

## Which Version?

by Pastor Marty Hughes,

### Introduction:

The subject which we will discuss tonight is one of the most controversial and emotional subjects in Christianity today. There are clearly good and wise men on each side of this controversy. My purpose tonight is not to divide, judge, or criticize, it is simply to clarify my reasons as your Pastor for the conviction and policy of our church to only use the King James Version in all of its ministries.

I believe that the King James Bible is the Word of God. I believe and teach that all other current English versions contain errors and, as a result, are subtle attempts by the Devil to cover up the truth. While it is clear that other versions do contain the major portion of God's Word and that those who use them can be and are being used of God, if one desires all of the truth, then there is only one source in English today, the King James Version. Now, I will not deny that some of the wording in the King James is difficult to understand. I do dispute the assertion that children or young Christians can't understand the King James so we should throw it aside and accept something

inferior that is easier to read. However, since those arguments are generally based upon one's preferences and/or one's opinions, let us examine the root of the problem. There are several facts that make my choice of the King James Version a conviction to which I will continue to hold.

### I. The New Versions Come From Questionable Sources

A. There are two distinct lines of manuscripts from which the Bible has been translated down through the centuries.

#### 1. The Syrian Family

##### a. The Byzantine Text

##### b. The Received Text

#### 2. The Egyptian Family

##### a. Hesychian type texts

##### b. Alexandrian Text

B. The Source of the Syrian Family of texts was Antioch, the missionary capital of the early

church.

1. The true line of biblical manuscripts begins in Antioch and is carried by Paul throughout Europe and Asia Minor.
2. It is from this area that we find all of our spiritual ancestors; the Albigenses, the Waldenses, and any number of Anabaptist groups.
3. The scriptures were preserved because they were highly treasured among these Bible-believers.
4. These groups(Read Bible-believers) took these manuscripts and were the catalyst behind their being translated into Latin, German and Syriac.
5. Eventually, it was these Bible-believers that won the privilege for the King James Version to be translated from these texts.
6. The Anglicans took up the cause late in the process, and since they were in power at the time, their desire to be behind the work was welcomed by those who had loved and revered the Bible for so long.
7. King James had very little to do with it. He just put his stamp of approval on their already finished work.

C. The second trail of Bibles begins in Alexandria, Egypt as the result of the work of a renegade Jew named Philo.

1. We will look at Philo's beliefs later, but the university which he instituted was the storehouse of this second line of manuscripts.
2. Every mention of Alexandria in scripture is cause for concern.
  - a. The first mention of Alexandrians were a group in Acts 6:9 who disputed with Stephen. They turned out to be bitter enemies of the Word of God.
  - b. The next mention of anyone from Alexandria is found in Acts 18. Apollos was an eloquent speaker, a great pulpiteer, but doctrinally messed up. He had to be straightened out by Aquilla and Priscilla in Acts 18:26.
  - c. The only other mentions of Alexandria in scripture are found in Acts 27:6 and

Acts 28:11. Both have to do with ships going from Alexandria to Italy for the purpose of trade.

d. As we continue you will see a definite connection between Alexandria and Rome in the New Testament.

3. From Alexandria, this family of texts went straight to Rome, where it became the foundation of the Catholic Bible, the Codex Vaticanus.

4. Constantine authorized a distribution of 50 copies of this Greek text and these became the standard of the paganized, Roman church.

D. Every English translation from any source other than the Roman Catholic Church, until 1881 was from the Syrian Family rather than the Egyptian.

## II. The New Versions Have Questionable Lines of Support

A. The Egyptian school of manuscripts has a long line of what we would consider heretics as their major proponents.

### 1. Philo of Alexandria

a. Totally rejected the Old Testament as an accurate revelation from God. He used it, but changed it wherever it did not line up with his own beliefs. (See Gen. 3)

b. He was a follower of the ideas of Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle and incorporated them into the Old Testament at will.

c. Philo did not believe that Adam and Eve were real people; he believed that the first eleven chapters of Genesis were a myth.

### 2. Clement of Alexandria 150 - 215 AD

a. He was a star worshipper.

b. He believed the Greeks to be God's chosen people.

c. He taught that a man gets to heaven by overcoming sensuality.

### 3. Origen 184-254 AD

- a. Origen was undoubtedly the greatest heretic that this world has ever known.
- b. He believed water baptism was necessary for salvation.
- c. He did not believe that the Old Testament was true.
- d. He did not believe that the account of the beginnings in Genesis was literal.
- e. He did not believe in the literal resurrection of Jesus Christ.
- f. He taught the restoration of the devil. In other words, he believed that God and the Devil would eventually patch up their differences and live happily ever after.
- g. He did not believe in the bodily second coming of Christ.
- h. He taught a doctrine similar to Catholic "purgatory".
- i. He believed that the writings of Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle were inspired of God.
- j. The main theme of teaching in his school was that Jesus Christ was not God.

#### 4. Eusebius circa 300 AD

- a. He was the one who got Constantine behind this line of manuscripts.
- b. Eusebius worshipped the ground Origen walked on and followed him into his apostasy.

#### 5. Westcott and Hort

- a. These two men were the founders of the modern movement known as higher criticism.
- b. We could speak volumes as to their credentials but let this suffice.
  - 1). They were not Christians, so how could they have been able to discern that which was pure from that which was corrupt.
  - 2). They had an overt prejudice against all Byzantine texts.

3). They excused their errors by creating in their own conjecture, a position which they believed the original authors most assuredly must have held. They had no proof that such a position was in fact the case.

4). There is great evidence from the secular biographies of these men that they were involved in what we would refer to today as New Age religion.

c. Yet their work is accepted as the foundation for every English translation of the Bible since the King James.

B. The fact that many of today's respected Bible teachers use the newer versions is not an infallible landmark to truth.

### III. The Question of 6000 Omissions

A. The modern translators, having accepted the writings of the before mentioned men as true, have chosen to heed the readings of the Egyptian text rather than the Syrian text in over 6000 places through out the Word of God.

1. It should be noted that this is in spite of the fact that there are generally almost nine times as many Syrian manuscripts as there are Egyptian manuscripts.

2. In many of these cases it results in a mere change in wording, but there are many significant omissions.

B. You will receive a list of the 200 most prominent omissions along with these notes, but there are a few that I wish to emphasize.

1. Acts 8:37 is completely deleted in the NIV. The doctrine of salvation is omitted.

2. I John 5:7,8 - The doctrine of the Trinity is severely weakened by the omissions here.

3. Acts 9:5,6 - The conviction and response of Paul is omitted.

4. John 3:15 - The prospect of perishing is omitted.

C. There are a multitude of other examples that we could list, but hopefully these are enough to convince you that something is missing.

D. The great danger in this is that we are taking away from the Word of God, and God has warned us of the consequences of those actions.

Conclusion:

The illustration from Joshua 9 from "How To Study The Bible" by Bob Alexander, pages 104-105

Now please don't go and burn all the new versions that you can find just to show that you are spiritual. Don't point your finger and condemn those who use them and accuse them of being "demon possessed." My purpose in this chapter was to show YOU the difference in Bible versions so YOU could be edified and challenged to believe the word of God and come to your own conclusion.

Resources:

"Revision Revised" By Dean John Burgon

"Believing Bible Study" - Author Unknown

"Inquiry Into The Integrity of The Greek Vulgate or The Received Text of the New Testament" By Frederick Nolan Published 1815

"Translators Revived" By Alexander McClure

"Defending the King James Bible" by D.A. Waite

"Introduction To The New Testament in The Original Greek" by Westcott - Let him tell you what he believed !

"Our Authorized Bible Vindicated" by Benjamin Wilkinson Excellent resource!

Chapter IX about the lives and beliefs of Westcott and Hort. Short summary: Hort writes on Oct. 21, 1858 Evangelicals seem to me to be perverted rather than untrue. There are, I fear, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, and especially the authority of the Bible. On April 3, 1860, Hort praises the writings of Darwin and says that he(Hort) believes his theory to be unanswerable. On Oct. 26th, Hort, writing to Dr. Lightfoot says, "But you know I am a staunch sacerdotalist." Westcott & Hort were founding members of the "Ghostlie Guild" which was "established for the investigation of all supernatural appearances and effects." Hort stated that "Protestantism is only parenthetical and temporary.

Hort, "We dare not forsake the sacraments, or God will forsake us. Hort on the vicarious death of Christ: "Certainly nothing could be more unscriptural than the modern limiting of Christ's bearing our sins and sufferings to His death; but indeed that is only one aspect of an almost universal heresy." Westcott's conspiratorial tone before the Committee met: "I suggested to Ellicott a plan of tabulating and circulating emendations before our meeting which may in the end prove valuable." Hort again, "It is, I think, difficult to measure the weight of acceptance won beforehand for the Revision by the single fact of our welcoming an Unitarian." Hort writes to Williams: "The errors and prejudices, which we agree in wishing to remove, can surely be more