is equally as important. There are generally two different ways of interpreting the Bible, literal and allegorical. Unsurprisingly, these two views can be directly linked to Alexandria and Antioch. The school of Alexandria is where the allegorical approach to Scripture comes from. The view where nothing in the Bible is what it seems to be, and everything is up for interpretation, and re-interpretation. This is certainly wrong, just look at 2 Peter 1:20, “Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation.” This verse makes it clear that the Scriptures have meaning, and it is not up for changing. The Antioch approach to the Bible is the literal approach, this is by far the biblical view. This view approaches the Bible as God's inspired Word and holds that when the Bible says something, that is exactly what it means. So even in this, Antioch is a superior place to get your Bible than Alexandria.

Alright, now let's look at what history has to say about Alexandria Egypt, and what went on there. So, in our search for the true history of Alexandria, we will look at three men, each was president of the catechetical school of Alexandria in succession. Their names are Pantaenus, Clement, and Origen.

First, let's take a look at the actual city of Alexandria. The city of Alexandria was founded in 332 B.C. by Alexander the Great.²⁴ The city was situated on the

Mediterranean Sea, 120 miles from the present city of Cairo²⁵ and boasted of the 400-foot high lighthouse just west of the island of Pharos that was one of the seven wonders of the ancient world.²⁶ However, while these facts may be interesting, they are not the primary focus of this chapter. Now that we know a little bit more about this city, we can speak of where all of the corruption that stemmed from it all started. As early as the second century a theological school was begun in Alexandria, this Catechetical school was where the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture began. Championed by the school's first recorded president, Pantaenus. We don't have much knowledge of Pantaenus, but from a little research, we discover that he was very theologically corrupt. Henry Wace said,

“Pantaenus led the way in that method of spiritual or mystical interpretation of O.T., usually associated with his more famous followers, Clement and Origen.”²⁷ This certainly sheds some interesting light on Pantaenus, earlier in this chapter we looked at the fact that there are two philosophies of interpreting the Bible, the literal and allegorical, and how the allegorical method originated in Alexandria Egypt. Here however, we actually learn that not only did it originate in Alexandria, but actually with this man named Pantaenus, who was in charge of the Alexandrian catechetical school, which was later taken over by Clement, then Origen. This method of interpreting the Bible is far from what is correct, and it originated with this man. This isn't all we know about

this man from history, however. The name Clement has come up several times in our discussion of Alexandria, and for good reason. Pantaenus was Clement's mentor, and Clement succeeded him as president of the Catechetical School of Alexandria. So, what did Clement have to say about his mentor? William Grady sheds some light on this.

"The Clementine writings...did not even recognize Pantaenus as a Christian. On the contrary, Clement depicted his mentor as 'The deepest Gnostic'. Possessing a perfect insight into the significance of Christianity. (Clement himself claimed the honored title of gnostic often)"²⁸ So, this certainly sheds some light on the man named Pantaenus, and his un-Christian, Gnostic beliefs.

But, now let's look at his successor as president of the Alexandrian catechetical school, Clement. He was born Titus Flavius Clemens in A.D. 150 and grew up in abject paganism. Later in his life, he was drawn to some semblance of Christianity by Pantaenus, who we just saw wasn't much of a Christian himself. Then, in A.D. 190²⁹ he replaced Pantaenus as head of the catechetical school in Alexandria, a position which he maintained until 202 A.D. when he was driven out by Septimus Severus.³⁰ He never did return to his position as president of the school, but died in 220 A.D.³¹ Now that we know who he is, we must look at what he taught. First of all, he obviously taught the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture, in this way following in the footsteps of his mentor. However,

in many ways, his heresy is worse than his mentor. William Grady again sheds some interesting light on what this man taught,

“Apart from Clement's three inspired authorities and seven plans of salvation, he was a fairly conservative guy. Not only did he quote the Apocrypha, specifically calling it “the Scripture” (i.e., citing Tobit 12:8. “Fasting with prayer is a good thing.” in his Stromata Book VI, Chapter XII) but also from the books that were “way out” (Pseudepigrapha) and rejected by all.”³² The amount of heresy that this man espoused is astonishing to learn. He held more false doctrines than most people would think reasonable. Not only this, but he also held the Apocryphal writings in high regard, causing him to fall into even more heresy. F.F. Bruce cites one humorous example, where “From the Gospel of the Egyptians Clement quotes an alleged saying of Jesus ‘I came to destroy the works of the female’ and illustrates it with a conversation between Jesus and Salome. In reply to Salome’s question, ‘How long will death prevail?’ he said “As long as you women give birth to children.”³³ As you can see, Clement was very confused theologically, once even writing about the evils of sneezing! However, we will close our examination of the heresies of Clement with one final heresy he espoused. That is his opinion that the Greek philosophers were inspired by God. He was so messed up theologically that he actually believed that the Greek philosophers such as Plato were divinely inspired by God! At one point even saying “O philosophy, hasten to produce many others also, who

declares the only God to be God, through his inspiration, if in any measure they have grasped the truth.” This is heresy to the extreme, but this isn't the only time he mentioned his doctrine of ‘the inspiration of philosophy’ Later he remarked “ For the knowledge of God, these utterances, written by those we have mentioned through the inspiration of God.”³⁵ These quotes should serve as evidence of the heresies that this man believed

The third and final person we will look at was a man named Origen. In 202 A.D. when Clement was forced out, the 18-year-old Origen took his place as the president of the catechetical school. He was born in A.D. 185 and was highly intelligent. However, of these three presidents of the Alexandrian theological school, he was probably the most heretical.

So, now let's take some time to look at this man and some of the heresies he taught (some of these were quite comical). Well to start with although the allegorical view of interpreting the Scriptures started with Pantaenus, Origen “Was the most famous allegorizer of Scripture. He developed a sophisticated theory of the different levels of Scripture [the following is Origen's own writing] ‘The Scriptures were composed through the Spirit of God, and have both a meaning which is obvious, and another which is hidden from most readers. For the contents of Scriptures are the outward forms of certain mysteries, and the reflection of divine things...the whole law is Spiritual, but the inspired meaning is not recognized

by all- only by those who are gifted with the grace of the Holy Spirit in the word of wisdom and knowledge.’ It also enabled Origen to discover secret teaching concealed beneath the surface of the Scriptures, like a Christian Platonist or a true Gnostic.”³⁷ Well, did you catch what that said? Origen had a system of biblical interpretation that actually went beyond the allegorical method he and the two presidents of the Catechetical school before him used. He actually taught that the Bible had two levels of understanding. The ordinary Christian wouldn’t understand the deeper meaning of the Bible, but only those who were “gifted with the grace of the Holy Spirit in the word of wisdom and knowledge” could actually understand them. This certainly isn’t Scriptural teaching. He’s saying that only those that God specially ‘chooses’ to understand the Bible will truly understand it. This is heresy plain and simple. Notice also that the quote links his teachings straight to Plato and even Gnosticism, both of which are heretical! “Instead of being concerned with the meaning of the writer of Scripture for those to whom he was writing and its application to present circumstances, the men of the Alexandrian school were ever seeking hidden meanings. This method of interpretation has done much harm to the cause of correct interpretation of the Scriptures and has resulted in absurd and, often unscriptural ideas.” Origen also, “Unfortunately...thought of Christ as ‘eternally generated’ by the Father but subordinate to Him. He also held the ideas of the pre-existence of the soul and the final restoration of all spirits.”³⁸ These

were only some of his heresies. However, holding such heretical views doesn't come without consequences. "Some of his speculations, for example about the pre-existence of souls and universal salvation, were repudiated by the church, and helped bring about his later condemnation."³⁹

This was a man whose beliefs and teachings were so far from the Scriptures that he was publicly declared a heretic and possibly even anathematized. We don't have the space in these pages to cover all of the heresies he taught in this manner, so instead let's just look at a couple of them. Well, we already saw one thing; he believed in the pre-existence of souls, and that one's status in this present world is exactly proportional to one's commitment to God in this pre-existence. He also believed that the trinity was a ranking, not an equality, and that everyone, even demons, would one day be reconciled to God. These beliefs are why Origen is considered a heretic by all, except those who willfully choose to ignore the facts of history.

So, at this point, you may be wondering why we would spend so much time going over all of the heresies taught by these men, but honestly, the reason is very simple. All of the manuscripts that modern 'scholars' use to 'correct' the true text of the Bible and form the Critical Text came from Alexandria Egypt probably even from this school that these three heretics were successive presidents of. This certainly is not the theological environment that is conducive to the accurate copying and translation of God's Word.

Just look at the type of people who came from Alexandria. Pantaenus, who was referred to by his own pupil as a Gnostic. Clement was so confused about inspiration that he assigned it to a number of things, including the Apocryphal works of the deuterocannon and pseudepigrapha, and even the Greek philosophers! Origen whose list of heresies is so long that we cannot even hope to list them all in these pages. A few people from Alexandria we have yet to look at may even be worse. Philo, a Judaist who attempted in vain to actually interpret the Old Testament through the lens of paganistic Greek philosophy. Also, a man named Arius, who was the father of a belief called Arianism. Which literally denies the pre-existence of Christ, stating that He was a created being and that the three members of the trinity are not one God, but three separate entities. These heretics created a religious climate in Alexandria that was so heretical that every manuscript that came out of there was corrupted beyond belief. Such as the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

So, in summary of this chapter, the religious climate of Alexandria was extremely heretical, denying the basic tenets of Christianity and espousing countless doctrines that are completely contrary to Scripture and reason. This is why we use manuscripts from the Antiochian line, because Alexandria was so heretical that the manuscripts from there are completely unreliable. This is why we spent so much time in this chapter discussing the heresies of Alexandria,

because ultimately if you use a modern version, then you are using a Bible whose text is composed of manuscripts that originated in Alexandria, and were either approved of, or at least employed by these heretics.

Chapter Nine

Translators and Translation

Now that we have discussed the texts used for the translation of both the KJV and the modern versions, we can look into the actual translation of the KJV, another area in which the KJV is superior. When looking at the translation, several things need to be considered, the history leading up to the translation, the translators themselves, the rules of translation, and the method they used to translate it.

First on the list is the history behind the translation of the KJV. The King James Bible wasn't published until 1611, but we're going to start slightly before that, in 1525, with William Tyndale. The reason we are beginning our study so long before the KJV even existed is quite a simple one. Contrary to what some believe, the 1611 KJV was not the first English Bible. The very first was the Wycliffe translation of the New Testament appearing in 1383. But we're starting at 1525, with Tyndale. The reason we are starting when we are is that one of the rules given to the translators of the King James Bible was that they consult prior

translations, such as the Tyndale Bible, the Bishops Bible, the Geneva Bible, the Matthew's Bible, and the Coverdale Bible. The fact that the KJV consulted these translations makes it necessary to establish a brief history of some of these translations. The basic timeline leading up to the KJV is as follows:

1525, William Tyndale translated the entire New Testament into English, this being the first entirely printed New Testament to be produced. Over the ten years that followed, he revised his New Testament and began the work of translating the Old Testament. While some try to claim he made some questionable decisions in his translation, the merits of his work are clear to see. Not only was his translation the foundation of countless subsequent translations of the Bible, but he actually coined several words and terms we still use today, some of those including; Jehovah, scapegoat, passover, and atonement. Many more examples could be given, but this is enough to illustrate that not only does the English Bible owe Tyndale a great debt, but even the entire English language!

1539, the official Great Bible was produced. It was designed for reading aloud in churches, and it used much of Tyndale's work. Edited by Myles Coverdale, William Tyndale's Incomplete Old Testament, and his New Testament became the basis for the Great Bible.

1560, the Geneva Bible was published. When Mary I took the throne in 1553, she returned the church of

England to catholicism, and many English-speaking reformers were forced to flee, some establishing a community in Geneva Switzerland, under the leadership of John Calvin. Geneva became the international center for reformed Protestantism and Latin biblical scholarship, it was these reformers that produced the Geneva translation.

1568, the Bishop's Bible was published. Not long after Elizabeth I took the throne in 1558 the numerous flaws in the Geneva Bible and the Great Bible had become apparent. So in 1568, the church of England responded with the Bishops Bible, a revision of the Great Bible in light of the Geneva Bible.

1603, King James VI of Scotland, became King James I of England.

1604, King James I convened the Hampton court conference. It was here that a new translation was proposed. It was at this conference that King James spoke out against the Geneva Bible, he said that he, "Could never yet see a Bible well translated in English; but I think that, of all, that of Geneva is the worst. I wish some special pains were taken for an uniform translation, which should be done by the best learned men in both Universities, then reviewed by the Bishops, presented to the Privy Council, lastly ratified by the Royal authority, to be read in the whole Church, and none other." As a result, this resolution was made, "That a translation be made of the whole Bible, as consonant as can be to the original Hebrew

and Greek; and this to be set out and printed, without any marginal notes, and only to be used in all churches of England in time of divine service."⁴⁰

It was after this conference that the 47 translators of the King James Bible began their work of translating the Bible from the Textus Receptus for the New Testament, and the Masoretic Text for the Old Testament.

1608, the main translation was completed.

1611, the King James Bible was finally published.

Now that we have seen a condensed timeline of the history leading up to the publishing of the KJV, we can look at the translation itself. The forty-seven men who translated the KJV were divided into six companies with about 8 men per company. Three to translate the Old Testament, two to translate the New Testament, and one to translate the Apocrypha. Note: The King James translators did not believe that the Apocrypha was inspired Scripture, they only included it for historical context between the Old and New Testaments.

Now let's look at some of the men who translated the KJV and the qualifications they had. In looking at the qualifications, and achievements of these men, I think it will become clear that never before, and never since, has there been a group of men as qualified as the KJV translators. First however, let's go back to our analogy of a sword. If the Bible is our sword, then the

translators would be the blacksmith. They didn't create the metal the sword is being made of, but they are forming that metal into something different. If you were going to go into battle you would want a sword made by an experienced blacksmith, someone who knew what they were doing and that you had confidence in. If your sword isn't made properly then it will ultimately fail you in battle. The translators are like the blacksmiths, if you're going into battle you want a sword made by someone who knows what they're doing, the same applies to the translators of the Bible.

Let's look at a couple of these men.

The first man I would like to look at is Dr. Lancelot Andrews. He was the president of the Westminster group that translated twelve books altogether, from Genesis to 2 Kings. He was so skilled in languages that his manual for his private devotions, which he prepared himself, was written entirely in the Greek language. Not many people even do private devotions, and of those, how many prepare a manual for them, and of those few that do prepare a manual for them, how many of them do it entirely in Greek? This is surely a great example of his linguistic capabilities. It has even been said that such was his skill in languages, that if he had been present at the confusion of languages at Babel, that he could have served as interpreter-general. He was conversant with fifteen languages. I don't believe that any of the translators for the NASB, the NIV, or the ESV could boast such a genius in the ranks of their translators.

The second man I would like to look at is Dr. William Bedwell. He was in the same company as Dr. Lancelot Andrews and was also a highly capable scholar. He has quite accurately been called "an eminent Oriental scholar." Dr. D. A. Waite said, "his fame for Arabic learning was so great that scholars sought him out for assistance."⁴¹ For many years he actually was in the process of compiling an Arabic lexicon in three volumes. His outstanding scholarship in Arabic wasn't his only accomplishment; however, Dr. Bedwell also began a Persian dictionary, proving beyond doubt that he was highly qualified in the area of the biblical languages much more so than many of the translators of today.

The third man is Dr. Miles Smith. He was in the Oxford group; they translated a total of 17 books from Isaiah through Malachi. He was so skilled in Greek and Latin that he read through all of the Greek and Latin fathers, making his annotations on them all. 100 church fathers wrote extensively from 100-300 A.D. and there were 200 more who wrote from 300-600 A.D. He read through all of these in Greek and Latin, making his own comments on each of them. Dr. D. A. Waite said he was "so expert in the Chaldee (which is related to the Hebrew), the Syriac and the Arabic, that they were almost as familiar as his own tongue."⁴² He also said, "Hebrew, he had at his fingers ends"⁴³ This man was certainly more qualified to translate our King James Bibles than the translators of today.

The fourth man is named Sir Henry Savile. He was in the New Testament Oxford group, the group that translated six books; the gospels, Acts, and Revelation. Very early on in his career, he became famous for his Greek and mathematical learning. He was so proficient in Greek and mathematics that he actually became tutor to Queen Elizabeth. Dr. D. A. Waite said, "He translated the histories of Cornelius Tacitus, and published the same with notes. Tacitus was a Latin historian, and Savile translated his work into English."⁴⁴ He also published the writings of Bradwardin against Pelagius, The Writers of English History Subsequent to Bede, and Prelections on the Elements of Euclid. According again to Dr. D. A. Waite, "Euclid was concerned with geometry and wrote in Greek. Savile translated that, and other learned works in English and Latin. He certainly had to have tremendous skill in order to do so. Some of the works in Greek are most difficult."⁴⁵ However, he is most widely known for being the first to edit the complete work of Chrysostom, the most famous of the Greek Fathers. His edition was made in 1613 and takes up eight immense folios. A folio is about the same size as a large dictionary or encyclopedia. I don't know of any modern translators of new versions that could come close to the achievements of this man.

The final man we will look at is named John Bois. As a child, John Bois was taught by his father, and at the age of five had read through the entire Bible, in Hebrew. Many people can't even read English at five

years old, let alone Hebrew! Do any of the translators today have anything even approaching this skill? If you asked them whether or not they had even read the Bible by age five they would probably say no. Then add two words to the end IN HEBREW and they certainly won't have anything to say. By six years old he could write Hebrew quite well. Dr. D. A. Waite said, "he not only wrote Hebrew legibly, but in a fair and elegant character."⁴⁶ Many can't even write English at age six, let alone Hebrew. Not long after he distinguished himself by his immense skill in Greek. So skilled was he in Greek that it is said that, "he was so familiar with the Greek Testament that he could, at any time, turn to any word that it contained."⁴⁷

These five men were certainly more qualified to translate the Bible than anyone alive today. The reason this matters is that people alive today who have no knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages are claiming that the KJV is inferior and that those who translated it didn't know Hebrew and Greek well enough. Next time someone tries to say that the KJV translators "mistranslated" something, just ask them whether or not they could read and write Hebrew at age six, ask them whether or not they are conversive in fifteen languages, I can say with certainty that none of them will be able to make those claims. The men who translated the KJV knew more about Greek, Hebrew, and the cognate languages (cognate languages are related languages, also called sister languages) than anyone alive today;

none of the translators of modern Bibles can hold a candle to these men.

Now that we have looked at five of the translators somewhat in-depth and seen some of their achievements, let's briefly look at a few more of the translators and their accomplishments

1. Dr. John Overall. He received his doctor's degree at Cambridge University and had been speaking Latin for so long that he struggled to speak English in a continued oration.

2. Dr. Hadrian Savaria. He received his doctor's degree and was educated in several languages, especially Hebrew.

3. Rober Tighe. He was, as stated by Dr. D. A. Waite, "an excellent textuary and profound linguist."⁴⁸

4. Edward Lively. He had immense skill in the oriental languages, and was "One of the best linguists in the world".⁴⁹ He was also the king's professor of Hebrew at Cambridge University.

5. Richard Brett. He was learned in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, Arabic, and several Ethiopic tongues.

6. George Abbot. "entered Oxford at fourteen years of age."⁵⁰ Not to mention, that in 1598 he also published

a work entirely in Latin which was later reprinted in Germany.

7. Andrew Downes. Milton described him as the "chief of learned men in England." At Cambridge, he taught Greek for a full forty years. How foolish for people today who took a year or two of Greek in college to think that they can correct such a learned man as this.

8. Dr. Thomas Holland. He "had a wonderful knowledge of all the learned languages,... he was mighty in the Scriptures; and so familiarly acquainted with the fathers, as if he himself had been one of them."⁵¹

9. He was the king's professor in Greek at Oxford University.

10. Thomas Harrison. "Because of his exquisite skill in the Hebrew and Greek idioms, he was one of the chief examiners in the university [Cambridge] of those who sought to be public professors of those languages."⁵²

These men were of the highest qualification for the work of translating the Bible. Surely no man can say that they were unqualified, without either being ignorant of the facts, or a liar. These men knew Hebrew and Greek better than anyone else, and I believe that anyone would be hard-pressed to find a modern version translator who could hold a candle to these men's linguistic skills. Almost all of them were professors of Hebrew or Greek at some point, and of

those that weren't, you can clearly see their linguistic capabilities in their other achievements. I feel it necessary to say here that I in no way am trying to attack the translators of modern versions. Some of the men who translate modern versions of the Bible are highly intelligent men, the purpose here is to simply show that while the men translating modern versions today are intelligent, they don't come near to being as qualified as the men behind the KJV.

Now, we've only looked at fifteen of the forty-seven, but the other thirty-two men were equally qualified as the men that we have looked at. It certainly is no stretch of the truth to say that never before, and never after the KJV, has a group of such learning and skills been assembled.

Now that we have looked at some of the men who translated the King James Bible, and the immense qualifications they had, let's look at how they translated the King James Bible we hold today.

The forty-seven men were split into six companies, three to translate the Old Testament, two to translate the New Testament, and one to translate the Apocrypha. NOTE: the KJV translators did not believe that the Apocrypha was inspired Scripture, they instead included it for historical context between the Old and New Testaments. Each company was made up of about eight men, and the system they used for checking their work was exhaustive. They met once a week during the duration of the translation process,

and once each man had finished translating his portion of the Bible they would send it to be reviewed by every other man in their company, who would make suggestions about alterations. This means that before any of them had finished their portion of the translation, it had been reviewed by no less than eight men. Once their entire company agreed that the portion in question was completely correct, and no more alterations needed to be made, they would send it to the other five companies, who would then review it, again making suggestions about alterations. This means that by the time the translation was finished, every book, every sentence, and every word had been reviewed and checked by no less than forty-seven men. No other Bible translation has ever gone to such great lengths for accuracy. Now, you may be wondering, what would happen if someone suggested an alteration in the translation, and they couldn't all agree on the resolution. Well, after the translation was completed a final review committee met and went over all of the places where the translators couldn't agree (it wasn't very many places) and worked tirelessly to resolve them. As you can see, the KJV translators spared no expense in ensuring their translation was absolutely as perfect as can be.

When King James commissioned the translation in 1604, he set forth 15 rules for the translators to follow. For the sake of space we'll only list a few here, but if you want to look at the full list of rules turn to Appendix B.

1, The ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit.

4, When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogies of faith.

8, Every particular man of each company to take the same chapter or chapters; and, having translated or amended them severally by himself where he thinks good, all to meet together to confirm what they have done, and agree for their part what shall stand.

9, As any one company hath dispatched any one book in this manner, they shall send it to the rest, to be considered of seriously and judiciously; for his Majesty is very careful on this point.

10, If any company, upon the review of the book so sent, shall doubt or differ upon any places, to send them word thereof, to note the places, and therewithal to send their reasons; to which if they consent not, the difference to be compounded at the general meeting, which is to be of the chief persons of each company, at the end of the work.

11, When any place of special obscurity is doubted of, letters to be directed by authority to send to any learned man in the land for his judgment of such a place.

12, Letters to be sent from every bishop to the rest of his clergy, admonishing them of this translation in hand, and to move and charge as many as, being skillful in the tongues, have taken pains in that kind, to send their particular observations to the company, either at Westminster, Cambridge, or Oxford, according as it was directed before in the king's letter to the archbishop.

14, These translations to be used, when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible: Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Matthew's [Rogers'], Whitchurch's [Cranmer's], Geneva.⁵³

The reason that these rules are important is because they give us an insightful look into the translation process.

Rules 1 and 14 show us that while the King James translators were as qualified as humanly possible, they didn't underestimate the work of scholars of the past who had dedicated their lives, some dying in the process, to translate the Word of God into the English language. Taking into account the translational decisions of those that went before them.

Rules 4 and 11 show us something else the King James translators did that is unique to the KJV. When they came to a place where they were unsure of a word, they would first look at the church fathers and how they interpreted a word or phrase. The church fathers are an invaluable resource for the translation

of the Bible, because they lived so much closer to the time it was actually written, some of them were actually disciples of the apostles who wrote portions of the New Testament. Of course, they would understand what the different words and phrases mean.

The second thing they would do is send letters to all of the learned men in the land to get advice on different places. This is another invaluable resource that the King James translators utilized. Now, remember, the study of languages like Greek, Hebrew, and Latin were far more prevalent than they are today, so they were probably getting the insight of dozens of different men who were learned in these languages. These are two resources that all translations since have failed to utilize.

Rules 8, 9, and 10 show the unique review system that they used that we saw a little earlier, where each man would translate the portion assigned to their committee, then every other man in his company would review it, then once they had all reviewed it they would send it to every other company for even further review. No Bible translation before, or since has ever adopted a form of review this exhaustive.

Rule 12 shows us another resource they took advantage of. Throughout the translation, they received letters from countless other people throughout the land who were giving suggestions on the translation.

This isn't the whole list, but for now, I think that these show how careful the King James translators were in ensuring that their translation was as perfect as they could make it. They reviewed it, then re-reviewed it, and then also got the insight of countless other learned men in the process. These measures to ensure the accuracy of translation have Never all been utilized since. This is just one more area where the King James Bible is superior to all modern versions.

Now let's briefly look at the method used for the translation. If the text is the metal the sword is made from, and the translators are the blacksmiths, then the translation method would be the way the sword is made. When going into battle, you want a sword that is made properly, even if your sword is made of the best materials by the best blacksmiths alive, if it is made wrong then it is worthless. If the sword isn't made properly then it won't be balanced or strong, and as soon as it faces resistance it will fail. The KJV translators used a method of translation called formal equivalence, which means they translated the Greek and Hebrew word for word, so when the Greek said one word, that was what they translated. This may seem like common sense, but believe it or not many modern versions don't translate it this way. They instead use a method called "dynamic equivalence" which means that instead of translating on a word-for-word basis they translate on a thought-for-thought basis. This means that when the Hebrew or Greek said one word, they did not

necessarily translate that word, instead translating the "thought" behind the word. Common sense should tell us that this is foolishness.

God promised to preserve His Words, not His thoughts. When I read my Bible I want to know that I am reading, in English, the words that Moses, Paul, or Luke actually wrote, not what some translator thought that's what they meant by what they wrote. I want God's Word, not what

men think God is saying in His Word. This matter of formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence is just one more place where the KJV is superior.

Chapter Ten

The Theology

Now that we have seen the King James Bible's immense superiority in its texts and translation, we can turn our sights to its superior theology. The superior theology of the KJV would be equivalent to the sharpness of a sword. When going into battle you want a sword that is sharp, because even if the sword is made of the best materials, made by the best blacksmiths, and made in the correct way, if it is dull, then it will be of no use. This also applies to the subject of Bible translations. Our spiritual sword needs to be sharp, not dull like so many modern versions. The King James Bible is far superior theologically, with other versions removing key verses, words, and doctrines around every corner. For instance, the following list is over 100 places where the NIV omits the names and titles of Jesus which the KJV includes.

Matt. 8:29.....Jesus

Matt. 9:28.....Jesus

Matt. 13:36.....Jesus

Matt. 13:51.....Lord

Matt. 15:30.....Jesus'
 Matt. 16:20.....Jesus
 Matt. 17:20.....Jesus
 Matt. 17:22.....Jesus
 Matt. 18:2.....Jesus
 Matt. 18:11.....Son of man
 Matt. 23:8.....Christ
 Matt. 24:2.....Jesus
 Matt. 25:13.....Son of man
 Matt. 28:6.....Lord
 Mark 2:19.....bridegroom
 Mark 5:13.....Jesus
 Mark 7:27.....Jesus
 Mark 9:24.....Lord
 Mark 11:10.....Lord
 Mark 11:14.....Jesus
 Mark 14:18.....Jesus
 Mark 14:45.....master

Luke 4:41.....Christ
 Luke 7:22.....Jesus
 Luke 7:31.....Lord
 Luke 9:56.....Son of man
 Luke 9:57.....Lord
 Luke 13:25.....Lord
 Luke 17:6.....Lord
 Luke 22:31.....Lord
 Luke 23:42.....Lord
 John 4:16.....Jesus
 John 4:42.....Christ
 John 4:46.....Jesus
 John 6:69.....Christ
 John 8:20.....Jesus
 John 8:35.....the Son
 John 11:14.....Jesus
 John 11:39.....Jesus
 John 13:23.....Jesus

John 19:38.....Jesus
 John 20:15.....Jesus
 John 21:5.....Jesus
 John 21:21.....Jesus
 Acts 2:30.....Christ
 Acts 3:26.....Jesus
 Acts 7:30.....Lord
 Acts 8:37.....Jesus Christ
 Acts 8:37.....Son of God
 Acts 9:5.....Lord
 Acts 9:6.....Lord (twice)
 Acts 9:29.....Jesus
 Acts 15:11.....Christ
 Acts 15:18.....God
 Acts 16:31.....Christ
 Acts 19:4.....Christ
 Acts 19:10.....Jesus
 Acts 20:21.....Christ

Acts 22:16.....Lord

Rom. 1:16.....Christ

Rom. 6:11.....Lord

Rom. 14:6.....Lord

Rom. 15:8.....Jesus

Rom. 16:18.....Jesus

Rom. 16:20.....Christ

Rom. 16:24.....Lord Jesus Christ

I Cor. 5:4.....Christ (twice)

I Cor. 5:5.....Jesus

I Cor. 9:1.....Christ

I Cor. 9:18.....Christ

I Cor. 10:28.....Lord's

I Cor. 15:23.....Christ's

I Cor. 15:47.....Lord

I Cor. 16:22.....Jesus Christ

I Cor. 16:23.....Christ

2 Cor. 4:6.....Jesus

2 Cor. 4:10.....Lord
 2 Cor. 4:11.....Jesus
 2 Cor. 5:18.....Jesus
 2 Cor. 10:7.....Christ's
 2 Cor. 11:31.....Christ
 Gal. 3:17.....Christ
 Gal. 4:7.....Christ
 Gal. 6:15.....Christ Jesus
 Gal. 6:17.....Lord
 Eph. 3:9.....Jesus Christ
 Eph. 3:14.....Lord Jesus Christ
 Phil. 4:13.....Christ
 Col. 1:2.....Lord Jesus Christ
 Col. 1:28.....Jesus
 I Thess. 1:1.....Lord Jesus Christ
 I Thess. 2:19.....Christ
 I Thess. 3:11.....Christ
 I Thess. 3:13.....Christ

2 Thess. 1:8.....Christ
 2 Thess. 1:12.....Christ
 I Tim. 1:1.....Lord
 I Tim. 2:7.....Christ
 I Tim. 3:16.....God
 I Tim. 5:21.....Lord
 2 Tim. 4:1.....Lord
 2 Tim. 4:22.....Jesus Christ
 Titus 1:4.....Lord
 Philem. 6.....Jesus
 Heb. 3:1.....Christ
 Heb. 10:30.....Lord
 I Pet. 5:10.....Jesus
 I Pet. 5:14.....Jesus
 I John 1:7.....Christ
 I John 4:3.....Christ
 I John 5:7.....the Word
 I John 5:13.....Son of God

2 John 3.....Lord

2 John 9.....Christ

Rev. 1:8.....the beginning and the ending

Rev. 1:9.....Christ (twice)

Rev. 1:11.....Alpha and Omega

Rev. 1:11.....the first and the last

Rev. 12:17.....Christ

Rev. 20:12.....God

Rev. 22:21.....Christ

This is a staggering number of verses where the NIV translators decided that the very name of Jesus Christ did not belong in the Bible. This isn't a complete list, but it certainly goes to show just how corrupt these modern versions are.

I have examined over 30 different Bible translations, and chosen these six because they represent the most popular translations today. These six translations will act as a representation of the corruption inherent in all modern versions. Dr. D. A. Waite, in his outstanding work, *Defending the King James Bible*, lists 158 doctrinal passages which are removed, or otherwise altered in modern versions and the manuscripts that underlie them. If you would like to see even more passages that are altered in

modern versions then I would highly recommend Dr. Waite's book. Another book that goes into even more detail is *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version--a Closer Look*, which lists 356 different doctrinal passages that are affected by modern versions and their underlying manuscripts. The passages we will look at were chosen to demonstrate that the King James Bible is far superior to the modern versions, but by the same token that means the modern versions are far inferior to the King James Version. The purpose of this chapter is not to defend the Textus Receptus against the Critical Text, I believe that we have already done that satisfactorily. But, instead to demonstrate that unless you use the King James Bible, you are using a Bible that is theologically corrupt. A common claim is that the changes between the KJV and modern English versions don't have anything to do with doctrinal matters and that the additions, changes, and subtractions in modern English versions don't affect any doctrines. But, as I will show in the following pages, this is certainly not true.

We will be looking at the NIV (New International Version), ESV (English Standard Version), NASV (New American Standard Version), NLT (New Living Translation), CSB (Christian Standard Bible), and NRSV (New Revised Standard Version). These same theological errors could be found in any other modern version, such as the ASV, TEV, CEB, etc. But for the sake of length, we will only be looking at the six listed above.

The first passage we'll look at is 1 John 5:7-8

KJV -"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. This is one of the clearest verses in the Bible attesting to the Trinity, and these Bible translations completely cut it from their text. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this great trinitarian passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The second passage we'll look at is Luke 4:8

KJV- "And Jesus answered and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. It clearly shows Jesus' power over Satan, and his ability to command him to do his bidding. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is

theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The third passage we'll look at is Mark 16:9-20

KJV- "Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not. After that, he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them. Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined passage is bracketed in the above translations, the NRSV, ESV, NLT, NIV, and CSB also include a note that throws doubt over the whole passage. The NIV actually sets this passage off from the rest of the text with a thick black line and a questionable footnote explaining that they don't think that it's genuine. This passage contains countless doctrines, including the resurrection! Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The fourth passage we'll be looking at is John 7:53-8:11

KJV- "And every man went unto his own house. Jesus went unto the Mount of Olives. And early in the morning he came again into the temple, and all the people came unto him, and he sat down, and taught them. And the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst, They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou? This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not. So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him

first cast a stone at her. And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground. And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst. When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV)

The underlined passage is bracketed in the above translations, with the ESV, NIV, and CSB including a note that throws doubt on the passage. Again, the NIV separates this passage from the rest of the text with a thick black line and a questionable footnote explaining that they don't think it's genuine. This passage also contains countless doctrines. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The fifth passage we will be looking at is Luke 4:4

KJV- "And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. If we aren't to live by bread alone, then what? In this verse Jesus is exalting the Word of God to Satan, to remove these words completely changes the meaning of the verse. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The sixth passage we'll be looking at is Matthew 27:35

KJV- "And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. This verse very clearly states that Jesus fulfilled an Old Testament prophecy, which happens to be one of the clearest ways to prove Jesus' deity and the reliability of the Bible. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The seventh passage we'll look at is Matthew 25:13

KJV- "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV,)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. The modern translations listed above completely remove the doctrine of the second coming of Christ in this verse. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The eighth passage we'll be looking at is John 3:15

KJV- "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. Modern versions completely omit the doctrine of Hell in this verse. This phrase is an important part of the verse, it shows that if you don't believe in Him, you will perish. But modern translations completely remove this instead skipping straight to eternal life. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The ninth passage we'll be looking at is Mark 9:44

KJV- "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. This verse testifies to the eternity of Hell, and modern versions completely omit the entire verse. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The tenth passage we'll look at is Luke 11:2

KJV- "And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. In this verse both mentions of Heaven are omitted, completely removing it from the verse. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The eleventh passage we'll be looking at is Colossians 1:14

KJV- "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins:"

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. The removal of this phrase completely destroys the doctrine of redemption through Christ's blood in this verse. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The twelfth passage we'll look at is John 6:47

KJV- "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. Jesus wasn't just saying that those who believe have everlasting life, He said those who believe on Him will have it. Removing this phrase completely changes the meaning of the verse. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The thirteenth passage we'll look at is Romans 1:16

KJV- "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. Paul wasn't just unashamed of "the gospel", but "the gospel of Christ", there were, and are, many false gospels. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The fourteenth passage we'll look at is Galatians 4:7

KJV- "Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. "Through Christ" is the only way one can become an "heir of God" These words are vital to the message of the verse. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The fifteenth passage we'll look at is Galatians 6:15

KJV- "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. Unless you are "in Christ Jesus" you can never be a "new creature", these words are of the utmost importance to the meaning of the verse. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The sixteenth passage we'll look at is 1 Corinthians 11:29

KJV- "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. Removing the word unworthily doesn't even make sense. It would then teach that any person who partakes of the Lord's supper "eateth and drinketh damnation to himself". That is certainly an unscriptural teaching, this is just one more place where modern versions omit a word that is vital to the meaning of the verse. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage

shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The seventeenth passage we'll be looking at is 1 John 4:3

KJV- "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. Leaving out this phrase is a denial of Christ's incarnation. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The eighteenth passage we'll be looking at is John 7:8

KJV- "Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up yet unto this feast: for my time is not yet full come."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. The removal of the small three-letter word "yet" changes the verse so drastically as to make Jesus a liar. Later, Jesus proceeds to go up to the feast, removing the word

"yet" makes it so that He lies in this passage. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The

removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The nineteenth passage we'll be looking at is Luke 2:22

KJV- "And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord;"

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are CHANGED in the above-listed translations. The word "her" is changed to "them". This passage speaks of Jesus and His family, when the KJV says "her" it is referring to Mary, when the modern English versions say "them" it makes it sound as if Mary, Joseph, and Jesus were all there for purification. Jesus didn't need purification, He was sinless! Changing the word "her" to "them" denies the very sinlessness of Jesus Christ! Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The twentieth passage we'll be looking at is Matthew 18:11

KJV- "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. This verse teaches Jesus' purpose for coming to earth, to save this lost and dying world. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The twenty-first passage we'll be looking at is Luke 9:56

KJV- "For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. Again, they remove an entire sentence that clearly states Jesus' mission when they omit this entire sentence. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The twenty-second passage we'll be looking at is Luke 2:33

KJV- "And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are CHANGED in the above-listed translations. While a single word being changed may not seem like a big deal, the changing of this word is equivalent to denying the deity of Christ! In the above-listed translations, each and every one changes the word "Joseph" to "father" At first this may seem insignificant, except for the fact that Joseph was not Jesus' father! Remember, Jesus was born of a virgin, meaning that he had no earthly father, Mary was miraculously "found with child of the Holy Ghost". To say that Joseph was Jesus' father is the same as denying the virgin birth, a requirement of the Messiah as seen in Old Testament prophecy. If there was no virgin birth, then there could be no salvation. Modern English Bibles have made a grave error in changing this word. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The twenty-third passage we'll look at is Revelation 11:17 KJV- "Saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. By removing this phrase they completely omit the eternal future of Christ. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The twenty-fourth passage we'll be looking at is John 8:59

KJV- "Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. There is a great difference between just saying that He left the temple, and saying that He left through the midst of those that wanted to hurt Him. These people were trying to kill Him, and instead of sneaking out the back door, as modern versions would have you believe, He performed a miracle by leaving the temple through the midst of those who wanted to kill Him. Modern versions completely omit this miracle. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

The twenty-fifth passage we'll be looking at is Acts 8:37

KJV- "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."

(NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, NRSV, NLT)

The underlined words are completely OMITTED from the above-listed translations. This entire verse is removed, completely omitting yet another clear representation of salvation. Certainly, this is a doctrinal matter. The removal of this passage shows that the KJV is theologically superior and that these modern versions are theologically inferior.

These twenty-five passages are only a small fraction of the countless examples that could be given. As the passages we've looked at have shown, modern English Bibles are severely deficient theologically, and the KJV is superior.

The King James Bible is theologically superior to all modern versions, as we have seen and anyone who uses one of these modern English Bibles is using a theologically corrupt Bible. We have even seen where modern Bible corruption goes so far as to deny Jesus' sinlessness, eternal existence, and even His deity. Modern Bible versions cannot be trusted. The King James Bible is God's Word, and no other modern perversion can ever replace it.

Part Three: Problems, Claims, and Lies

Chapter 11

‘Problem Passages’

As we saw in the previous chapter, there are a number of passages that modern versions excise from the Bible. The purpose of this chapter is to show why a few of the most important of these passages belong in the Bible. Regardless of what modern ‘scholarship’ claims, the amount of evidence supporting these passages is quite convincing. But, because their two most worshipped manuscripts, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, exclude them, they out of hand reject all other evidence put forth. This is why if you open an NIV, ESV, or NASB and turn to the closing verses of Mark you will find that they are put in brackets, and are separated from the rest of the text by a big black line. With an ominous footnote saying that “the oldest manuscripts don't include this chapter”. How many manuscripts exclude this passage? Exactly three. Of those three, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are the main reason they distrust this passage. On the basis of these two manuscripts alone, they discredit this passage and mostly ignore the 99% of manuscripts that contain it. This is the type

of evidence we will be looking at, the passages modern Bibles remove or discredit are God's Word and certainly belong. We will, in this chapter, be examining four passages that modern versions attack in these ways, and showing why they most certainly belong in the Bible. There are dozens of passages that we could speak of, but for the sake of length, we will only be dealing with these four. The reason these specific four were chosen is because they are among the most hotly contested. The hope is that through these pages the reader will see why these passages belong in the King James Bible, and why modern Bibles are even further deficient in removing them. The reason we will be dedicating an entire chapter to defending these passages is that when the debate of Bible translations is brought up, often the critics and 'scholars' will point to these passages and say that they do not belong in the Bible and that the KJV is wrong to include them. But, while looking at these verses, we will be examining different types of evidence to support their inclusion in the text of Scripture. The external evidence will include, Greek manuscript evidence, patristic evidence (quotes from the early church fathers), and early versions. We will also be looking at internal evidence, including grammatical evidence and parallel passages.

The first passage we will look at is by far the most contested, that is 1 John 5:7-8 in the KJV it says "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth,

the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.” However, in the NIV it says “For there are three that testify: the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement.” Do you see what's missing? modern versions completely remove this clear reference to the Trinity. We already saw that modern versions excise a large number of verses and passages, but this is one passage that they remove with great spite. Ignoring the mountains of evidence there is to support its inclusion in the text. So, let's start looking at some of the evidence supporting this passage.

First, however, I want to briefly examine the evidence against this passage. In all truth, there is really only one piece of evidence that is put forth against this passage, and that is its relative rarity in Greek manuscripts. Usually, they will say something like this; “We have over 5000 manuscripts of the Greek New Testament, and only eleven of these contain this passage, further, those eleven are all late manuscripts!” Honestly, this sounds like an unanswerable argument at first glance, however, while this statement is factual, it is actually quite misleading. First of all, while it is true we have over 5000 Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, only about 500 of them contain 1 John, and of those manuscripts that do contain the contested passage, (1 John 5:7-8) the far majority of them are ‘late manuscripts’ from the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries. There are only a handful of early manuscripts that contain this passage at all in any form. However,

despite this it is true that of the few early manuscripts of this passage, none of them contain the missing words. This is strong evidence against the inclusion of the passage, but as we will see, this is nothing compared to the evidence we will see that supports its inclusion.

Before we get to that, however, there is one more thing I want to look at, and that is this: is there possibly a reason why these early manuscripts don't contain this passage? Well, yes. As we already saw, the manuscripts we have were all copied by hand, and while many copiers were honest, there were still some that weren't. So, is it possible that this passage was removed in the early centuries by copiers who were changing the Bible to fit their own doctrinal bias? Absolutely, in fact, we see a quote from Jerome, who lived from 327-420 A.D. He said that this is exactly what happened to this passage

“Just as these are properly understood and so translated faithfully by interpreters into Latin without leaving ambiguity for the readers nor [allowing] the variety of genres to conflict, especially in that text where we read the unity of the Trinity is placed in the first letter of John, where much error has occurred at the hands of unfaithful translators contrary to the truth of faith, who have kept just the three words water, blood and spirit in this edition omitting mention of Father, Word and Spirit in which especially the catholic faith is strengthened and the unity of

substance of Father, Son and Holy Spirit is attested.”⁵⁴

Here we see Jerome, who lived in the fourth century saying that these words were removed by unfaithful copiers. The corruption he says these unfaithful copiers introduced is exactly what we see in modern Bibles, which are evidently based on one of these manuscripts which were altered.

But, who were these ‘unfaithful translators’ that Jerome mentioned? Well, the answer is simple, the Arians. In 256 A.D. a man named Arius was born. He garnered quite a following and indoctrinated them with his heretical teachings. We mentioned him earlier in our chapter on textual streams. But let's look at what he taught again. Basically, Arius and the Arians (his followers) believed that Jesus was a created being and thus subordinate to the Father, this would make 1 John 5:7-8 tricky for them to explain.

Now, let's look at an article that sheds even more light on how the Arians would have gone about corrupting the Scriptures in this way. “After his condemnation, Arius fled to Syria-Palestine and succeeded in converting a large number of both the common masses and influential church leaders to Arianism (such as Eusebius of Nicomedia, who had previously sheltered Arius during his trials, and Eusebius of Caesarea). This region was also under the control of the Emperor Constantius II (r. 317-361, r. solely 337-361), who was also an Arian. It was during this

time that several orthodox bishops such as Eustathius of Antioch, as well as the noted defender of trinitarianism, Athanasius, were banished, and the eastern churches handed over to Arian leadership (for instance, Arius' old protector, Eusebius of Nicomedia, was given the patriarchate of Alexandria, in Egypt). Hence, for nearly half a century – including the time period in which Eusebius of Caesarea was performing his textual critical work on the Greek New Testament which was eventually affirmed and “codified” in the textual line leading to manuscripts such as Sinaiticus – the major Greek-speaking regions of the Empire were under Arian control.”⁵⁵

Do you know what's fascinating about this statement? In it, we learn that for a period of fifty years, the Arians were in control and would thus be in control of all copying of the Scriptures. Do you know what's even more interesting? The earliest manuscripts that exclude this passage are all supposed to have been copied during this period when the Arians were in control. So, then once the Arians corrupted this passage the manuscripts that were copied from it would also exclude this passage! So, here we not only see that someone who lived at the same time as these manuscripts were being copied said that this specific verse was corrupted in this specific way, but we also see that during this same period, there was a group of people in power, who had complete control over manuscript copying, and also strongly opposed what this passage taught! This is undeniably strong

evidence supporting the inclusion of this passage, but this isn't anywhere near all of it.

Now I would like to examine some of the Patristic evidence supporting this passage. Countless church fathers directly quoted or at least alluded to this passage but we'll just focus on a few. Tertullian lived from 155-220 A.D. long before Arius or his corruption came into existence. While Tertullian didn't directly quote the passage, he certainly alluded to it. He said

"Thus the connection of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, produces three coherent persons, one from the other, which three are one, not one [person], as it is said, 'I and my Father are One'"⁵⁶ As I said, this is a direct quote, but it is definitely an allusion that seems to demonstrate he had knowledge of the passage. The other time he alluded to the passage he said:

"For if in the mouth of three witnesses every word shall stand: — while, through the benediction, we have the same (three) as witnesses of our faith whom we have as sureties of our salvation too— how much more does the number of the divine names suffice for the assurance of our hope likewise! Moreover, after the pledging both of the attestation of faith and the promise of salvation under three witnesses, there is added, of necessity, mention of the Church; inasmuch as, wherever there are three, (that is, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit,) there is the Church, which is a body of three."⁵⁷ Just like last time, Tertullian did not

directly quote the passage, but he clearly alluded to it. 1 John 5 talks much about salvation, and verses 7-8 talk about witnesses. While the presence of 1 John 5:7-8 might not be clear, it's certainly present.

The church father we will look at is Cyprian, he lived from 200-258 A.D. also long before the Arian heresies. However, he is different from Tertullian in that he didn't just allude to the passage, he directly and clearly quoted it. He said:

“The Lord says, “I and the Father are one; “ and again it is written of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, “And these three are one.”⁵⁸ Did you see the quote? He very specifically said, ‘it is written’ This shows he was speaking about Scripture, then he quotes 1 John 5:7-8 as it appears in our KJV. This is incredible evidence for the inclusion of this passage, it proves that it existed all the way back to Tertullian and Cyprian, who lived in some of the earliest days of the church.

The last quote we will look at is by far the most convincing. In the year 484, a man named King Huneric called a council with the intent of persuading many of the bishops from North Africa to turn to Arianism. This attempt failed, however, when the North African bishops chose Eugenius of Carthage as their spokesperson to defend the Trinity. Which he did by very clearly quoting 1 John 5:7-8. He said “...and in order that we may teach until now, more clearly than light, that the Holy Spirit is now one divinity with the

Father and the Son. It is proved by the evangelist John, for he says, 'There are three which bear testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one.'⁵⁹ This quote is the strongest evidence for this passage that you will find anywhere. Do you know why? This council? had 350 bishops in attendance, and half of them were Arian. If the passage in question wasn't genuine and didn't belong, then as soon as Eugenius quoted it the Arians would have cried foul and berated him for using a passage that doesn't belong. But, this didn't happen, the Arians didn't say a word. Even the Arians knew that this passage belonged in the Bible. For Trinitarians to accept this verse is one thing, but for a massive group of Arians to accept this verse as genuine means something. This is incredible evidence for its inclusion. However, these weren't the only church fathers that quoted it or alluded to it, a few more are: Origen (born 184 died 253), Athanasius (born 296-298 died 373), Priscillian of Avila (quoted it in 380), and Augustine. Idacius Clarus (380 A.D.), Theodorus (4th century), Gregory of Nazanzius (4th century, Eucherius of Lyons (434 A.D.), Vigilius Tapsensis (484 A.D.), Victor Vitensis (484 A.D.), Fulgentius Ruspensus (507 A.D.), Cassiodorus (550 A.D.). This is only a portion of the names that could be listed.

That will be all the patristic evidence we will look at in regard to this passage, but let me briefly explain what it proves. First, it proves that this passage as it appears in the KJV has existed as far back as we can

trace, it was not a later addition as some claim. Second, it proves that this passage was known, it wasn't some random addition that died out until the tenth century. The fact that multiple different church fathers quoted it attests that it was known and used by Christians of that age. Now let's look at other external evidence that has a bearing on this discussion.

Let's now look at the evidence of the Latin Vulgate. Now, I don't put much faith in the Latin Vulgate or its accuracy, but it is strong evidence not only that this passage existed, but was actually in use even up to the time of Jerome. F.H.A Scrivener said "49 out of 50 [vulgate] manuscripts testify to the disputed comma".⁶⁰ That means 98% of all Vulgate manuscripts support the inclusion of this passage.

Let's look now at the grammatical evidence for the inclusion of this passage. I am not as well versed in this area as others, so I will simply present a portion of an article I found that does a great job summarizing this topic.

Note: the portion of this passage that modern versions remove is known by some as the 'comma' this is what the article refers to it as.

"In Greek, you can have verbs with gender (participles). That is, I could write "I was running" using a masculine noun/verb, and you would understand that "I" am male. However, just like in

English – you need to have gender agreement in your sentence.

So you can't write "I(masculine) was running(feminine)" because they don't match gender. That's horrible grammar, just like the "The girl picked up her purse himself" example above...

...In verse 7 with The Comma, all the relevant words "οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ" (the testifying in the heaven) are masculine, matching "ὁ πατήρ" (the father) and "ὁ λόγος" (the Word) = no problem. The gender of the verbs match the genders of the related word, so it works...

...In verse 8 with The Comma, you have the masculine "οἱ μαρτυροῦντες" (the testifying) mated with the feminine "τῇ γῇ" (the earth). To answer a set of words that's both masculine and feminine, you use a neuter. For example: "he said ABC, she said XYZ; but they agreed on 123". In that example, "they" is neuter, so it can answer both a feminine and masculine noun at the same time because of the neuter gender...

...Without The Comma, you have the neuter words "τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα" (the Spirit and the water and the blood) answering masculine words "οἱ μαρτυροῦντες" (the testifying). You can't have masculine answered by neuter. You can have both masculine and feminine answered by neuter, but not

just masculine. That's where the gender issue lies, and it's a major no-no as we've seen."⁶¹

So, basically, the issue is as follows. In the Greek language, you can't have a neuter word answer either a masculine or a feminine word unless they are mated. If you remove the 'Comma' then you lose the mating of the masculine and feminine words and have the neuter words answering the masculine ones. This certainly is a mistake that John would not have made and is strong evidence for the inclusion of this passage"

Summary: This is far from all of the evidence that supports the inclusion of this passage, but should be more than enough to prove that it belongs. We have seen that this passage undoubtedly belongs in the Bible. While the Greek manuscript backing may not be as large as other readings, we already looked at why that came to be. We also saw that there is a mountain of other evidence that supports this passage, such as Patristic citations, the Arian council, the Latin Vulgate, and even grammar and the Greek language itself. Certainly, anyone who denies that this verse belongs in the Scriptures is only deceiving themselves.

Now, the second passage we are going to look at that modern 'scholarship' tries to deem spurious is Mark 16:9-20. In modern versions such as the NIV, ESV,

and NASB, when you come to what they call 'the longer ending of Mark' you will find several things. One, you will find a thick black line separating these verses from the rest of the passage. Second, you will find that the passage is also put in brackets. Third you will find a footnote that basically says that the oldest and best manuscripts don't contain this passage and that it should be ignored. But, is all of this warranted? Is it true that this passage doesn't really belong in Scripture? Absolutely not! In fact, of the four passages we are going to look at in this chapter, this one is actually the most well-attested. For this reason, it will not require as much space to prove it deserves its inclusion. In his incredible book, "The Last Twelve Verses of Mark", John William Burgon, sums up some of the evidence supporting the inclusion of this passage in one paragraph. This evidence includes patristic citations and the evidence of the early versions. He finds these verses recognized "In the IInd century,-By the Old Latin, and-Syriac In the IIIrd century,-By the Coptic-and Sahidic versions: - by Hippolytus;-by Vincentius at the seventh Council of Carthage;-by the "Acta Pilati;"-and the "Apostolical Constitutions" in two places. In the IVth century,-By Cureton's Syr. and the Gothic Verss.: -besides the Syriac Table of Canons; -Eusebius;-Macarius Magnes;-Aphraates;-Didymus; -the Syriac "Acts of the Ap.;"-Epiphanius;- Leontius; -ps. - Ephraem;- Ambrose;- Chrysostom; - Jerome;- Augustine. In the Vth century, Besides the Armenian Vers.,- by codices A and C;-by Leo;- Nestorius;-Cyril of

Alexandria;-Victor of Antioch;-Patricius;- Marius Mercator. In the VIth and. VIIth centuries,-Besides cod. D,-the Georgian and Ethiopic Verss.: -by Hesychius;-Gregentius; - Prosper; - John, abp. of Thessalonica;- and Modestus, bishop of Jerusalem.”⁶²

Well, besides being somewhat admittedly hard to read, this is certainly an incredible amount of evidence supporting the inclusion of this passage! Between all of this evidence, it seems certain that this passage belongs, even based solely on this evidence from the early versions and patristic citations, but what is even more astonishing than all of the evidence we just saw is the fact that there is still more.

At last count, we have 1,653 manuscripts which include Mark 16:9-20.⁶³ Do you remember how many exclude it? Literally only three. This means that 99.8% of manuscripts include the disputed passage, this is an unprecedented amount of support in the Greek manuscripts. Honestly, in light of this evidence, it is beyond belief that anyone could still think it isn't genuine. What is even more convincing is actually found in two of the three manuscripts which exclude it, the Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus. Both of these manuscripts have evidence that the copier did in fact have knowledge of this passage but willfully chose to exclude it. In the Vaticanus manuscript, it ends at Mark 16:8, in the second of three columns. But, the third column is completely blank, the scribe for Vaticanus didn't do this anywhere else. Thus, this column was left blank on purpose which makes it

unique. So, why does this matter? The scribe who copied Vaticanus remembered that there was supposed to be more to the Book of Mark than the manuscript he was copying from didn't contain. So, he left this space in memorial of this missing passage. This is even more likely when you consider the fact that if you start after 16:8 then the passage which is missing fits snugly in the blank space, which only further proves that the scribe had knowledge of the missing verses.⁶⁴ The other manuscript, the Sinaiticus, also has indications that the scribe who copied it knew of the missing passage as well. "In Sinaiticus, four replacement pages contain Mark 14:54–16:8 and Luke 1:1–56 which are not written by the scribe of the surrounding pages. It was probably made by the manuscript's supervisor and proofreader (known as a *diorthōtēs*). Although initially, this copyist wrote at a rate of 635 letters per column, in Luke, he drastically compressed his lettering at the rate of 690 letters per column. But near the end of Mark, he did the opposite: he expanded his lettering in the first column of the third page. Without taking this step, after accidentally omitting most of Mark 16:1, the *diorthōtēs* would have reached the end of v. 8 in this column, leaving the next column blank. But, not wanting to do so, he not only expanded his lettering but also made the decorative design after 16:8 uniquely emphatic."⁶⁵ So, what does this mean? Well, it means that originally the Sinaiticus manuscript contained this passage, but that a later scribe removed those pages and replaced them. But,

because these pages originally contained this passage, that was the size it was measured for. So, when he came to the end of Mark and realized the page was too big without that passage, they spread the letters apart to make them take up more space. But, then once he got to Luke he realized he had taken up too much space with Mark, so now he had to make the letters closer together. This certainly indicates that the scribe knew of the missing passage, but also that the original manuscript may have actually contained the passage in question. Not to mention that the third manuscript which excludes it is from the 12th century, which is late enough as to not be important in this discussion.

Summary: The evidence for the inclusion of this passage is overwhelming. From the evidence of the Greek manuscripts with 99.8% of them containing the disputed passages, early versions, and patristic citations, we see how unbelievable this amount of evidence is. Then we also see how two of the three manuscripts that don't contain these verses knew that they belonged!

The third passage that we are going to look at in this chapter is John 7:53-8:11. Just like with the passage in Mark, in modern Bible versions you will find a large note before these verses that says, "The earliest manuscripts and many other ancient witnesses do not have John 7:53-8:11." Then, they proceed to put the entire passage in italics. But, why does 'modern scholarship' feel that this verse is not genuine? Is this

warranted by the facts? Most certainly not. As we will see in the following pages, this verse most certainly belongs in the Bible. So, for this passage, we will mostly be relying on external evidence. This passage admittedly has less evidence than the others, but I will explain why in a moment. However, although there may be less evidence in support of this passage in comparison to the others, that doesn't make it any less genuine. James Snapp Jr. Wrote an excellent little book entitled; *A Fresh Analysis of John 7:53-8:11*. In it he lays out much evidence supporting the inclusion of this passage as Scripture, if you're interested in learning more about this subject I would highly recommend this book.

To begin, let's briefly look at what we can learn from the Greek manuscripts. Honestly, if we were to just look at the numbers I think most people would concede that the evidence is definitely in favor of its inclusion. Currently, we have 1476 copies of John's gospel that contain the contested passage, and only 268 which omit it. Of these 268 manuscripts which omit it scholars will generally point to several that they deem as the "oldest and best" There are six of these which were produced in the fourth century. P66, P75, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus (surprise, surprise, these two manuscripts are partially responsible for this passage's controversy), and codices T, and W. It should come as no surprise to any who have read the previous chapters of this book that four of these six manuscripts are Alexandrian. It certainly seems that every time there is a question of whether or not a

passage belongs in the Bible it starts in Alexandria. However, although the ‘scholars’ make such a big deal about how the oldest manuscripts omit this passage, first, they forget that four of these five are from the same place, and second, that there is an equally ancient manuscript that contains the disputed passage, Codex Bezae. This is good evidence already, but there's even more.

Commonly when ‘scholars’ are referring to this passage they make some interesting claims that most certainly aren't true. Well, first they claim that it doesn't appear in any manuscript before the 12th century, but we already saw that as false with the 5th-century Codex Bezae, so this claim is clearly and demonstrably false. The second is that this is a “floating” passage. This claim is strange indeed, they say that this passage does not have a set place in the Bible and that depending on which manuscript you use it could be at the end of John, earlier in John, or even in the middle of Luke. However, although this sounds like a devastating argument, and is technically true, it is almost always used deceptively. When you actually examine the manuscript evidence you will find that only a very small minority have this passage in a different location, almost every manuscript that contains this passage has it in the same place, between John 7:52 and 8:12. So, this claim also is evidently false, or at the very least deceptive. The final claim is that no church father before the 12th century even alludes to this passage, this however is more than just misleading, this is a flat-out lie. There

are many church fathers and writings that allude to and even directly quote this passage even as far back as 200 A.D. which we will examine momentarily. So, of these three claims, what have we found? The first one is false, the second is misleading, and the third is a flat-out lie. Now that we have shown the error of the most common claims against it, let's examine the evidence for it.

So, we already saw that the amount of manuscripts that include it far outnumber the ones that exclude it. But, we also have the evidence of the early versions, of which it is contained in the Vulgate, the Palestinian Aramaic, and copies of the Harklean Syriac⁶⁶. We also have testimony of the early church fathers which support this passage. The oldest testimony we have of this passage is in something called the Didascalia Apostolorum. The date assigned to this document is generally somewhere in the 200s A.D. It says, "If you do not receive the one who repents, because you are without mercy, you shall sin against the Lord God; for you do not obey our Savior and our God, to do as He also did with her that had sinned, whom the elders set before Him, and leaving the judgment in His hands, departed. But He, the searcher of hearts, asked her and said to her, 'Have the elders condemned thee, my daughter?' She said to Him, 'No, Lord.' And He said unto her, 'Go your way; neither do I condemn thee.' In Him therefore, our Savior and King and God, is your pattern, O bishops."⁶⁷ Now, this obviously isn't an exact quote of the passage, however, the author does use it as an authoritative example of forgiveness. "It is

just the sort of loose summary that one might make when taking for granted that one's readers know and accept the passage. And where else could they have encountered it, in a context that rendered it authoritative, if not in their copies of the Gospel of John?"⁶⁸ This certainly is strong evidence for its validity. But we have even more quotes from the early church fathers to further prove its genuineness. A man named Pacian of Barcelona who lived in Spain, far far away from Syria wrote in his Third Epistle to Sympronian – Against the Treatise of the Novatians, "O Novatians, why do you delay to ask an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, and to demand life for life? Why do you wait to renew once more the practice of circumcision and the sabbath? Kill the thief. Stone the petulant. Choose not to read in the Gospel that the Lord spared even the adulteress who confessed when none had condemned her; that He absolved the sinner who washed His feet with her tears; that He delivered Rahab at Jericho. . . ." ⁶⁹ In this quote Pacian, who lived in the 4th century, directly references the story as something you could "read in the gospel". Then, Ambrose, who also lived in the 4th century wrote, "The acquittal of the woman who, in the Gospel of John, was brought to Christ accused of adultery, is very famous."⁷⁰ Ambrose actually quoted and referenced this passage quite extensively, but in this specific quote he actually says that it's "quite famous" certainly not the language he would use to describe a passage that didn't belong. Now, it's certain that Patian, and Ambrose who were separated

by who knows how many miles weren't using the same copy of the gospel of John, this means that this passage was at least as widespread as this. We will only examine two more patristic quotations in regard to this passage. The first is from Jerome.

Jerome said in his book, *Against the Pelagians*: "In the Gospel according to John, there is found, in many of the Greek, as well as the Latin, copies, the story of the adulteress who was accused before the Lord."⁷¹ This quote is equally as fascinating. Here, we have Jerome literally saying that this passage is in many Greek manuscripts that he knew of, Jerome lived from 347-419/420 A.D. This means that this passage not only existed but was in multiple manuscripts at least as early as 300 A.D. This is extremely strong evidence for its inclusion as well.

The final patristic citation we will look at is from a man named Augustine. He said, "Certain persons of little faith, or rather enemies of the true faith, fearing, I suppose, lest their wives should be given impunity in sinning, removed from their manuscripts the Lord's act of forgiveness toward the adulteress, as if He who had said 'sin no more' had granted permission to sin."⁷² This is also great evidence for the inclusion of this passage. But I also wanted to highlight the fact that Augustine actually said that this passage was being removed, similar to Jerome's testimony which we saw earlier in this chapter in regards to 1 John 5:7-8. This is a strong and undeniable testimony to

the inclusion and validity of these verses that so many 'scholars' today deny.

Before moving on to the fourth and final passage we will look at why this passage would be removed in the first place. There are actually two different hypotheses as to how this may have happened, and let's briefly look at both of them. The first theory is basically summed up in what Augustine said, that certain people disagreed with the level of forgiveness that Jesus showed to this woman in light of the sin she had committed, and so they removed it for moral reasons. The other theory is a little more complicated. Basically in the early church, they would read specific passages on specific days, so they would mark these passages in their copies of the Bible so they would know what to read, these are called lections and would be read on the designated day by someone called the lector. Well, they would also have specific passages to be read on different feasts, and this specific passage happened to fall on the feast of Pentecost. So, here's what happened. The lection started at John 7:37-52 plus John 8:12, The reason they included this last verse was so that the lection would end on a positive note, however, they did not include the missing passage because it did not fit very well with the feast of Pentecost and what they were teaching on that day. So, the person who was supposed to read this passage on that day would have marked verses 7:53-8:11 so he knew to skip over these verses for the lection. Imagine this; the scribe is copying down a new manuscript from this

lectionary (a manuscript used in the lection cycle) and when he came to the note that the lector wrote saying to skip over these verses he would've been confused and assumed they were for him, so he would skip over these verses in his copying. This would explain the absence of the passage from where it belongs.

Further, these verses were widely used as the lection for Pentecost so it would make absolutely no sense for someone to have added them later. If someone were going to add verses to a passage they would never have put it in the manuscript right inside an already well-known lection. That would be akin to someone deciding to add twelve verses into the nativity! Obviously, if someone had attempted this it would have been noticed immediately and stopped. There is ample reason for the passage to have been wrongly removed, and not to have been added.

The fourth and final passage we will look at in this chapter is also in John, this passage is found in John 5:3-4. This passage is noticeably shorter than the last two but it is still important to uphold and defend the integrity of Scripture, no matter how small the passage in question. Let's start by looking at this passage in the KJV, which says: "In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had." Now let's see these same two

verses in the NIV: “Here a great number of disabled people used to lie—the blind, the lame, the paralyzed.” Now, did you notice what’s missing? The translators of the NIV completely removed verse four, and the end of verse three. The removal of verse four actually makes this passage unintelligible in the next verses. Well, let’s say you’re doing your daily devotions with an NIV. You start reading through John 5 and come to a strange statement, Jesus asks a man lying there if he wants to be healed, and the man replies by saying “I have no one to help me into the pool when the water is stirred.” What could this possibly mean, what water stirring was he talking about? Why would stirred water heal him? Then you notice a footnote at the bottom of the page that says “some manuscripts include here, wholly or in part...” and then it goes on to give you a whole chunk of text that they failed to include in the passage. However, if you are using a King James Bible, then when you come to this passage you will find these words right there in verses 3 and 4! So, now we must answer the question, do the words that are missing belong in the Bible? But, do you see the problem? Without the missing verse four, what the old man says doesn’t make sense, the text then gives absolutely no reason for why these people are all waiting by this pool for healing. This alone should be enough to prove that this verse belongs. The context demands its inclusion. But, nonetheless, let’s look at the external evidence as well.

First, we must examine the Greek manuscript evidence. Unlike the first passage we looked at this one actually has a significant backing in Greek manuscripts. Dr. Thomas Holland wrote of the Greek backing of this manuscript: "If we are to accept a reading based on its wide geographical distribution, we should accept this reading because it has old textual support with the greatest amount of geographical distribution. It is found in codices A, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, D, Q, P, and the third corrector of C. The Greek minuscules overwhelmingly support the verse and it is contained in 28, 565, 700, 892, 1009, 1010, 1071, 1195, 1216, 1230, 1241, 1242, 1253, 1344, 1365, 1546, 1646, and 2148. It is also included in the majority of Old Latin manuscripts and early translations."⁷³ This is a great summary of some of the evidence supporting this passage, but this is only scratching the surface. We also have to consider the testimony of the early versions. Now, there are so many early versions that contain this passage that we don't have nearly enough space to go over them all. However, some of the most notable are Tatians Diatessaron, which is dated to 175 A.D. which is only 100 years after this gospel was written, far too short a period of time for this to be an added corruption. Also of note is the Old Latin Vulgate, which is dated between 90 and 150 A.D.⁷⁴ This means that this passage is certainly true Scripture, and any argument made against it is unfounded. Before moving and closing this chapter, let's look at what the Early Church Fathers had to say. The patristic citations are

some of the strongest evidence for this passage, with it being quoted by: Gregory of Nazianzus (390 A.D.); Ambrose (340-397 A.D.), Chrysostom 390 A.D. and Didymus 379 A.D, Ammonius (Third Century), Hilary (Fourth century), Ephraem the Syrian (306-373 A.D.), Nilus (died 430 A.D.), Jerome (347-420 A.D.), Cyril of Alexandria (376-444 A.D), Augustine (354-430 A.D.), and Theodorus Studita (759-826 A.D.). This is a large number of quotes that even further reinforces the already overwhelming amount of evidence that supports this passage.

These four passages are some of the most heavily contested in the entire Bible. But, as we have seen, modern Bible versions are even further corrupt in removing them or putting them in brackets. The scholarship of today has claimed that these verses don't belong in the Bible, but as we have seen, they are clearly wrong. These verses belong in the Bible just as much as every other verse, and in seeing that they are supported by the Greek manuscripts, early versions, and patristic citations, we have only proved even further that the King James Bible is God's Word to the English-speaking people.

If you use a modern version, you are using a Bible that has been corrupted by the excision of Passages of Scripture. We've already seen how important the Bible is to God, and how important it should be to us. Thus, it should be of utmost concern when modern "scholars" begin attacking the Scriptures by telling us

that parts of it don't belong. To accept modern versions is to reject vital portions of the Bible which are removed by them.

Chapter 12

Claims, Lies, and Questions

This chapter is necessary for at least three reasons. One, although we live in the age of information, misinformation is more rampant than ever before, because of this many have been misled by these claims and blindly believe them to their own detriment. Two, because those who oppose the King James Bible, and instead prefer modern perversions such as the NIV, ESV, and NASB, have not always been faithful to the facts. Because of this deception, whether intentional or incidental, much harm has been done to the truth by the mouths and pens of the so-called 'scholarship' of today. The third reason is simply that the majority of Christians have little knowledge of these subjects, and as such have many questions that they desire to be answered, so the goal in this chapter is to combat the misinformation and lies and to answer some of the questions that honest seekers may have. So, here I have taken some of the most common questions and deceptions that are circulating and answered as many as we have space for.

Common Questions

Question: Is the KJV of today different from what it was in 1611?

Answer: One of the first objections one will encounter when talking about the King James Bible is that the KJV of 1611 differs in tens of thousands of places from the KJV of today. This objection is almost always exaggerated and although it is loosely based on truth, we will see that almost all of the changes are entirely inconsequential.

First, let's look at the types of changes that have occurred since 1611. To understand the different types of changes it needs to be understood that the English language was very different in 1611. In 1611 when the KJV was published there were no set rules for spelling or punctuation, words could be spelled several different ways. Sometimes you would encounter a word spelled two different ways in the same sentence! Today when you write a book or paper, each word must be spelled a specific way, and the punctuation has to be used correctly. It wasn't like that in 1611, as we will see. Before we look at the changes, however, let's look at how the changes occurred.

How did the KJV change between 1611 and today? That's simple, when it first came out the KJV had numerous printing errors that needed to be corrected, so it has been through several different editions over

the years. Between 1613 and 1639 there were several updates for the purpose of correcting many of these printing errors. Alexander McClure, in his book, *The Translators Revived*, said, "Some errors of the press having crept into the first edition, and others into later reprints, King Charles the First, in 1638, had another edition printed at Cambridge, which was revised by Dr. Ward and Mr. Bois, two of the original Translators who still survived, assisted by Dr. Thomas Goad, Mr. Mede, and other learned men".⁷⁵

Another update was made in 1762-69 to correct any lingering printing errors, update the spelling, add more marginal notes and cross-references, and enlarge and standardize the use of italics. This revision began in 1762 and was undertaken by Dr. F.S. Paris of Cambridge University and completed in 1769 by Dr. Benjamin Blayney of Hertford College, Oxford University.⁷⁶ As you can see no major revision of the KJV has ever occurred, save for the purpose of correcting printing errors, updating some spelling, and adding marginal notes/cross references. Now that we've seen how the changes took place, let's look at the types of changes that have occurred.

The first type of change between the 1611 and the KJV of today is printing errors. As I stated before, when the KJV first came out it contained numerous printing errors that had to be corrected. Many of these were of no consequence and were insubstantial, while others were quite humorous. For example, here are a

few of the printing errors that were fixed in the first 28 years after the KJV was released.

Psalm 69:32 -- “seek good” was a printing error in the 1611 that was corrected to “seek God” in 1617

Ecclesiastes 1:5 -- “the place” was a printing error in the 1611 that was corrected to “his place” in 1638.

Matthew 6:3 -- “thy right doeth” was a printing error in the 1611 that was corrected to “thy right hand doeth” in 1613.⁷⁷

In the twenty-eight years following 1611 this was almost exclusively the nature of the changes and corrections made. Several printing errors that occurred became famous for their humorous nature, these included:

The Wicked Bible (1631) omitted “not” in “Thou shalt not commit adultery” in Exodus 20:14.

The Printer’s Bible (1702) read “printers have persecuted me” instead of “princes” in Psalm 119:161

The Vinegar Bible (1717) read “The Parable of the Vinegar” instead of Vineyard.

The Ears to Ear Bible (1810) read “who hath ears to ear let him hear” in Mat. 14:43.

The Rebekah’s Camel’s Bible (1823) read “And Rebekah arose, and her camels [should be damsels]” in Gen. 24:61.⁷⁸

As you can see many printing errors needed to be corrected after 1611, and while modern "scholars" will continually harp on the thousands of changes between the 1611 KJV and the KJV of today, they fail to mention that most of these "changes" are the result of correcting errors made by the printers, and not the translators.

The second type of change is changes in spelling. As I said there were no set rules for spelling in 1611, so many words were spelled quite differently than they are today. For instance, in Old English, they would put an e at the end of a verb, (blinde, sinne, borne,). There were also great differences in letter use back then. They would often use a long s in places, which looked similar to our modern-day f, they also would have the letters u and v reversed, and even swap out i and j. Because they used letters so differently, 'Jesus' would be spelled 'lesvs', 'evil' would be spelled 'euil', and the word 'also' would look like 'alfo'. These are also a large number of the "thousands" of changes between the 1611 KJV and today's KJV.

In conclusion to this question, I think that it can clearly be seen based on what I just showed that the KJV of today is textually the same as the KJV of 1611.

Almost all of the changes are of the same kind as the two basic types that we looked at. The number of substantial changes is unfathomably small. Dr. D. A. Waite personally compared the 1611 KJV to the KJV of today and counted each and every difference. The vast majority of these differences were differences in

spelling, such as blinde to blind, but since these have no translational significance he didn't count them. Of the 791,328 words in the King James Bible, he only found 1,095 differences that affect the sound, of these 1,095 almost all of them are minor changes of form, such as; towards to toward, amongst to among, burnt to burned, etc. These are obviously not changes of any significance. All of these changes amount to about 0.13% of the words in the King James Bible, this number is so small that it's hardly of note.

Here are a few of the substantial changes that he found.

1 Samuel 16:12 -- "requite good" changed to "requite me good"

Esther 1:8 -- "for the king" changed to "for so the king"

Isaiah 47:6 -- "the" changed to "thy"

Isaiah 49:13 -- "God" changed to "Lord"

Isaiah 57:8 "made a" changed to "made thee a"

Ezekiel 3:11 -- "the people" changed to "the children of thy people"

Nahum 3:17 -- "the crowned" changed to "thy crowned"

Acts 8:32 -- "shearer" changed to "his shearer"

Acts 16:1 -- "which was a Jew" changed to "which was a Jewess"

1 Peter 2:5 -- "sacrifice" changed to "sacrifices"

Jude 25 -- "now and ever" changed to "both now and ever"⁷⁹

We can draw two conclusions from this information. One is that the KJV has gone through such an exhaustive purification process that we can have absolute faith in its accuracy. The second is that the "thousands" of changes between the KJV of 1611 and the KJV of today are so minor and inconsequential that they in no way should affect our faith in God's Word.

Question: Isn't the NKJV just an updated version of the KJV?

Answer: A common question people have is whether or not the NKJV is a good translation. The NKJV purports itself to be just another edition of the KJV, but is it really what it claims to be? The first thing you will notice is that the NKJV removes the words "thee" "thine" and "thou", whenever they appear in the KJV. They do so under the guise of "updating the language". The removal of these words may not seem like a big deal, but the words "thee" "thou" and "thine" actually have a very specific meaning that is completely lost in modern versions. We'll look at this more later. This is nothing however when you look at the NKJV side by side with the KJV.

Here are a few examples of places where the NKJV not only disagrees with the KJV but certainly does so incorrectly.

MATTHEW 7:14

KJV “Because STRAIT is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.”

NKJV “Because narrow is the gate and DIFFICULT is the way which leads to life, and there are few who find it.”

Tell me, do “strait” and “difficult” mean the same thing? No, according to Merriam-Webster's dictionary “strait” means “a narrow space or passage”. Does that mean the same thing as difficult? No, to say that “strait is the way” is actually defined later, it's saying that it's considered narrow because there are “few who find it” not because it's difficult to attain salvation. This is just one of the countless areas where the NKJV differs from the KJV in a way that completely undermines the truth of God's Word.

REVELATION 1:18

KJV “I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of HELL and of death.”

NKJV “Re 1:18 “I am He who lives, and was dead, and behold, I am alive forevermore. Amen. And I have the keys of HADES and of Death.”

This is one of the strangest changes that the NKJV makes, repeatedly throughout the text they substitute the word “hell” for the word “hades”. Following is a list of 11 verses where the NKJV uses the word “hades” in place of “hell”

Mt. 5:22

Mt. 5:29

Mt. 5:30

Mt. 10:28

Mt. 11:23

Mt. 16:18

Mt. 18:9

Mt. 23:15

Mt. 23:33

Mk. 9:43, 45, 47

Lk. 10:15

Lk. 12:5

Lk. 16:23

Acts 2:27

Acts 2:31

1 Co. 15:55

James 3:6

2 Pe. 2:4

Re. 1:18

Re. 6:8

Re. 20:13

Re. 20:14

This is an unnecessary and unneeded change that the NKJV translators decided to employ. There are numerous reasons why simply translating the word “hell” is far superior to transliterating it as “hades” but for now this is just meant to show that the NKJV is certainly not “just an updated version of the KJV”.

This is just a small portion of the countless examples that could be given where the NKJV disagrees with the KJV, but this should be enough to demonstrate its untrustworthiness.

In conclusion, The NKJV is just as corrupt as other modern English versions, and just because it falsely uses the name of the KJV does not make it trustworthy. I would certainly avoid this version.

Question: Do archaic words in the KJV need to be updated?

Answer: Before we answer this question, let's answer the question of whether or not the KJV actually contains archaic or obsolete words, and if so, then of what kind. One of the most common arguments against the KJV is that it contains archaic words and phrases that are just impossible for modern readers to understand. This is another argument that is rooted in truth but blown way out of proportion. So does the KJV use archaic language? Absolutely, only a fool would try to say that it doesn't. The KJV occasionally uses words that have fallen out of common use. However, the use of these archaic words are not nearly as common as some would have you believe, in truth, they are few and far between. These "archaic words" usually aren't that hard to understand. Yes, sometimes you may occasionally come across a word that you don't know, but in my experience, the meaning can generally be ascertained by looking at the context that the word is used in. However, while there are some words that can't be figured out with context clues, all you have to do to find the meaning of these is check a dictionary or just look it up. Many editions of the KJV even have definitions of uncommon words in the margins. One of these is, The Defined King James Bible, it is published by the Bible for today and gives a definition for any word that may not be in common use today.

We live in an age where many have sacrificed the very Words of God, on the basis that the KJV uses "archaic" or "obsolete" words. How foolish is it for someone to care so little for the very Words of the living God, that they won't take the time to look in a dictionary? As I stated, these archaic words aren't all that common, so why is it that modern Christianity cares so little for the very Words of the one who redeemed them, that they refuse to occasionally crack open a dictionary or even just glance over to the margin? In today's world of technological advancements, you don't even need to own a dictionary, you can just look it up on your phone, tablet, computer, or any other device you have handy. This problem of archaic words is a non-issue for those who truly care about God's Words.

Now, you may say, 'Why don't we just make a new edition of the KJV where the archaic words are updated?' My answer to this would be to look at what the Bible says about updating archaic words. Many are surprised to hear that the Bible actually does have a form of guidelines for dealing with archaic words, but it is there. 1 Samuel 9:1-11 says;

"Now there was a man of Benjamin, whose name was Kish, the son of Abiel, the son of Zeror, the son of Bechorath, the son of Aphiah, a Benjamite, a mighty man of power.

2 And he had a son, whose name was Saul, a choice young man, and a goodly: and there was not among

the children of Israel a goodlier person than he: from his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people.

3 And the asses of Kish Saul's father were lost. And Kish said to Saul his son, Take now one of the servants with thee, and arise, go seek the asses.

4 And he passed through mount Ephraim, and passed through the land of Shalisha, but they found them not: then they passed through the land of Shalim, and there they were not: and he passed through the land of the Benjamites, but they found them not.

5 And when they were come to the land of Zuph, Saul said to his servant that was with him, Come, and let us return; lest my father leave caring for the asses, and take thought for us.

6 And he said unto him, Behold now, there is in this city a man of God, and he is an honourable man; all that he saith cometh surely to pass: now let us go thither; peradventure he can shew us our way that we should go.

7 Then said Saul to his servant, But, behold, if we go, what shall we bring the man? for the bread is spent in our vessels, and there is not a present to bring to the man of God: what have we?

8 And the servant answered Saul again, and said, Behold, I have here at hand the fourth part of a shekel

of silver: that will I give to the man of God, to tell us our way.

9 (Beforetime in Israel, when a man went to enquire of God, thus he spake, Come, and let us go to the seer: for he that is now called a Prophet was beforetime called a Seer.)

10 Then said Saul to his servant, Well said; come, let us go. So they went unto the city where the man of God was.

11 And as they went up the hill to the city, they found young maidens going out to draw water, and said unto them, Is the seer here?"

Notice something fascinating in this passage, you see, in times past when the events recorded in this passage took place, a prophet was known as a seer. By the time the passage was actually written, the word seer had fallen out of common use, and was replaced by the word prophet. You could say that the word seer had become "archaic". In verse 9, God, through the author, does something very interesting. You see, the word seer had become archaic but instead of just "updating it" God, through the human author, simply informed the reader what the archaic word meant. This is certainly how we should deal with archaic words in our Bible. With the Bible as our final authority, we are to follow it in whatever it says, which includes archaic language. When you come across a word that maybe isn't used in everyday language,

either look to the margin, (if your Bible has those) and if not then look up the meaning of the word in a dictionary or online, then write the definition in the margin next to the word yourself so you won't have to look it up again next time. If you do this, then not only will the "problem" of "archaic" words be completely solved, but you will actually be following exactly what the Bible does in regards to "archaic" words! Now, some people may be wondering, isn't this all just unnecessary work, wouldn't it be easier to just use a modern version that uses modern language? Well, as we have already proven, it really isn't all that much work, and God's Word is certainly important enough that we should be willing to do the work to find out the meaning of a couple words so that we can be sure we have God's unaltered Word.

The first thing you will notice when reading the modern versions (if you have ever used a KJV before) is that the words; thee, thou, thy, and thine are almost completely absent. Those who translate modern English versions deem them to be "archaic" and so they remove them. However, the removal of these words actually does great damage to the meaning of the text. You see, what people don't seem to understand is that in 1611, they didn't talk like that, the words 'thee' and 'thou' weren't a part of everyday language, they were already "archaic". They used them in the KJV to convey further meaning than what simply using the word 'you' could. You see, in the KJV whenever it uses the words 'you' or 'ye' its plural, and whenever it uses words like 'thee', 'thou', 'thy', or

'thine' its singular. For example, when Jesus said, "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again" in this passage Jesus is talking to Nicodemus and uses both forms, thee and ye, notice however, the context clearly shows they don't mean the same thing, or Jesus would have used the same word. When Jesus used the word 'thee' He was speaking directly to Nicodemus, which is why He used the singular form, but when He used the word 'ye' He was referring to everyone, which is why He used the plural form. As you can see in this example removing the word thee completely changes the meaning. You see, in Greek and Hebrew, they had different words for 'you' one plural, and one singular. But, in English today there really isn't an equivalent, so the KJV translators used words like 'thee' and 'thou' to make this important distinction.

Nonetheless, the definition of "archaic" is simply a word that has fallen out of common use, the words 'thee' and 'thou' wouldn't even fall into this category, because almost everyone already knows what they mean and can understand them just fine even without any prior knowledge of the King James Bible. If you walk up to a stranger and say "how art thou doing?" They will probably look at you a little strangely, but they will understand what you are saying just fine, because those words aren't archaic, they're just not as common in everyday conversation as they once were.

In conclusion to this answer, I think that we have seen clearly that while yes, the KJV has "archaic" words, no it certainly does not need to be updated, and anyone can understand it just fine if they will just be willing to put in the work to understand God's Word. In the end, which is more important, convenience or God's Word? I pray that everyone will choose God's Word over their own convenience.

Question: What do the italics mean in the KJV?

Answer: It's simple, when translating from one language to another, such as from Hebrew to English, you will come across words in the Hebrew that don't have a perfect English equivalent. So, when translating, it is required that you include certain words that aren't found in the Hebrew so that the text can be easily understood. The italics in the KJV are those words that the KJV translators inserted so that the text could be read, and more importantly, understood. They wanted the reader to be able to differentiate what the text exactly says, from how it would be best translated in English, so it includes italics. This is yet another point where the KJV is superior to modern versions. When the KJV translators inserted these extra words, they marked them so the reader would be able to tell them apart from the rest of the text. Modern versions on the other hand fail to do this, they instead include these words directly into the passage without giving the reader the ability to tell them from the rest of the text, failing to show as much honesty as the KJV translators.

Question: Did the KJV originally contain the Apocrypha?

Well, another common question people have regarding the KJV debate comes from a very common subject that those opposed to the King James Bible often bring up, and that is the subject of the Apocrypha. Basically, the question goes, "If the original King James Bible contained the Apocrypha, how can we trust the rest of it?" This is a very good question and I think that it's important for us to be able to address this issue. The simple fact is, when the original King James Bible came out in 1611, it contained what is known as the Apocrypha, which is simply a collection of ancient writings. These extra writings are accepted by the Roman Catholic church as simply more books of the Bible, but the fact of the matter is that these books are not Scripture. They are heretical, and contradictory. These "extra books" not only contain teaching that contradicts the Bible, but they actually contradict themselves! These books are not Scripture, so, why were they included in the original KJV? Does their inclusion bring the rest of the KJV into question? Let's start by answering the first question, why they were included. The translators of the King James Bible include the Apocrypha, but not as Scripture. They were firm believers in the Word of God and as such rejected the Apocrypha, listing seven reasons why they rejected the Apocrypha as Scripture:

- “1. Not one of them is in the Hebrew language, which was alone used by the inspired historians and poets of the Old Testament.
2. Not one of the writers lays any claim to inspiration.
3. These books were never acknowledged as sacred Scriptures by the Jewish Church, and therefore were never sanctioned by our Lord.
4. They were not allowed a place among the sacred books, during the first four centuries of the Christian Church.
5. They contain fabulous statements, and statements which contradict not only the canonical Scriptures, but themselves; as when, in the two Books of Maccabees, Antiochus Epiphanes is made to die three different deaths in as many different places.
6. The Apocrypha inculcates doctrines at variance with the Bible, such as prayers for the dead and sinless perfection.
7. It teaches immoral practices, such as lying, suicide, assassination and magical incantation.”⁸⁰

However, while the translators of the King James Bible did not believe it to be Scripture, they did acknowledge that it contained valuable historical context. They included it in the translation to add context to what was being read, the Apocrypha may not be inspired Scripture, but because it was written in the same time period as the Bible it can be used to

obtain historical context on the events of the Bible and to shed light on things like the culture of the ancient world. What's also important in regards to the inclusion of the Apocrypha in the KJV is where they included it. If you pick up a Catholic Bible, you will find the Apocrypha is scattered throughout the text, which is where Roman Catholicism thinks they should be, mixed in with the rest. But, in the 1611 KJV, the Apocrypha was not scattered throughout the genuine books as with Catholic Bibles. Instead, the translators placed all of the Apocryphal books in between the Old and New Testaments, completely separate from the real text of Scripture. To further make sure that you understood that the Apocrypha was separate from the rest of the Bible, they had the word Apocrypha in large bold letters at the top of every single page. So, while they included the Apocrypha, they made certain to separate from the rest of the Bible.

So, does the inclusion of the Apocrypha throw doubt on the reliability of the KJV? No! It certainly does not, the King James translators did not consider the Apocrypha to be Scripture, but only included them for historical and cultural context. They even had them separate from the rest of the text, with the word Apocrypha stamped on the top of every page. The inclusion of the Apocrypha for historical context in the original KJV doesn't make it less trustworthy any more than having some maps in the back of it like many Bibles do today.

Question: In light of the KJVs superiority, how should we view other translations?

This question is as common as the others, and there are many variations of answers you will receive if you ask this question, but I believe that only one is truly biblical. Most commonly the views you will find amongst those who hold to the KJV are as follows.

1. Complete separation. This view basically holds that besides the KJV, all other translations are corrupt, and as such they and everyone who uses them are heretics. This view drives its adherents to completely disfellowshipping with those who use modern versions, sometimes even doubting their salvation.

2. Complete acceptance. This view holds that while the KJV is superior, modern versions are also acceptable. The adherents of this view often primarily use the KJV, but also use modern versions alongside it.

3. In between. This is the view that I believe is correct for several reasons. Somewhere in between the other two views, but far closer to the first one than the second. Basically, it's summed up as thus, modern versions are corrupt, and should never be used. However, it is not necessary to disfellowship from those who do use them. I do not agree with those who claim that the Bible translation debate is secondary to salvation and thus unimportant. While I do agree that salvation is the single most important issue, that is no excuse to downplay other vital issues such as this.

However, many are simply not aware of the facts, simply not knowing that the Bible they are using is corrupt. Those who use a modern version can certainly still be saved, and I believe they can even be sincere, but they are wrong. This is not a reason for disfellowshipping though. I am a firm believer in the King James Bible, I will never waver in that belief because that is where the burden of evidence lies, biblically, historically, and logically. However, there are many people I call friends and even family who disagree with me on this issue. I believe they are wrong, and I have told some of them this, I've explained why I think they are wrong as well. We don't see eye to eye on this issue, but we can still be friends, we can still have fellowship, and I still value their advice and their opinions. One year while I was at camp I had a conversation on this topic with that week's speaker, Bro. Jim Schettler, and I will never forget the illustration he gave to describe modern translations. He said, if you take a can of soda, and you pour it in a glass, then you have a glass of soda. Then, if you fill the glass the rest of the way with water, then you have a glass of watered down soda. Is there still soda in the glass? Yes, if you look in the glass you can still find soda in it, it's still there, it's just watered down. This is how he explained modern versions. Modern versions are watered down, they are corrupted. You can still find the truth in them, it's still there, but it's watered down. In the analogy I've repeatedly used in this book, it's like a sword. Modern versions are still swords, they can still be used in

combat, but they are dull. They are not completely worthless, there is still truth that can be found in them, but they are dull. They are watered down. They should not be used. So, while I believe modern versions are corrupted, and only the KJV is the pure Bible, God can still use them to bring people to Him, and those who know the truth can still have fellowship, and learn from those who use other translations.

Question: Can you be saved from another version?

Now, I won't spend as much time answering this question as some of the others, because this isn't complicated. For context, there are those who claim that you can only be saved from the KJV, and that if you accepted salvation from an NIV, ESV, or NASB then that salvation is null. It didn't really happen, it doesn't exist. All because the translation you used was wrong. For those of you that have made it this far into this book you may not be able to answer this question immediately, I've gone into great detail about the inherent corruption of modern versions. However, here I must make one thing absolutely clear, salvation is by grace alone through faith, and the translation that is used to show you that **does not matter**. If you were biblically saved, then it doesn't matter if you used a KJV, NIV, or none of the above. You can come to an understanding of salvation without ever reading or being quoted the Bible. You can be saved with a

gospel tract, or even a billboard. The method by which you learn of Christ and His sacrifice **does not matter**. Our salvation isn't based on the method by which we were introduced to God, but our faith in Him. As followers of Christ, and believers in the King James Bible we need to be clear on this. We are saved by Christ, not the King James Bible, and people who confuse that are teaching heresy, whether they admit it or not.

Common Claims

Claim: Modern Bibles are based on better and older manuscripts.

Well, this is the most common claim one will run into when researching the subject of Bible translations, but it is unfounded. Basically, modern 'scholars' say that because the 'oldest and best' manuscripts (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) agree with the Critical Text and that the Bibles translated from it are superior. This claim shouldn't take long at all seeing as how we've already extensively looked at the major differences between the Textus Receptus and Critical Text. But, are modern versions based on older and better manuscripts? Well, while Sinaiticus and Vaticanus may be old, they're certainly not better. We've already looked at their inherent corruption, and seen how untrustworthy they are in previous chapters, so we won't get into that again here. If you want to re-examine the evidence showing the corruption of these manuscripts I would suggest turning back to the

chapter on modern versions New Testament texts. So, obviously, the claim that modern versions are based on better manuscripts is certainly false, but are they based on an older text and older manuscripts? Well, this is one more area where modern scholarship has pulled the wool over people's eyes. We already saw that the Textus Receptus type text can be traced all the way back to the apostles, while the Critical Text cannot. So, which text is older? The Textus Receptus will win that battle every time. But, are modern versions based on older manuscripts? In truth, we can't truly know if this is the case. We know that countless manuscripts agree with the Textus Receptus from all over the world, from the same time period and even older than Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, but we don't know for absolute certainty the age of all the manuscripts involved in the forming of Erasmus first edition of the Textus Receptus in 1516 which we will look at in the next claim. However, despite our lack of knowledge in Erasmus manuscripts, we do know that there *are* manuscripts that are quite ancient which at the very least agree with the Textus Receptus.

So, in summary, when modern scholarship claims that translations such as the NIV, ESV, NLT, and NASB are based on 'older and better' manuscripts, we can know for certain that this claim is unfounded and untruthful. The King James Bible is stronger in its textual basis, and no modern version can stand against it.

Claim: Erasmus only used a handful of manuscripts in forming his Textus Receptus

This is probably the second most common claim that you will run into. Basically, they say that the Textus Receptus can't be trusted because when Erasmus originally published it in 1516 he entirely based it on only a few manuscripts. Obviously, I have many problems with this argument to begin with. One, God promised to preserve His Word for all generations, if He decides to do that with just a handful of manuscripts then so be it. God is powerful enough to perfectly preserve His Word through only one manuscript if that is what He desires. Two, those who claim that Erasmus only used a handful of manuscripts aren't being entirely honest with the facts. There is a lot to discuss when answering this claim, but we don't have enough room to go over all of it so we'll just look at some of the most notable evidence. While it is true that when Erasmus created his Textus Receptus he had only about 7 manuscripts before him (according to the Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal the manuscripts he had in his possession were: Codex 1eap, Codex 1r, Codex 2e, Codex 2ap, Codex 4ap, Codex 7p, Codex 817.) This is no reason to think that those were the only seven manuscripts that he had ever seen. You need to understand that Bible manuscripts were rare and expensive, and so while he was only able to come into possession of those 7 he had extensively traveled the world searching every nook and cranny for manuscripts to examine. It is an undisputed fact that in the years

leading up to Erasmus creating the Textus Receptus he had extensively traveled and examined countless manuscripts. Due to Erasmus's fame, he was given access to many manuscripts, and also many libraries where he would search for biblical manuscripts to examine.

It was said by Beatus Rhenanus in a letter to a friend that Erasmus had arrived in Basel with, among other things, "copious notes on the New Testament".⁸¹ Although much weight is given to the number of manuscripts that Erasmus did or didn't have, people seem perfectly content to ignore the fact that he carried with him the notes from a lifetime's worth of studies into various manuscripts and their variants. It was said in a letter written by Erasmus on July 8, 1514 (just before he would've arrived in Basel) that "After collation of Greek and other ancient manuscripts, I have emended the whole New Testament, and I have annotated over a thousand passages, not without benefit to theologians." So, as can clearly be seen, while Erasmus only had seven manuscripts in his possession in 1516 during the production of the Textus Receptus, he also had a lifetime of studying variant readings amongst New Testament manuscripts, not to mention the "copious" amount of notes he had made on the subject, and the fact that he had annotated over 1000 passages. It is also reported that he actually had access to Codex Vaticanus, but willfully chose not to use it. In his book, *The Historic Origin of the Bible*, Edwin Bissel states that he probably could have obtained a transcript of

the Vaticanus, but never even requested one. What even further proves that he willfully chose not to use the Vaticanus is documented in S. P. Tregelles' book, *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek Testament*, Tregelles says that in 1522 Erasmus sent a letter to his friend Paulus Bombasius, asking him to examine the Vaticanus manuscript on his behalf in regards to 1 John 5:7-8. The significance of this is that Erasmus was in contact with a man who had complete access to the manuscript and was perfectly willing to send him transcripts. Also of note is that in Frederic Kenyon's book, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, he reports that in 1533 a correspondent of Erasmus sent him selected readings of Codex Vaticanus, however, these selected readings never made an appearance in any of his editions of the *Textus Receptus*. Meaning, that since he undoubtedly had access to the Vaticanus, the only explanation for his not using it is the simple fact that he did not believe that it was as accurate as the manuscripts that he had in his possession and that he had previously examined. So as I think this has clearly demonstrated, Erasmus wasn't constrained to just the seven manuscripts that he had in his possession, but had extensive knowledge of New Testament textual variants, and even had access to certain manuscripts that he chose not to use.

Summary, well this second claim is certainly false. In these few pages, we have seen beyond doubt that Erasmus certainly had access to more than just those seven manuscripts, and also had spent an entire

lifetime studying the New Testament text and brought those notes with him and had them when he was collating the Textus Receptus. Which truly best represents the far majority of New Testament manuscripts.

Claim: The KJV has errors

Now, this claim is a little harder to combat because of the variety of alleged ‘errors’ that the person who employs this argument usually presents. Because of this variety, it would be necessary to go over each and every example of an alleged error that is presented, but in this volume we will only examine the one most commonly presented.

The one I wanted to examine is the inclusion of the word ‘Easter’ in Acts 12:3-4 which says “And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also. (Then were the days of unleavened bread.) And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people.” Most people are unaware that there is any controversy in this passage, but ‘scholars’ take issue with the KJV. Basically, they say that this is an error in the King James Bible and that the word there translated as ‘Easter’ should instead be translated as ‘Passover’. However, as we will briefly see, the word ‘Easter’ most certainly belongs in the Bible, and it is in fact the modern versions that are introducing an error into this verse. Well, this is

actually quite simple to resolve, we learn in Exodus 12:6 and Leviticus 23:5 that the day of Passover is on Abib 14th and that this is immediately followed by the feast of unleavened bread, which according to Exodus 12:15-20 and Leviticus 23:6-8 falls on Abib 15th through the 21st. This means that by the time this verse took place, the days of unleavened bread had just ended and so the word Easter couldn't be translated as Passover because Passover comes before the days of unleavened bread, not after it. This proves that the word Easter belongs in the King James Bible, and translating it as Passover actually introduces an irresolvable error into the text. Further, we see that this word is in fact translated as Passover at least 28 other times (Matthew 26:2,17,18,19; Mark 14:1,12,14,16; Luke 2:41; Luke 22:1,7,8,11,13,15; John 2:13,23; John 6:4; John 11:55; John 12:1; John 13:1; John 18:28,39; John 19:14; 1 Corinthians 5:7; Hebrews 11:28). So, clearly the KJV translators knew that this word meant Passover in normal circumstances, but recognized that this was a unique case and thus translated it as Easter.

Maybe add one more error, the sentence highlighted above says a few but then you did one so either add or delete the sentence????

Well, this is only one of the alleged 'errors' that 'scholars' claim are in the KJV, but hopefully, this will at least show that even though modern scholarship claims that the KJV has errors, they are wrong on all counts. The KJV is God's Word to the

English-speaking people and contains no errors. I have personally examined countless different alleged errors that are claimed to be found within the KJV, and every single time have found that the claim was either born from deception or ignorance. The KJV has absolutely no errors, and this only further cements that it is in fact God's Word.

Chapter Thirteen

Conclusion

Well, this book is far from being exhaustive, but regardless we have gone over a lot of information, so I feel it necessary to have a brief summary of what we've looked at. We saw why all of this matters, to begin with. We saw three of the most important doctrines in regard to this subject. We saw the superiority of the Old Testament text of the KJV and the inferiority of the Old Testament text of modern versions. We saw the superiority of the New Testament text of the KJV and the inferiority of the New Testament text of modern versions. We saw the difference between the Alexandrian and Antiochian text streams, we saw the superior translation and translators of the KJV, and we saw the superior theology of the KJV. We saw the legitimacy of several 'problem passages' and finally, we saw the answers to some common claims and questions. This is a lot of information but was hopefully presented straightforwardly and understandably. My purpose in this book has been to present some of the evidence supporting the superiority of the King James Bible and

although this is far from all of it, my hope and prayer is that what is contained in these pages will show you that the King James Bible is God's Word to the English speaking people, and that no matter what the world thinks it will always remain.

In the Garden of Eden, Satan began his attacks on God's Words when he said "Yea hath God said...". Since then he has relentlessly attacked and besieged the very Words of God. As we saw his plan was furthered in Alexandria, with Pantaenus, Clement, Origen, and their heretical corrupting of the Scriptures. Then when that didn't work as well as Satan planned he used the Catholic church in an attempt to destroy the Scriptures by force. Now, Satan veils his attacks on God's Words with the name of 'scholarship'. By using this title he has deceived millions into using his false corrupted versions. Whether Satan uses plain deception, subtle corruption, persecution, or 'modern scholarship', Satan's plan has always been the same. To destroy God's Word. However, although Satan's attacks have been relentless through the years, despite all of this, God's Word has endured. God's people have always had access to His Word in some form, whether that be in the Textus Receptus, or the King James Bible which was translated from it, God has always protected and preserved His Word. As long as time continues, the King James Bible will always stand, although the majority may reject it, there will always be those who stand for God's Word, the King James Bible.

However, although I may endeavor to prove beyond any doubt that the KJV is God's Word, ultimately, it is up to the reader to examine what is documented in this book and decide whether or not the KJV is superior to modern versions.

God's Word is our sword. When going into battle you want your sword to be made of the right materials, made by the best blacksmiths, made in the correct way, and as sharp as can be. If this is the criteria we would apply to an earthly sword, then why not hold our spiritual sword to the same standard?

For my entire life, I have used the KJV, and for the longest amount of time, I simply used it because that's what I was told to use. My parents used it, my church used it, almost everyone I knew held to the KJV, so I did too. But, now, after reading thousands of pages and spending countless hours studying the subject, I can say with absolute certainty that the KJV perfectly preserves, through accurate translation, the inspired Words of God contained in the Hebrew Masoretic Text, and the Greek Textus Receptus. In these pages I have endeavored to show some of the reasons why I believe that the KJV is God's Word, and why I will never abandon it. This isn't an exhaustive book and is far from all of the reasons I hold to the KJV, but is only a small portion of the evidence supporting the King James Bible. If I were to include all of the evidence for the KJV's superiority this work would be many times longer, but for the sake of space I only included a portion of it. I would highly encourage any who reads

this not to stop, but to dig deeper and continue to study this most important subject. I have spent many hours studying it and have never regretted it. I would encourage everyone to take the time to look into this subject.

Much more could be said on the superiority of the King James Bible, but I feel that what I have written here is at least enough to show any who reads this that the KJV is God's inerrant Word preserved for us in the English language and that modern versions are corrupt. As I have stated I believe that all Christians should study this most important subject and that they strive always to learn more. "Study to show thyself approved unto God..." It is my hope and prayer that all who read this heed the message it contains.

Appendix A

The rules followed the King James translators:

1. The ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit.
2. The names of the prophets and the holy writers, with the other names in the text, to be retained, as near as may be, accordingly as they are vulgarly used.
3. The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, as the word church, not to be translated congregation.
4. When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogies of faith.
5. The division of chapters to be altered either not at all, or as little as may be, if necessity so require.
6. No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek words, which cannot, without some circumlocution, so briefly and fitly be expressed, in the text.
7. Such quotations of places to be marginally set down as shall serve for the fit reference of one Scripture to another.
8. Every particular man of each company to take the same chapter or chapters; and, having translated or amended them severally by himself where he thinks good, all to meet together to confirm what they have done, and agree for their part what shall stand.
9. As any one company hath dispatched any one book in this manner, they shall send it to the rest, to be considered of seriously and judiciously; for his Majesty is very careful on this point.
10. If any company, upon the review of the book so sent, shall doubt or differ upon any places, to send them word

thereof, to note the places, and therewithal to send their reasons; to which if they consent not, the difference to be compounded at the general meeting, which is to be of the chief persons of each company, at the end of the work.

11. When any place of special obscurity is doubted of, letters to be directed by authority to send to any learned man in the land for his judgment of such a place.

12. Letters to be sent from every bishop to the rest of his clergy, admonishing them of this translation in hand, and to move and charge as many as, being skillful in the tongues, have taken pains in that kind, to send their particular observations to the company, either at Westminster, Cambridge, or Oxford, according as it was directed before in the king's letter to the archbishop.

13. The directors in each company to be the Deans of Westminster and Chester, for Westminster, and the king's professors in Hebrew and Greek in the two universities.

14. These translations to be used, when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible: Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Matthew's [Rogers'], Whitchurch's [Cranmer's], Geneva."

15. By a later rule, "three or four of the most ancient and grave divines, in either of the universities, not employed in translating, to be assigned to be overseers of the translation, for the better observation of the fourth rule."

Appendix B

The translators of the King James Bible:

Launcelot Andrews
John Overall
Hadrian Saravia
Richard Clarke
John Laifield
Robert Tighe
Francis Burleigh
Geoffry King
Richard Thompson
William Bedwell
Edward Lively
John Richardson
Lawrence Chaderton
Francis Dillingham
Roger Andrews
Thomas Harrison
Robert Spaulding
Andrew Bing
John Harding
John Reynolds
Thomas Holland
Richard Kilby
Miles Smith
Richard Brett
[Daniel] Fairclough
Thomas Ravis

George Abbot
Richard Eedes
Giles Tomson
Sir Henry Savile
John Peryn
Ralph Ravens
John Harmar
William Barlow
John Spencer
Roger Fenton
Ralph Hutchinson
William Dakins
Michael Rabbet
Mr. Sanderson
John Duport
William Brainthwaite
Jeremiah Radcliffe
Samuel Ward
Andrew Downes
John Bois
John Ward
John Aglionby
Leonard Hutten

Supervisors of the Work.

Thomas Bilson
Richard Bancroft

Endnotes

1. Waite, Donald A. *Defending the King James Bible*. 3rd ed., *The Bible for Today Press*, 2006. p. 41.
2. Ibid.
3. Vistar, Deolito. *The Neo-Orthodox View of Divine Revelation*. 2009. Masters thesis. Pg 5.
4. Waite, Donald A. *Defending the King James Bible*. 3rd ed., *The Bible for Today Press*, 2006. p. 24
5. Miller, Herbert S. Rev. *General Biblical Introduction*. *The Word-Bearer Press*, 1937.
6. Waite, Donald A. *Defending the King James Bible*. 3rd ed., *The Bible for Today Press*, 2006. p. 28
7. Ibid., p. 29
8. Ibid., p. 30
9. Ibid., p. 44-48
10. Ibid., p. 56-57
11. Ibid., p. 53-56
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid., p. 45-48
14. Burgon, John W. *Revision Revised*. *John Murray*, 1883. p. 11.
15. Brooks, J T. *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century*. *Baker Pub Group*, 1999. p. 264.
16. Fuller, David O. *Which Bible*. *Grand Rapids International Publication*, 1970. p. 58.
17. "Hebrews 1:3 A Manuscript Changes and a Rebuke." *Taylormarshall.Com*,

taylormarshall.com/2018/04/hebrews-13-manu-script-changes-rebuke.html.

18. Parker, D C. *Codex Sinaiticus: The Story of the Worlds Oldest Bible*. The British Library Publishing, 2010. p. 76.
19. Grady, William P. *Final Authority*. Grady Publications Inc, 1993. p. 218.
20. Riplinger, Gail . *New Age Bible Versions*. AV Publications, 2021. p. 441.
21. Waite, Donald A. *The Theological Heresies of Westcott and Hort*. Bible For Today Publishers, 1979.
22. Ibid.
23. Burgon, John W. *Revision Revised*. John Murray, 1883. p. 11.
24. *Pictorial Bible Dictionary*. Zondervan Publishing House, 1968. p. 29.
25. *Smith's Bible Dictionary*. Nelson. p. 30
26. *Aid to Bible Understanding*. Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, 1971. p. 50.
27. Wace, Henry. *A Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature to the End of the Sixth Century AD with an Account of the Principle Sects and Heresies*. Hendrickson Pub, 1994.
28. Grady, William P. *Final Authority*. Grady Publications Inc, 1993. p. 82
29. Ibid., 84
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid.

33. Bruce, F F. *Canon of Scripture*. IVP Academic, 2018. p. 189.
34. *Ante Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, *Eerdmans Pub Co*, 1867.
35. Ibid.
36. *Eerdmans Handbook to the History of Christianity*. Lion Publishing, 1978. p. 125.
37. Ibid., p. 102-103
38. Cairns, Earle E. *Christianity Through the Centuries*. Zondervan Publishing House, 1964. pp. 120-122.
39. *Eerdmans Handbook to the History of Christianity*. Lion Publishing, 1978. p. 104
40. "King James Bible History."
ThekingsBible.Com,
thekingsBible.com/library/Biblehistory.
41. Waite, Donald A. *Defending the King James Bible*. 3rd ed., *The Bible for Today Press*, 2006. p. 68
42. Ibid., p. 70
43. Ibid.
44. Ibid.
45. Ibid., p. 71
46. Ibid., p. 73
47. Ibid., p. 75
48. Ibid., p. 76
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid., p. 78
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid., p. 77

53. Goeman, Peter. "The 15 Rules Behind the Making of the KJV." *Petergoeman.Com*, 26 Jul. 2025,
petergoeman.com/15-rules-behind-the-making-of-the-kjv/.
54. "The Johannine Comma of 1 John 5:7-8: Added or Removed?" *Bereanpatriot.Com*, 8 Mar. 2018,
www.bereanpatriot.com/the-johannine-comma-of-1-john-57-8-added-or-removed/
55. Ibid.
56. Tertullian. *Tertullian against Praxeus*. Delphi Classics, 2018.
57. Ibid.
58. "Cyprian a Third Century Witness to the Authenticity of 1 John 5:7." *Textandtranslation.Org*,
www.textandtranslation.org/cyprian-a-third-century-witness-to-the-authenticity-of-1-john-57/.
59. Victor of Vitensis, *Historia persecutionis Africanae*, quoted in Michael Maynard, *A History of the Debate over 1 John 5:7-8*, p. 43.
60. Scrivener, Frederick H. A. *A Plain Introduction to the New Testament*. vol. 2, George Bell and Sons, 1861. p. 403.
61. "The Johannine Comma of 1 John 5:7-8: Added or Removed?" *Bereanpatriot.Com*, 8 Mar. 2018,
www.bereanpatriot.com/the-johannine-comma-of-1-john-57-8-added-or-removed/

62. Burgon, John W. *Revision Revised. John Murray*, 1883. p. 422-423.
63. Snapp, James Jr. "A Case for the Longer Ending of Mark." *Textandcanon.Org*, 1 Jun. 2025,
textandcanon.org/a-case-for-the-longer-ending-of-mark/.
64. Ibid.
65. Ibid.
66. Snapp, James Jr. *A Fresh Analysis of John 7:53-8:11. James Snapp Jr.*, 2018. p. 10.
67. Ibid., p. 11
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid
70. Ibid.
71. Ibid.. p.12
72. Ibid.
73. Holland, Thomas. *Crowned with Glory. IUniverse*, 2000.
74. Ibid.
75. McClure, Alexander. *The Translators Revived. Filiquarian Legacy Publishing*, 2012.
76. Waite, Donald A. *Defending the King James Bible*. 3rd ed., *The Bible for Today Press*, 2006.
p. 237
77. Cloud, David. "Changes To The KJV Since 1611." *Wayoflife.Org*, 17 Jun. 2015,
www.wayoflife.org/reports/changes_to_kjv_since_1611.html.
78. Ibid.
79. Ibid

80. Waite, Donald A. *Defending the King James Bible*. 3rd ed., *The Bible for Today Press*, 2006.
p. 72-73
81. "Desiderius Erasmus." *Textus-receptus.Com*,
textus-receptus.com/wiki/Erasmus#Basel.

Bibliography

- Waite, Donald A. *Defending the King James Bible*. 3rd ed., *The Bible for Today Press*, 2006.
- Miller, Herbert S. Rev. *General Biblical Introduction*. *The Word-Bearer Press*, 1937.
- Burgon, John W. *Revision Revised*. *John Murray*, 1883.
- Brooks, J T. *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century*. *Baker Pub Group*, 1999.
- Fuller, David O. *Which Bible*. *Grand Rapids International Publication*, 1970.
- Parker, D C. *Codex Sinaiticus: The Story of the Worlds Oldest Bible*. *The British Library Publishing*, 2010.
- Grady, William P. *Final Authority*. *Grady Publications Inc*, 1993.
- Riplinger, Gail . *New Age Bible Versions*. *AV Publications*, 2021.
- *Pictorial Bible Dictionary*. *Zondervan Publishing House*, 1968.
- *Smith's Bible Dictionary*. *Nelson*.
- *Aid to Bible Understanding*. *Watchtower Bible and Tract Society*, 1971.
- Wace, Henry. *A Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature to the End of the Sixth Century AD with an Account of the Principle Sects and Heresies*. *Hendrickson Pub*, 1994.
- Bruce, F F. *Canon of Scripture*. *IVP Academic*, 2018.

- *Ante Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, *Eerdmans Pub Co*, 1867.
- Cairns, Earle E. *Christianity Through the Centuries*. *Zondervan Publishing House*, 1964.
- *Eerdmans Handbook to the History of Christianity*. *Lion Publishing*, 1978.
- Tertullian. *Tertullian against Praxeus*. *Delphi Classics*, 2018.
- Michael Maynard, *A History of the Debate over 1 John 5:7-8*,
- Scrivener, Frederick H. A. *A Plain Introduction to the New Testament*. vol. 2, *George Bell and Sons*, 1861.
- Snapp, James Jr. *A Fresh Analysis of John 7:53-8:11*. *James Snapp Jr.*, 2018.
- Holland, Thomas. *Crowned with Glory*. *IUniverse*, 2000.
- McClure, Alexander. *The Translators Revived*. *Filiquarian Legacy Publishing*, 2012.
- Waite, Donald A. *The Theological Heresies of Westcott and Hort*. *Bible For Today Publishers*, 1979.
- Driscoll, Mark , and Gerry Breshears. *Doctrine*. *Crossway*, 2010.
- Jones, James Jr. *The Doctrine of the Word of God*.
- Hills, Edward F. *The King James Version Defended*. 1956.
- Riplinger, Gail. *In Awe of Thy Word*. *A.V. Publications*, 2003.

- Ray, Jasper J. *God Wrote Only One Bible. The Eye Opener Publishers*, 1976.
- Hoskier, H C. *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions. Bernard Quaritch*, 1911.
- Hoskier, H C. *Codex B and Its Allies. Bernard Quaritch*, 1914.
- Moorman, Jack. *Forever Settled*. 1985.
- Gipp, Sam. *An Understandable History of the Bible. DayStar Publishing*, 1987.
- Daniels, David W. *Is the Worlds Oldest Bible a Fake. Chick Publications*, 2017.
- Ouellette, R B. *A More Sure Word. Striving Together Publications*, 2013.