"FOUR REASONS *for* DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE"

By
Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D., Director
THE BIBLE FOR TODAY
900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, NJ 08108
(Phone: 856-854-4452)

B.F.T. #2423

"FOUR REASONS
for
DEFENDING
THE KING JAMES BIBLE"

By Rev. D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D., Director
THE BIBLE FOR TODAY
900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, NJ 08108
(Phone: 609-854-4452)

B.F.T. #2423

*[NOTE: This review is taken from a message delivered on Wednesday, July 21, 1993, at the 15th Annual Meeting of the DEAN BURGON SOCIETY, given at the Berean Baptist Church, Greenwood, Indiana. It is a brief summary of the author's book entitled DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE. Throughout this presentation, the book has been abbreviated as "**DKJB**." For those who want a more in-depth discussion of the various subjects referred to, the page numbers in the book are given. The book (**B.F.T. #1594-P**) is available from THE BIBLE FOR TODAY (900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, NJ 08108), THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY (Box 354, Collingswood, NJ 08108) or from your local bookstore for a GIFT of $12.00.]*

BACKGROUND OBSERVATIONS

This booklet is a quick review of the book, *DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE--A Four-fold Superiority--Texts, Translators, Technique, and Theology*. It is now in its second printing. The review will consider **"FOUR REASONS FOR DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE."**

A. ORGANIZATION OF THE THEME.

BIBLE PRESERVATION and some other introductory matters will begin the review. Then it will focus on four reasons for defending the KING JAMES BIBLE, namely, its:

(1) SUPERIOR TEXTS (HEBREW AND GREEK);
(2) SUPERIOR TRANSLATORS;
(3) SUPERIOR TECHNIQUE; and
(4) SUPERIOR THEOLOGY.

B. BIBLE PRESERVATION [*DKJB*, pp. 6-19].

The Lord Jesus Christ said: *"Heaven and earth shall pass away, . . ." (Matthew 24:35a)* Most people don't believe this these days. They cannot bring themselves to believe that "**heaven and earth shall pass away**." They view "**heaven and earth**" as something that is permanent. We call the earth *terra firma*, the "firm earth." We take it for granted, but the Lord Jesus Christ, the Creator of both the heaven and the earth, said they will pass away.

In the next part of the verse, He said: *". . . but My Words shall not pass away." (Matthew 24:35b)* I believe that these words, spoken by the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, are the cause of a problem many people have today. Why do I say that? Because the Lord Jesus brought up the subject of **BIBLE PRESERVATION**. Many do not wish to accept this doctrine. This truth doesn't cause a problem for the DEAN BURGON SOCIETY because it believes God has preserved His Words both in the Hebrew Old Testament text and in the Greek New Testament text. But the people that deny the **PRESERVATION** of God's Words have a problem. They wonder where the Words of God are. They don't believe God's Words have been **PRESERVED**.

The Bible teaches **BIBLE PRESERVATION** very clearly. There are many verses that teach this Bible doctrine. Here are two:

> *(Psalms 12:6) "The **Words of the Lord** {are} pure words: {as} silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times."*
> *(Psalms 12:7) "**Thou shalt keep Them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve Them from this generation for ever**."*

God Himself **"shall keep Them"** and **"preserve Them."** This refers to His **WORDS!** That's the meaning of these verses. Our Lord is the One Who is going to **"keep Them"** and **"preserve Them from this generation for ever."** So, God has caused a problem for modern men and women. Because many don't believe that the words of Moses, the words of David, the words of Paul, the words of James, the words of John, and the words of all of the other Bible writers have been preserved right down to the very present in the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek texts. The fact of the matter is that God's Words have been **PRESERVED** because God keeps His promises. He has not faulted on one of them. He has never gone back on His Word!

Someone might ask, "How long can God `**keep**' and `**preserve**' His Words? He certainly couldn't `**keep Them**' until the 20th or 21st century, could He? He couldn't `**keep Them**' until today, and beyond, could He?" I believe that He not only CAN do this, but that He HAS DONE this! I have a Bible verse for that type of questioner:

> *(Psalms 105:8) "He hath remembered His covenant for ever, **the Word {which} He commanded to a thousand generations**."*

"**He hath commanded His covenant**," that's the Word He promised to "**keep**" and "**preserve**" "**for ever**." It is the Word "**He commanded to a thousand generations**." If a generation is twenty years, what would "**a thousand generations**" be equal to? This means God would PRESERVE His Words for 20,000 years. If a

generation is thirty years, this would mean God would PRESERVE His Words for 30,000 years. Do you think mankind will be around on this old earth that long? He's not finished PRESERVING His Words. This refers specifically to the Hebrew Words of the Old Testament, and the Greek Words of the New Testament. The **DEAN BURGON SOCIETY (DBS)** has as its motto and goal: "IN DEFENSE OF TRADITIONAL BIBLE TEXTS." It believes that the texts that God has Providentially PRESERVED are the Hebrew and Greek texts that underlie the KING JAMES BIBLE. These Hebrew and Greek texts are available (either from THE BIBLE FOR TODAY or THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY) in printed book form TODAY! The **DBS** believes that God has PRESERVED them right down to the present. God's PRESERVATION of His Words is the very thing many people today are doubting. The Society also believes that because of its **superior** texts, translators, technique, and theology, the KING JAMES BIBLE is the place where God has preserved (small "p") in English those Words in Hebrew and Greek that He has Preserved (capital "P") according to His promises. The **DBS** "ARTICLES OF FAITH" state:

> **"We believe that all the verses in the KING JAMES VERSION belong in the Old and the New Testaments because they represent words we believe were in the original Texts." [Dean Burgon Society's "ARTICLES OF FAITH," p. 3]**

I believe that the KING JAMES BIBLE is the only repository currently published in the English language today where every one of God's Preserved Hebrew and Greek Words have been accurately translated and by this means preserved in English. The KING JAMES BIBLE translators, with young Samuel of old, "**did let none of His Words fall to the ground.**" They translated every one of them into English, and they did so accurately! *(1 Samuel 3:19) "And **Samuel** grew, and the Lord was with him, and **did let none of his words fall to the ground**."* In this manner, God has preserved all of His Words in translated form for the benefit of the English speaking world. This is why I believe I can speak of the KING JAMES BIBLE as being "God's Word kept intact in English."

There is a poem on page v of our book, *DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE*, written by my wife's mother. She dedicated it to the DEAN BURGON SOCIETY. Let me quote it for you:

"THE BIBLE"

"Majestic, eternal, immutable BOOK,
Inspired, inerrant, complete.
The Light of my path as I walk on life's way,
The Guide and the Lamp to my feet.

Its writings are holy and verbally true,
The unalterable Statute of Light,
For profit, for doctrine, for correction, reproof,
Infallible Guide to the right.

My Treasure, my Comfort, my Help, and my Stay,
Incomparable Measure and Rod,
Each page is replete with its textual proof,
The Bible, the exact WORD OF GOD!

By Gertrude Grace Sanborn
September, 1979,

C. READABILITY AND THE KING JAMES BIBLE [*DKJB,* p. 50].

For Genesis 1	Readability = 8.13	8th Grade
For Exodus 1	Readability = 7.94	8th Grade
For Romans 1	Readability = 9.74	10th Grade
For Romans 3:1-23	Readability = 5.63	6th Grade
For Romans 8	Readability = 7.73	8th Grade
For Jude 1	Readability = 10.11	10th Grade

Many people say, "The KING JAMES BIBLE is too hard for people to read, they can't understand it." Well, if you consult the readability index called "Right Writer" (a computer program) that is absolutely neutral on this subject, you will find readabilities for the portions of the KING JAMES BIBLE examined as follows: From this chart you can see that the KING JAMES BIBLE is NOT too difficult to understand--provided that you can read at a 6th to 10th grade level.

Our son, Mr. D. A. Waite, Jr. (M.A., M.L.A.), has written a study he calls *"SIX BIBLE VERSIONS COMPARED ON READABILITY--A Comparison of the KJB, NKJV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, and NIV."* It is available from The BIBLE FOR TODAY (**BFT #2362.**) He took the first chapter of every book in the Bible, from Genesis through Revelation. He compared the six versions of the Bible mentioned above. In this sampling, the KING JAMES BIBLE, over all, has a "Flesch Grade Level" of from 6.1 to 8.6. The *NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION* on the other hand, has a "Flesch Grade Level" of from 6.1 to 11.0!! The NIV is not only less accurate by far, but also less readable than the KING JAMES BIBLE!! He is continuing to work on this comparative study, getting the exact readability for the entire Bible in each of these six versions. From this evidence, we see that it's not too hard to understand the KING JAMES BIBLE.

D. DO WE NEED MORE "TRANSLATIONS" OF THE BIBLE? [*DKJB,* pp. 202-220]

It can be asked: "Do we really need more `translations' of the Bible? Are these new versions really necessary?"

1. Complete English Bibles [*DKJB,* pp. 203-208]. In the back of our book, *DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE,* there's a chart (p. 218) that lists the number of "complete English Bibles" by years. From the 1300's through the 1900's, there were a total of 135 "complete English Bibles." This is taken from a research that's been done on English Bibles of all kinds. On the average, there has been one complete English Bible every 4.4. years. Do you think we need more Bibles? In the last 604 years (from 1388 through 1991) complete English Bibles have increased in frequency. In the 1300's, there were only three; in the 1400's, there were none; in the 1800's, there were forty-five; in the 1900's, there were fifty-three.

2. Complete English New Testaments [*DKJB,* pp. 208-218]. In the same book, there is a chart (p. 219) that lists the number of "complete English New Testaments" by years. From the 1300's

through the 1900's, there were a total of 293 "complete English New Testaments." This is, on the average, one complete English New Testament every 2.1 years. Do you think we need more New Testaments? Even if they were all presently available, imagine someone reading all of them. In the last 612 years (from 1380 through 1991) complete English New Testaments have also increased in frequency. In the 1300's there was only one complete English New Testament; in the 1400's, there was none; in the 1800's, there were ninety; and in the 1900's, there were 144 (averaging one every .69 years). That's quite a jump--from ninety to 144!

3. Complete English Bibles and New Testaments Combined. If you put the charts together (p. 219), you will notice, during the 612 years, from the 1300's to the 1900's, that there were a total of 135 complete English Bibles, and 293 complete English New Testaments. This totals 428. It means that, on the average, there was either one complete English Bible or complete English New Testament published every 1.4 years. Do we need more complete English Bibles or complete English New Testaments? That's the question. I believe that the major factor in the production of Bibles and New Testaments is money. When the publishers discover that a certain version no longer brings financial profit to their treasuries, that version runs out of print in a hurry! Very few churches are doing what the BEREAN BAPTIST CHURCH in Greenwood, Indiana, is doing--printing Bibles and giving them out at low cost. In fact, they give many of them away without charge. To my knowledge, only those who have the real truth found in the KING JAMES BIBLE are doing this. You will find few, if any, publishers of these false perversions printing them either at low cost or without charge!

I. REASON #1: THE KING JAMES BIBLE HAS SUPERIOR ORIGINAL LANGUAGE TEXTS

[*DKJB*, pp. 20-62]

The first reason for defending the KING JAMES BIBLE is because it has **superior** texts, both Hebrew and Greek. This correctly implies that the various versions and perversions of the Bible have **inferior** texts, both Hebrew and Greek.

A. THE KING JAMES BIBLE HAS A SUPERIOR OLD TESTAMENT HEBREW TEXT [*DKJB*, pp. 20-38].

1. The Two Competing Hebrew Old Testament Texts. There are two basic texts in existence in Hebrew, the false one, edited by Ben Asher, and the true one, edited by Ben Chayyim. The Ben Asher is exhibited in Rudolf Kittel's *BIBLIA HEBRAICA (BHK)* (1937) with all of his suggested footnote changes, as well as in the Stuttgart edition of *BIBLIA HEBRAICA (BHS)* (1967-77) with all of their suggested footnote changes. The true text of Ben Chayyim on which our KING JAMES BIBLE is based is also available. It is called the Daniel Bomberg edition or the Second Great Rabbinic Bible (1524-25). We carry this Hebrew Bible in the BIBLE FOR TODAY ministry. It is the Letteris text, printed in 1866. It has the Masoretic Hebrew text in the center and the KING JAMES BIBLE in the margins. This Ben Chayyim Masoretic Hebrew text was the unquestioned Hebrew text for the next 400 years. Nobody questioned it. In fact, Rudolf Kittel, in his first two editions of 1906 and 1912, used that text in his *BIBLIA HEBRAICA*. It was not until 1937, that he switched Hebrew texts and substituted the spurious and **inferior** text which uses

the Leningrad Manuscript (B19a or "L"). He used this because he claimed it was the oldest single Hebrew manuscript, dating from about 1008 A.D.

Both of these false *BIBLIA HEBRAICA (BHK & BHS)* Hebrew texts offer in their footnotes about fifteen to twenty suggested changes per page. This adds up to about 20,000 to 30,000 changes in the entire Hebrew Old Testament text. One or the other of these false Hebrew texts, either *BHK* or *BHS*, are used as the basis for the Old Testament in virtually all modern versions, as can be shown by reading their introductory pages. How many of these changes in the Hebrew text are you ready to accept? Do you want to accept 30,000? How about 20,000? 10,000? How about 5,000? How about 1,000? How many of you would like to accept 500 changes?

If you do not start with an absolute, where there is no doubt, you're going to continue to move and to accept more and more changes. Where can you stop, once you have begun to slide? Doubts will arise in your mind. We don't want to move from the Hebrew Old Testament on which our KING JAMES BIBLE is based. We must have an absolute. The DEAN BURGON SOCIETY, in its *ARTICLES OF FAITH*, has stated:

> **"We believe that the Texts which are the closest to the original autographs of the Bible are the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text for the Old Testament . . ." (p. 2)**

My personal belief is that the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew text that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE is not only the "closest to the original autographs," but that it is IDENTICAL to those original autographs. I can't prove that to anybody, but I accept it as a matter of personal faith. I believe we have the very Words that God has preserved through the years. I believe every Word in the Hebrew text is God's Word, preserved because He told us He would preserve it for the next 20,000 to 30,000 years--to a "thousand generations."

2. The New Versions Attempt to "CORRECT" The Hebrew Text in at Least Nineteen Different Ways. How do the new versions attempt to "CORRECT" the Hebrew Old Testament that underlies our KING JAMES BIBLE? There are at least nineteen methods they use to "CORRECT" the true Hebrew Text (pp. 28-31). The NIV uses all nineteen of these, by the way. In effect, the new version "translators/paraphrasers" might say, "Oh, I don't want to take this Hebrew word here. I want to take **the Septuagint (LXX)** reading instead." But the Septuagint (LXX) version for the most part is worse than a *Living Version*. It is the Old Testament written in Greek. It is rotten. Its text is corrupt. Even the ISBE article, (the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*) on the Septuagint (LXX) states that it has a very tattered and **inferior** Greek text. Remember, the ISBE is no friend of the KING JAMES BIBLE's text. The use of the Septuagint (LXX) by these new versions instead of using the Hebrew text is a serious error.

Another one of the nineteen methods is when they have no textual proof at all. It is pure **conjecture**. They might say, "I don't have any proof, but I think it sounds better this way." When this is done, they often print in the footnote an "L" which stands for "*legendum*," meaning in Latin, "*which read*." I remember Dr. Merrill F. Unger, my Hebrew teacher at Dallas Theological Seminary. He has written many books, including *UNGER'S BIBLE DICTIONARY*. He was an apt and humble man, though he reminded me of an "absent-minded professor" at times. He taught us Isaiah in our second year Hebrew class. On one occasion, he read a verse in a way that differed from the Hebrew text. I raised my hand and said, "Why did you read it that way? It doesn't read that way in the Hebrew text?" Dr. Unger replied, "Well, I just thought it sounded better that

way, so I changed it." Dr. Unger went to the Johns Hopkins University for his Ph.D. work. He was taught by Dr. Albright who was far from sound in his theology. Perhaps Dr. Unger learned this doubt of the Hebrew text from his professor. What was Dr. Unger doing? He was "CORRECTING" the Hebrew text by **conjecture**.

Some "CORRECT" the Hebrew with **the Syriac Version**. Some "CORRECT" the Hebrew with just "**a few Hebrew manuscripts"** rather than the entire Masoretic Traditional Hebrew text. Some "CORRECT" the Hebrew with **the Latin Vulgate**. Some "CORRECT" the Hebrew with **the Dead Sea Scrolls**. With the Dead Sea Scrolls, there are a few problems. Problem #1: How do you know which Hebrew manuscripts this heretical cult (called the Essenes) took with them when they left the temple of Jerusalem and went to the area of the Qumran caves? Problem #2: How do you know the methods they used and the accuracy with which they copied and recopied those manuscripts? It just so happens that the Dead Sea Scrolls, probably 99% of the time, did concur with the Hebrew text that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE. But, in the places where they don't, we should stick to the Masoretic Traditional Hebrew text.

Some, like the *New International Version* (NIV), use "**quotations from Jerome"** to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Some use **Josephus,** an unsaved Jew, to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Some use a "**variant Hebrew Reading in the margin**" to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Some use "**words in the consonantal text divided differently**" to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Some use **quotations from Jerome**, **Aquila**, the **Samaritan Pentateuch**, or **Symmachus** to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Some use the **Hebrew Targums, Theodotion,** or the "**Juxta Hebraica of Jerome for the Psalms**" to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Why are they taking Jerome as a substitute for the Hebrew Word of God? Was he there? Still others use a "**different set of Hebrew Vowels**" to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Some use "**an ancient Hebrew scribal tradition**" to "CORRECT" the Hebrew. Some use the ***BIBLIA HEBRAICA*** **of Kittel or Stuttgartensia** to "CORRECT" the Hebrew. These are nineteen of the different methods that other English versions have used to "CORRECT" the Masoretic Traditional Hebrew Old Testament text, thus changing the very Words of God!

3. God Authorized The Jews To Be the Exclusive Guardians of His Words. The Jews were to be the guardians of the Old Testament Hebrew text. God did not give that privilege and responsibility to any other race or people.

> *(Romans 3:1) "What advantage then hath **the Jew**? or what profit {is there} of circumcision?"*
> *(Romans 3:2) "Much every way: chiefly, because that **unto them were committed the oracles of God**."*

It was the Hebrew Old Testament text that God Preserved, not some Greek, Latin, Syriac, or any of these other documents. It must be Hebrew. There were eight or more important, strict rules that were followed by the Hebrew scribes who copied and recopied the Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament text (pp. 24-26). These rules were to insure that each letter, word, and sentence of the Hebrew text was preserved exactly. The Jews were meticulous and reverent in the copying and recopying of our Hebrew manuscripts. That's why I believe that we should not change any of the Hebrew Words of God that underlie the KING JAMES VERSION.

4. The Ben Chayyim Hebrew Old Testament Text Is Available Today. I hope that the American Bible Society and the British and Foreign Bible Society keep printing and circulating this Letteris Hebrew text. That's what they call it, the Letteris text of 1866. This came out before

Kittel decided to scrap it for his false Ben Asher text. These same Bible Societies print the false Hebrew texts, too. If they stop printing the true Ben Chayyim Hebrew Old Testament text, by God's grace, the BIBLE FOR TODAY will do every thing in its power to see that it's reprinted page by page and get it back into circulation. We'll preserve the very Old Testament Hebrew Words of God ourselves, if that becomes necessary. That's one of the important purposes of both the BIBLE FOR TODAY and the DEAN BURGON SOCIETY--to keep in circulation good and valuable books. Sometimes this Hebrew Bible has gone out of stock at the American Bible Society, but it has always come back in stock by a shipment from England.

B. THE KING JAMES BIBLE HAS A SUPERIOR NEW TESTAMENT GREEK TEXT [*DKJB*, pp. 38-62].

There is a simple table in our book (p. 42) which speaks volumes concerning the New Testament Greek text debate. Here it is:

THE N.T. GREEK TEXTUAL BATTLEGROUND

TEXTUS RECEPTUS	***W/H CHANGES IN T.R.***
Has 140,521 Greek words	**Changes 5,604 places in the N.T.**
Has 647 pages in Greek Text	**Changes include 9,970 Greek words**
Has 217 Greek words per page	**Changes 15.4 Greek words per page**
Has 100% of the Greek words	**Changes 7% of the Greek words**
Has all 647 pages unchanged	**Changes total 45.9 pages in Greek text**

1. The Greek Text that Underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE. If you examine this table carefully, you will learn much about the debate that is raging concerning the Greek New Testament text. On the left of the table are some facts about the Textus Receptus that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE. The Trinitarian Bible Society has published this text and made it available to anyone. The TBS took their text from that of Dr. Frederick Scrivener who was commissioned in about 1885, by the Cambridge University Press, to come up with the exact Greek text that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE. Scrivener set down all of the Greek words used by the KING JAMES BIBLE, but he did something else as well. He put in **BOLD FACE TYPE** all of the alterations made by editors Westcott and Hort in their 1881 English Revised Version. He inserted the exact alterations in the footnotes. These consisted of either additions of Greek words, subtractions of Greek words, or changes of Greek words in some other way. This Greek text edition has been reprinted by the BIBLE FOR TODAY, and is available through them or the DEAN BURGON SOCIETY. It is a very useful tool. Scrivener's Greek text is also available on the LOGOS Computer Program (available from THE BIBLE FOR TODAY) which enables the student to study more carefully. Dr. Jack Moorman counted **140,521 Greek words** in the Textus Receptus. Scrivener's Greek edition has **647 pages** which would average **217 Greek words per page**. That's what the Textus Receptus has.

2. The Greek Text of Westcott and Hort that Underlies the

Modern Versions.

a. Authenticating the Westcott and Hort Changes to the Textus Receptus. From the above table, notice the changes of Bishop Westcott and Professor Hort. You might rightfully ask, "How did you come up with this number of changes?" That's a valid question. I took a copy of the original Scrivener's Greek New Testament to a summer Bible Conference where I was preaching. During the afternoon, when there were no meetings, I studied that volume carefully, making notations on it as I read. When I indicate, in the above table, that there are **5,604 places** in the Greek New Testament where Westcott and Hort actually altered the Greek Textus Receptus used by the KING JAMES BIBLE translators, it is because I actually counted that many places. I have the data in my copy of Scrivener's Greek New Testament. These **5,604 places** involve a total of **9,970 Greek words**. How do I know that? Again, I counted them. I saw from the footnotes exactly how many Greek words each of the **5,604 places** involved. As you might know, some of the places involve twelve entire verses (Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53--8:11). In each of the **5,604 places**, compared to the Textus Receptus that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE, Westcott and Hort either added Greek words, subtracted Greek words, or changed the Greek words in some other way. You can see that the Westcott and Hort alterations amount to just thirty words short of **10,000 Greek words.** This means that there are **almost 10,000 Greek words** that are different in the Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament (and probably about the same or more in the Nestle/Aland 26th edition Greek text) as compared to the Greek text that underlies our KING JAMES BIBLE.

b. The New Versions Follow The Westcott and Hort Changes in These 5,604 Places in the New Testament. Yet this FALSE Greek text, with its **approximate 10,000 alterations**, was the basis for virtually all of the modern English versions and perversions, including the ERV, ASV, NIV, NASV, NKJV, RSV, NRSV, TEV, JB, NEV, LV and the rest.

c. Hort's Own Three Estimates on the Extent of the Greek Textual Problems Between His Text and the Textus Receptus. In 1882, Hort wrote an Introduction to the so-called Westcott and Hort Greek Text of 1881. In his *INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE ORIGINAL GREEK--The Text Revised by Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D. and Fenton John Anthony Hort, D.D.*, Hort made an estimate of the differences between various Greek texts. His estimate had three parts. Let me quote each of the parts:

(1) Hort's Estimate of the Proportion of the Greek New Testament that Was Virtually Accepted by Everyone. He wrote:

> **"With regard to the great bulk of the words of the New Testament, as of most other ancient writings, there is NO VARIATION or other ground of doubt, and therefore no room for textual criticism; . . . The proportion of words virtually accepted on all hands as raised above doubt is VERY GREAT, not less, on a rough computation, than SEVEN EIGHTHS OF THE WHOLE. The REMAINING EIGHTH therefore, formed in great part by changes of order and other comparative trivialities, constitutes the whole area of criticism."** [Hort, *INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE ORIGINAL GREEK*, p. 2, **B.F.T. #1303**]

Since the "whole" in numbers of Greek words and pages in the Greek New Testament, as seen in the table

above, is **140,521 Greek words (100%=647 pages)**, Hort's **7/8ths** of the Greek New Testament virtually agreed to by all would be **122,956 Greek words (87.5%=566 pages)**. Hort's **1/8th** of the Greek N.T. that he claimed was in dispute would be **17,565 Greek words (12.5%=81 pages)**. In point of fact, as seen in the above table, the area of dispute between the Westcott and Hort Greek text as opposed to the Textus Receptus that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE is only **9,970 Greek words (7%=45.9 pages)**. So Hort's estimate in this area is incorrect.

(2) Hort's Estimate of the Proportion of the Greek New Testament that Would Still be in Doubt if His Principles Were Followed. He wrote:

> **"If the principles followed in the present edition are sound, this area may be very greatly reduced. Recognising to the full the duty of abstinence from peremptory decision in cases where the evidence leaves the judgement in suspense between two or more readings, we find that, setting aside differences of orthography, the words in our opinion still subject to doubt only make up about ONE SIXTIETH of the whole New Testament."** [Hort, *INTRODUCTION, loc. cit.*]

Since the "whole" in numbers of Greek words and pages in the Greek New Testament, as seen in the table above, is **140,521 Greek words (100%=647 pages)**, Hort's **1/60th** of the Greek New Testament still subject to doubt if his principles were followed, would be **2,342 Greek words**. This represents **1.76%** of the Greek words, or **11.4 pages** in a Greek New Testament if put all in one place. But we don't follow Hort's "principles" at all. Because of this, we who hold to the Greek text that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE are still disputing **9,970 Greek words** (rather than only **2,342 Greek words**). This represents **7%** of the Greek words (rather than only **1.76%**), or **45.9 pages** in a Greek New Testament if the words were put in one place (rather than only **11.4 pages**). So Hort's estimate in this area is incorrect again. We still maintain that the of Greek words in dispute are vastly more in number than Hort has stated.

(3) Hort's Estimate of the Proportion of the Greek New Testament that Contains "SUBSTANTIAL VARIATION." He wrote:

> **"In this second estimate the proportion of comparatively trivial variations is beyond measure larger than in the former; so that the amount of what can in any sense be called SUBSTANTIAL VARIATION is but a small fraction of the whole residuary variation, and can hardly form more than A THOUSANDTH PART of the entire text."** [Hort, *INTRODUCTION, loc. cit.*]

Since the "whole" in numbers of Greek words and pages in the Greek New Testament, as seen in the table above, is **140,521 Greek words (100%=647 pages)**, Hort's **1/1000th** of the Greek New Testament that he thought could be called "**SUBSTANTIAL VARIATION**" would be **140.5 Greek words (.1%=.647 pages)**. This would be **a little over one half a page** in the Greek New Testament. This is extremely wide of the mark of truth! Since we don't follow Hort's "principles" at all, we who hold to the Greek text that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE are still disputing, either in "**SUBSTANTIAL VARIATION**" or otherwise, a total of **9,970 Greek words (7%=45.9 pages)**. It is Hort's last estimate that has been seized by his modern day puppets and grossly distorted in order to fool people into thinking that the problem is very tiny, when in reality,

it is much, much larger!

d. The Misquotation of Hort by His Followers on the Extent of the Greek Textual Problems Between His Text and the Textus Receptus. Modern disciples of this false Westcott and Hort Greek text have enlarged upon Hort's estimates. They say, in effect:

> **"If all of the variant readings between the Westcott and Hort-type text and the Textus Receptus-type text were assembled together in one place, they would amount to a little over one half a page in the Greek New Testament."**

Hort's pupils are either knowingly or unknowingly, misquoting their teacher. They want to make the DIFFERENCES in the Greek texts very, very slight so as to minimize the arguments against the false Westcott and Hort-types Greek text. From the above quotations from Hort's *INTRODUCTION*, his differences in Greek texts would be either **81 pages** (1/8th), or **11.4 pages** (1/60th), or **.647 pages** (1/1000th). Rather than merely "**a little over one half a page**," Hort's **1/8th** of total differences would amount to **81 pages**. In reality, we are faced with **45.9 pages** of difference!

A current illustration of this practice of distorting the facts in this area is found in a tape-recorded message given by Dr. Kenneth Barker, the chairman of the translation committee responsible for the *NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION*. Dr. Barker spoke in the Sunday evening service, September 12, 1993, at the SOUTHSIDE BAPTIST CHURCH in Greenville, South Carolina. A friend recorded the message and gave me a copy. Dr. Barker stated:

> **"There are over 5,000 Greek manuscripts, and all of them are AGREED 98% of the time. So all of this debate that Carson refers to in *The King James Version Debate*, all of this debate, all of the hullabaloo is over less than 2% of the entire text of the New Testament. And in that less than 2%, you can select any reading that you wish among the manuscripts, (that's not our approach, but you can) and it won't change Christian doctrine one bit."**

Dr. Barker is wrong on TWO COUNTS! (1) His "**less than 2%**" difference between any of the Greek manuscripts would be **2,810 Greek words (12.9 pages)**. The truth of the matter is that there is a **7% difference** between the Westcott and Hort Greek text and the Textus Receptus that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE. This would be **9,970 Greek words (45.9 pages)**. This is a most serious error. It is a blatant falsehood that is being promulgated by the chairman of the *New International Version* translation committee. It would give false confidence to the Pastor and members of this church that had just recently given up the KING JAMES BIBLE in favor of Dr. Barker's *NIV*. (2) The second serious error is Dr. Barker's statement relative to the fact that variations in manuscripts "**won't change Christian doctrine one bit**." In our book, we specify **158** such passages. Dr. Jack Moorman lists **356** such passages. These two falsehoods, from someone who should know better, are the major ones used to lull Bible believing Christians into deep slumber concerning the Bible version controversy that has been raging.

3. The KING JAMES BIBLE'S Greek Text Is Worth Fighting For! The Greek Text of the New Testament is truly a **BATTLEGROUND!** Someone might say to you that there is really very little difference in the two Greek texts. They may tell you that you shouldn't be fighting about these

differences. It seems to me that **almost 46 pages** of the Greek New Testament are worth fighting about. **9,970 Greek words** are worth fighting about. **7%** of the Greek New Testament is worth fighting about. This is a **BATTLEGROUND!** We must not retreat. **We must do battle for the Lord's Words!** We must stand fast. If we lose in this battle between truth and error, there's no stopping the onrush of more error. In the tug of war with truth and error, there is no middle ground. Those of us who believe in standing up for the Lord Jesus Christ should remember His Words:

*(Mark 8:38) "Whosoever therefore shall be **ashamed of Me and of My Words** in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when He cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels."*

4. The KING JAMES BIBLE'S Greek Text Is Attested by the Evidence.

Here is a table that is printed on page fifty-seven of the book. It gives us a summary of the manuscript evidence that is available to us today.

	TOTALS	# of MSS WH/TR	% of MSS WH/TR
Papyrus Fragments	**81(88)**	**13/75**	**15%/85%**
Uncials	**267**	**9/258**	**3%/97%**
Cursives	**2764**	**23/2741**	**1%/99%**
Lectionaries	**2143**	**0/2143**	**0%/100%**
TOTALS:	**5255**	**45/5210**	**1%/99%**

As of 1967, Kurt Aland, of Munster, Germany, counted a total of **5,255 Greek manuscripts** still in existence. Though there are a few others since 1967, I use these figures which are still very close. Aland is the lead editor of the 26th edition of the Nestle/Aland Greek New Testament which is being used as the critical text of today. I am using Aland's 1967 figures.

As you can see from the table, there are **81** (now **88**) papyrus fragments. There are **267** uncial manuscripts. These are large, capital letter documents. There are **2,764** cursives manuscripts. These are the flowing hand manuscripts. There are **2,143** lectionary manuscripts. These are portions of Scripture that were read on certain days of the church year. **This totals at least 5,255 Greek manuscripts of the New Testament that have been preserved and are available for us today.**

The table above gives the approximate number and percent of each type of Greek manuscript that supports the Westcott-Hort (WH) Greek text, as well as the number and percent of each class that supports the Textus Receptus (TR) Greek text. These approximations are taken from the careful research of Dr. Jack Moorman in his book *FOREVER SETTLED* which is available, along with five of his other books, from either the BIBLE FOR TODAY or THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY. The WH figures are given first and those for the TR second. For the papyrus fragments the score is **13** to **75** (**15%** to **85%**). For the uncial manuscripts the score is **9** to **258** (**3%** to **97%**). For the cursive manuscripts the score is **23** to **2,741** (**1%** to **99%**). For the lectionary manuscripts the score is **0** to **2,143** (**0%** to **100%**). For the totals for all classes of manuscripts the score is **45**

to **5,210.** This is a ratio of **less than 1%** to **more than 99%!**

5. The KING JAMES BIBLE'S Greek Text Has Been Preserved by God. Which of the two kinds of Greek text has God preserved? How do you define preservation? The Scripture says:

> *(Psalms 12:6) "**The Words of the Lord** {are} pure Words: {as} silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times."*
> *(Psalms 12:7) "**Thou shalt keep Them, O Lord, Thou shalt preserve Them from this generation for ever**."*

Obviously God has "**KEPT**" and "**PRESERVED**" His Words in the **99%** of the evidence, rather than in the **1%**. By very definition, this is "PRESERVATION." Suppose I had 100 million dollars to begin with and a thief stole it from me. Suppose I reported this to the police; and after long investigation, they were able to recover 99 million dollars out of the 100 million dollars. The thief would keep one million dollars. Which of the two parties could most accurately be described as having "**PRESERVED**" the 100 million dollars: the thief who had the one million dollars, or the police who recovered the 99 million dollars? The one million would be a "PRESERVATION" of practically nothing (**1%**) compared to the 99 million (**99%**). And so it is with the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament. The fulfillment of God's promise to "**KEEP**" and "**PRESERVE**" His Words is to be found in the more than 99% of the manuscripts we have today. And these support the Greek Text that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE, and NOT the Greek text that underlies the modern versions and perversions!

6. The False Greek Texts of "B" and "Aleph" Contradict One Another in Over 3,000 Places in the Gospels Alone. In the total numbers of manuscripts, you'll notice that the Westcott-Hort type has only **forty-five** manuscripts that go along with it as over against **5,210** that go along with the Textus Receptus that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE. This **forty-five** includes "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) and **forty-three** of their little heretical puppets that follow them. The theory behind the acceptance of these **less than 1%** is that "The oldest are the best." The oldest are not necessarily the best, especially if they have been tampered with by heretics! Both Dr. Frederick Scrivener and Dean John William Burgon agreed that the greatest pollution of the stream of pure manuscripts was accomplished **in the first 100 years after the New Testament was written**! So the oldest are not necessarily the best! This is especially true since the heretics had their knives out "correcting" the Greek New Testament almost as soon as it was written. The Egyptian scribes and editors of "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) were some of the most vicious "correctors" of God's Words; yet these two Greek texts form the very bedrock of the new versions and perversions of our day. "B" and "Aleph" contradict each other, as Herman Hoskier has so accurately pointed out in his two volume work entitled *CODEX B AND ITS ALLIES*, in **over 3,000 places** in the four Gospels alone! So, they are not good witnesses. They are false witnesses indeed!

II. REASON #2: THE KING JAMES BIBLE HAS SUPERIOR TRANSLATORS

[*DKJB*, pp. 63-82]

The second reason for defending the KING JAMES BIBLE is because it has **superior** translators. This correctly implies that the various versions and perversions of the Bible have **inferior** translators.

Let's take a brief look at the **superior** translators of the KING JAMES BIBLE. Why do I say that the KING JAMES BIBLE translators are **superior**? I say they are **superior** because they ARE **superior**! I think that there is no question about the expertise and ability of the translators who gave us our KING JAMES BIBLE. The new version people often say that the KING JAMES BIBLE translators were rather ignorant and didn't know as much about translating as the "translators/paraphrasers" of today. This is not only prideful, but completely false. Their linguistic qualifications are unequaled!

A. THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF LANCELOT ANDREWS [*DKJB*, p. 68]

Let's mention Dr. Lancelot Andrews. He was certainly a **superior** KING JAMES BIBLE translator. He had mastered fifteen languages. Someone said that if Dr. Andrews had been present at the confusion of tongues at the tower of Babel, he could have served as interpreter general. I don't know any of the modern "translator/paraphrasers" who have mastered fifteen languages, do you? Send me their names, if you have proof of this.

B. THE ACUMEN OF WILLIAM BEDWELL [*DKJB*, pp. 68-70].

How about Dr. William Bedwell? He was famed in Arabic learning. I don't know how many of these new men who are "translating/paraphrasing" for these modern versions and perversions who have studied as much of the Arabic language as he had. In fact, he published in *quarto*, an edition of the Epistles of St. John in Arabic with a Latin version. I don't know how many men today could do that. Dr. Bedwell left many Arabic manuscripts in the University of Cambridge, with numerous notes and a font of types for printing them. In fact, he wrote an Arabic lexicon, or dictionary, in three volumes. He also began a Persian dictionary which is among Archbishop Laud's manuscripts, still preserved in the Bodleian Library at Oxford today. I don't think anyone among our modern "translators/paraphrasers" of today has done this or could do this! Do you know any of these men who have written an Arabic dictionary and begun a Persian dictionary, or done anything similar in the scholarly world that will even come close to the accomplishments of William Bedwell? If so, send me their names and the proof. In our day, many people watch too much television. They attend too many football games, baseball games. and basketball games. We are ignoramuses today compared to the scholars who gave us our KING JAMES BIBLE!

C. THE ACCEPTABILITY OF MILES SMITH [*DKJB*, pp. 70-71].

Look at the acceptability of Dr. Miles Smith. He was an expert in Hebrew, in Chaldee, in Syriac, and in Arabic. They were almost as familiar to him as his native tongue. Dr. Smith went through both the Greek and Latin church Fathers, making annotations on them all.

D. THE ACTIVITIES OF HENRY SAVILE [*DKJB*, pp. 71-72].

Sir Henry Saville was proficient in both Greek and mathematics. He became tutor in these two subjects to Queen Elizabeth. I don't know how many queens or kings our modern "translators/paraphrasers" have

tutored, do you? Saville translated the histories of Cornelius Tacitus and published the same with notes. He published, from the manuscripts, the writings of *Bradwardin against Pelagius*, the *Writers of English History Subsequent to Bede*, and *Prelections on the Elements of Euclid*. He was the first to edit the complete works of Chrysostom, the most famous of the Greek Fathers. He was a profound, and exact scholar.

E. THE ACADEMICS OF JOHN BOIS [*DKJB*, pp. 72-76].

John Bois was expert in Hebrew as well as Greek. He studied at his father's knee. In fact, at the age of five, he had read the whole Bible **IN HEBREW!!** At the age of six, John Bois was able to write Hebrew in a clear and elegant style. If you know anything about the Hebrew letters, it's difficult to write in an elegant style, or in any style, for that matter. Much more could be said about John Bois.

F. THE SUPERIOR TRANSLATORS IN GENERAL.

Have you ever heard of *Gulliver's Travels*? It tells of Gulliver's adventures with the inhabitants of Lilliput. Do you remember what the Lilliputians did to poor Gulliver? They were tiny, tiny people, and Gulliver was like a giant to them. While he was asleep, they tied up Gulliver with tiny cords so he couldn't move. I liken the KING JAMES BIBLE translators to the giant Gulliver and the "translators/paraphrasers" of today to tiny Lilliputians. It states in Genesis 6:4: "**There were GIANTS in the earth in those days . . .**" It was true also from 1604 to 1611, when these profound scholars gave us our incomparable KING JAMES BIBLE! They had mastered English as well as the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek. They also knew the cognate or brother-sister-cousin related languages that shed light on the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek such as the Aramaic, the Arabic, the Persian, the Coptic, the Syriac, and the others. When the modern "translators/paraphrasers" come upon a word they don't understand, they throw up their hands in dismay. The KING JAMES BIBLE translators did not meet with such difficulty because they knew the cognate languages so well that they could unlock such mysteries. Our modern "translators/paraphrasers" are linguistically **illiterate** when compared to the men who gave us our KING JAMES BIBLE. They truly were "**GIANTS**"!!

III. REASON #3: THE KING JAMES BIBLE HAS SUPERIOR TECHNIQUE

[*DKJB*, pp. 83-132]

The third reason for defending the KING JAMES BIBLE is because it has **superior** technique of translation. This correctly implies that the various versions and perversions of the Bible have **inferior** technique of translation.

The KING JAMES BIBLE translators used the **superior** technique of verbal equivalence and formal equivalence--not dynamic equivalence. The modern versions and perversions have used, to a greater or lesser degree, the **inferior** technique of dynamic equivalence and have disdained both verbal and formal equivalence.

A. ALLEGED EXCEPTIONS.

1. "God Forbid." Some people allege that the KING JAMES BIBLE translators used dynamic equivalence in their expression "**God forbid**." Even if it were the case (and I do not accept that it is), it is found only fourteen times in the New Testament: Romans 3:4; Romans 3:6; Romans 3:31; Romans 6:2; Romans 6:15; Romans 7:7; Romans 7:13; Romans 9:14; Romans 11:1; Romans 11:11; 1 Corinthians 6:15; Galatians 2:17; Galatians 3:21 and Galatians 6:14. It is a rendering of **"mE genoito"** which is "may it not be" or "let it not be." "**God forbid**" is perfect 1611-parlance for this phrase. It was quite literal in 1611. If you don't believe it, consult the *OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY* which gives you the meaning of "**God forbid**" in 1611. It is found only seven times in the Old Testament: Genesis 44:7; Genesis 44:17; Joshua 22:29; Joshua 24:16; 1 Samuel 12:23; 1 Chronicles 11:19 and Job 27:5. It is a rendering of **"chalal"** which is "may it be something profane" or "may it be far from me." Again, "**God forbid**" is a perfect 1611-parlance for the Hebrew words used.

2. "God Save the King." Another favorite allegation of dynamic equivalency in the KING JAMES BIBLE is the expression "**God save the king**." Even if it were the case (and I do not accept that it is), it is only found four times in the Old Testament: 1 Samuel 10:24; 2 Samuel 16:16; 2 Kings 11:12; and 2 Chronicles 23:11. It means "may the king live long" or "may the king be preserved or safe." Well, if the king lives long, he is "saved" is he not? So why not let the 1611-parlance of "**God save the king**" alone? But such examples are very, very few in the KING JAMES BIBLE, whereas they abound in the modern versions and perversions because in those, the dynamic equivalent technique is the rule rather than the exception.

B. THE KING JAMES BIBLE'S VERBAL AND FORMAL EQUIVALENCE.

The KING JAMES BIBLE basically uses the technique of verbal equivalence and formal equivalence. Verbal equivalence means that the very words, wherever possible, are brought over from Hebrew into English and from Greek into English. The KING JAMES BIBLE also uses the technique of formal equivalence, that is, the translators brought over, wherever possible, the very forms of the Hebrew and Greek words into English. They didn't transform the grammar. They didn't take a noun and make a verb out of it. They brought a verb into a verb and a noun into a noun wherever possible. They were skilled craftsmen who had a proper concept of what "translation" really is. It comes from *translatus* which in turn comes from two Latin words, *trans* ("across") and *latus* which is the past participle of *fero* ("to carry"). It means to "carry across" from one place to another, or from one language to another. It does not seek to CHANGE, or to ADD, or to SUBTRACT! Let me illustrate "**translation**." If I have my wife's pocketbook and I want to translate it from one side of the church to the other, I would simply pick it up, take it across the aisle, and put it on the other side of the church. I wouldn't leave any of it behind, even though there may be some things in it I wouldn't want to take over. I wouldn't add anything to it, and I wouldn't drop any of it in the center aisle. Now that's translation, *translatus*. That's what the KING JAMES BIBLE translators did. They just simply took the Hebrew words and put them into English. They picked up the Greek words and put them into English. That's translation. That's the **superior** technique.

C. THE MODERN VERSIONS' USE OF DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE.

I have a computer print-out research of three of these modern versions--the *New King James*, the *New*

American Standard, and the *New International*. When compared to the Hebrew and Greek texts, I found that the *New King James Version* had **over 2,000** examples of dynamic equivalency, that is, adding to, subtracting from, or changing the Words of God. In a similar study of the *New American Standard Version*, I found **over 4,000** such examples. In a similar study of the *New International Version* I found **over 6,653** such examples.

What is meant by **dynamic equivalency**? "Dynamic" means "moving or changing." "Equivalence" means "the same or unchanging." You can't have it both ways! It is either changing or unchanging. Those who use this false technique in the various "translations/paraphrases" think it's a great technique. The bottom line for such a technique is that it gives a human being the right to ADD to God's Words (which is sin), to SUBTRACT from God's Words (which is sin), or to CHANGE God's Words (which is sin). God pronounces the strongest possible CURSE on anyone who dares to do any of those three things to God's Words!! Those who use this false technique are really paraphrasing rather than translating. Paraphrase comes from two Greek words, *para* ("along side or beside") and *phrasis* ("a word or phrase"). It means to use a word or phrase that is along side of the real meaning. It is to state something in other words. We should seek, as the KING JAMES BIBLE translators sought, to put into English the exact and accurate meaning of the Hebrew and Greek Words of God rather than to give something that is "beside" or "along side of" the word or phrase.

IV. REASON #4: THE KING JAMES BIBLE HAS SUPERIOR THEOLOGY

[*DKJB*, pp. 133-187]

The fourth reason for defending the KING JAMES BIBLE is because it has **superior** theology. This correctly implies that the various versions and perversions of the Bible have **inferior** theology.

A. SOME DENIALS THAT THEOLOGY IS AFFECTED BY GREEK OR ENGLISH VERSIONS. It is said by those who use the new versions and perversions of the Bible that there is no difference in any of them when it comes to theology. It is also said that there is no difference in any of the Greek texts in the matter of theology. This is even said by those who are looked up to as Bible believing leaders. In my book, pages 133 to 137, there are eight or nine quotations from such leaders to this effect. The statements are called "false statements" because they are not true. There are quotes from Dr. Arthur T. Pierson, Dr. Louis T. Talbot, Dr. John R. Rice, Dr. Robert L. Sumner, Dr. Robert L. Thomas, Mr. H. S. Miller, Dr. Stanley Gundry and Dr. Ernest Pickering.

There are two phases of their theological denial:

(1) These men believe that the **Greek textual variants** between the two basic Greek texts do not affect theology or doctrine. They believe that the false Westcott and Hort Greek text (when compared to the Greek text of the KING JAMES BIBLE) contains nothing that is theologically deficient or doctrinally incorrect. **This is false**.

(2) These men also believe that the **modern English versions** do not contain changes from the KING JAMES BIBLE that affect theology or doctrine. They believe that you can take

> any modern English version you wish and when you compare it to the KING JAMES BIBLE, that version does not have anything in it that is theologically deficient or doctrinally incorrect. **This is also false**.

Dr. John R. Rice stated:

> "**The differences in the translations are so minor, so insignificant, that we can be sure <u>not a single doctrine, not a single statement of fact, not a single command or exhoratation, has been missed in our translations</u>.**" (meaning the *English Revised Version* of 1881 or the *American Standard Version* of 1901) [***DKJB***, pp. 134-35]

This statement is clearly false. It is not true to the evidence. Dr. Sumner wrote: **"The rare parts about which there is still uncertainty <u>do not effect [*sic*] in any way any doctrine</u>."** [***DKJB***, p. 135] This is false! Doctrine IS affected. Dr. Robert L. Thomas, John MacArthur's professor in his California Seminary, wrote: **"No major doctrine of scripture is affected by a variant reading."** False, again. Dr. H.S. Miller wrote: **"No doctrine is affected."** False again. Dr. Stanley Gundry stated: **"Only a few outstanding problems remain, and <u>these do not affect doctrine or divine command to us</u>."** False again. Dr. Ernest Pickering wrote: **"Important differences of textual readings are relatively few and <u>almost none would affect any major Christian doctrine.</u>"** False again!

B. SOME EXAMPLES OF THEOLOGY THAT IS AFFECTED BY GREEK AND ENGLISH VERSIONS.

I have given **158 examples** of the theological superiority of the KING JAMES BIBLE in my book. I selected these from Dr. Jack Moorman's compilation of a total of **356 doctrinal passages** that have been changed in the Egyptian heretical Greek texts of "B" (Vatican), "Aleph" (Sinai), and others. I'll give you some examples of doctrines that are affected by these false Greek texts and new versions.

1. John 3:15.

> *(John 3:15) "That whosoever believeth in him <u>**should not perish,**</u> but have eternal life."*

Do you know what the "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) manuscripts do to the three words, "**should not perish**"? They REMOVE them. So, in the two false Greek texts, there's no hell in John 3:15. What versions follow these corrupted Greek texts? The *New International Version* follows them, the *New American Standard Version* follows them, and the *New King James Version* in the footnotes, follows them. So do the other modern versions and perversions. For them, there is no hell in John 3:15. Is this not a major doctrine?

2. Mark 9:44 and 9:46.

Another example is Mark 9:44 and 46. Both verses are gone:

> *(Mark 9:44) "<u>**Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched**</u>".*
> *(Mark 9:46) "<u>**Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.**</u>"*

Because "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) remove both verses, so does the *New King James Version* in the footnotes; so does the *New American Standard Version* (by putting them in brackets); and so does the *New*

International Version. So do the other modern versions and perversions. In so doing, they take away the fires of hell. Is this not a major doctrine?

Perhaps this is where Michael Van Horn got his false ideas about hell. According to their 1992-93 Catalog, he was an Assistant Professor in the Division of Bible, Religion, and Ministries at the Grand Rapids Baptist College and Seminary (GARBC approved). He was not fired, but was permitted to "resign" despite his rank heresy on heaven and hell as well as on other doctrines! Before a room full of twenty-two Michigan Pastors, Professor Van Horn denied that there was a literal heaven or a literal hell. He especially denied that there was any "literal fire" in hell!

Maybe that's where the Council of Eighteen of the GENERAL ASSOCIATION OF REGULAR BAPTIST CHURCHES (GARBC) and its resolution- makers got their ideas. They refused to state in their resolution on hell that there was "literal fire" there. Dr. Clay Nuttall was present as a witness. In his written report, he mentioned that when a man suggested "literal fire" be inserted in the GARBC resolution on hell, a Council of Eighteen member said they couldn't do that because many of the Pastors and people of the GARBC fellowship do not believe there is "literal fire" in hell. Now, if that isn't the first step in the direction of absolute and total apostasy in the GARBC, I don't know what is! In the original draft, they didn't even include a "literal hell," much less "literal fire" there! One visitor in the meeting raised his hand and told them they should specify a "literal hell." They agreed to this much. The GENERAL ASSOCIATION OF REGULAR BAPTIST CHURCHES' Resolution #2 on "ETERNAL HELL," passed at their 62nd Annual Conference in June, 1993, at Des Moines, Iowa, used the words, "a literal, eternal hell," but no "literal fire"!

When you take the "literal fire" out of hell, as Billy Graham and many of the other new evangelicals have done, and as all of the apostates have done, and as Mary Baker Eddy and all false cults have done, you are in serious trouble and in grievous doctrinal error! For centuries, many have removed the fire out of hell even though the KING JAMES BIBLE keeps it in. Now these false Egyptian Greek texts and the false English perversions will assist them in their heresy of a "fireless hell"!

3. John 6:47. Let me see if you can accurately lead a soul to Christ using exclusively John 6:47 as rendered in the new versions. Note John 6:47 in the KING JAMES BIBLE, where the Lord Jesus declared:

*(John 6:47) "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth **on me** hath everlasting life."*

That verse is as clear as a bell, on how to receive "**everlasting life**." But, the Westcott and Hort Greek text, following the "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) manuscripts, takes out those two vital and precious words, **"on me."** Because of their reliance on these false Egyptian Greek texts, the *New International Version* also removes **"on me."** So does the *New American Standard Version*. So does the *New King James Version* in the footnotes. So do the other modern versions and perversions. If you're trying to lead a soul to Christ with those new versions and perversions, using John 6:47 exclusively, you'll never lead them to Christ, because **"on me"** (Christ) is gone from that verse in their perversions! All they say is something like this: *"Whoever believes has everlasting life."* Believes what? Their verse doesn't say. Their verse merely says *"**believes**."* According to these perversions of John 6:47, if I were to believe in atheism, Christ promises me everlasting life. The same if I believe in humanism, or in the Easter Bunny, or the Tooth Fairy, or in Santa Claus, or in Rudloph the Red-Nose Reindeer, or in Bugs Bunny, or in Buddhism, Taoism, Judaism, Modernism, or in anything else! That's major false doctrine in my judgement, and it stems directly from false Greek texts and false English perversions!

4. Romans 1:16. Consider Romans 1:16. Here's what it says in the accurate KING JAMES BIBLE:

*(Romans 1:16) "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."*

The heretical Greek texts of "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) remove the two words, **"of Christ"** in this verse. Because of this, the *New International Version* also removes these words. So does the *New American Standard Version*. So does the *New King James Version* in the footnotes. So do the other modern versions and perversions. This certainly is doctrine. "**Gospel**" means "good news" or a "good announcement." What "**gospel**" could be inserted there instead of the **"gospel of Christ"**? Was it the good news about a pay raise? Was it the good news about a new car, a new hat, or a new house? No! It's the gospel or good news **about Christ**. That's doctrine! That's theology!

5. John 7:8. Was the Lord Jesus Christ a liar? If you believe the false Greek text, "Aleph" (Sinai), and some of the versions, He was. Note John 7:8:

*(John 7:8) "Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up **yet** unto this feast; for my time is not yet full come."*

According to the Greek text "Aleph" (Sinai), the word **"yet"** must be removed. The *New American Standard Version* omits it also. So does the *New King James Version* in the footnotes. So do some other modern versions and perversions. Why do I say this removal of **"yet"** makes the Lord Jesus Christ out to be a liar? Because He went up to the feast in question. If He told his brethren that He was NOT going up to the feast, and then later went up to that feast, He would have told a lie, would He not? This certainly is a major theological doctrine. As in all of the other **356 doctrinal passages**, the KING JAMES BIBLE has **superior** theology here. The perversions are **inferior** in their theology and doctrine! Stay away from them!

CONCLUDING REMARKS

I believe that in the KING JAMES BIBLE, we have the Word of God kept intact in English. I believe we should defend the KING JAMES BIBLE for four reasons: (1) It has **superior** original language texts (Hebrew and Greek); (2) It has **superior** translators; (3) It has **superior** technique; and (4) It has **superior** theology.6

We ought not to be ashamed of the Book of books that has stood the test of time and will continue standing. Let's stand for it and with it. I hope the reader will secure for himself a copy of our book, *DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE--A Four-fold Superiority--Texts, Translators, Technique, and Theology*. It has elaborated on each of the above considerations. The KING JAMES BIBLE, which is being hammered and beaten on every hand today (by so-called "friend" and foe alike), can be very much likened to

the "ANVIL" in that famous poem with which I close:

"THE ANVIL OF GOD'S WORD"

Last eve I passed beside a blacksmith's door
And heard the anvil sing the vesper chime;
Then, looking in, I saw upon the floor
Old hammers, worn with blasting years of time.

"How many anvils have you had," said I,
"To wear and batter all these hammers so?"
"Just one," said he; and then, with twinkling eye,
"The anvil wears the hammers out, you know."

And so I thought, the anvil of God's Word
For ages, skeptic blows have beat upon.
Yet tho' the noise of falling blows was heard
The anvil is unharmed--the hammers gone.

By John Clifford