
Why I Believe the
OLD KING JAMES BIBLE
BRUCE LACKEY



Table of Contents

Conversion and Call to the Ministry.....	1
It Proves Itself.....	5
Inspiration.....	13
The Doctrine of Preservation.....	23
King James Version Only?.....	35
Answers to Objections.....	39
Significant Differences With Other Versions.....	59
Revisions of the 1611 King James Version.....	75
Conclusions.....	91
Scripture Index.....	99

Conversion and Call to the Ministry

As a result of hearing men preach the King James Version, I was convicted of my sins and need of a Saviour. I received the Lord Jesus Christ as my personal Saviour, believing God's promise in John 1:12, as recorded in the KJV. Preachers told me that it was God's Word, inspired by the Holy Spirit and without error. Maybe some of them did not really believe that; maybe they were thinking of the original manuscripts, but when they said it, they held up the KJV and read from it.

There is no denying that the Lord changed my life, just as He promised in II Cor. 5:17. And the work that He did has lasted for many years, in spite of many attacks which I have heard on the Bible that I first believed. The fact is, it worked back then and has been unabated ever since! I have absolutely no reason to doubt its practical value, now.

The only way a person can be born again is by the incorruptible word of God (I Pet. 1:23). Was I born again, on that night long ago? Have I been deluded all these years? Did a book full of errors

change my life and make me love God, whom I had so long ignored? Has that book of errors edified me through thick and thin, motivating me to prayer and faith and self-denial? I answer a resounding "No!" If the King James Version has errors, it can not be the word of God, and I could not have been born again. How many millions of people would be thus deceived?

There was a time when I seemed to be engulfed by satanic forces, trying to make me think I had never been saved. It was during an invitation which was being given at the close of a preaching service. I seemed to be surrounded by a great cloud of confusion. The Spirit of God immediately brought John 1:12 to my mind, enabling me to recall that I had believed that verse the night I trusted Christ. Over and over, I repeated, "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." I do not know how long it lasted, but before that invitation was closed, those words of scripture had driven away the confusion and fear, assuring my heart once and for all. Did a wrongly-translated verse defeat the devil? Not for a split second! Anyone who has ever faced a temptation by Satan knows that nothing less than the word of God will overcome him!

In the five years which followed that new birth, my heart was frequently stirred by various scriptures, prompting me to preach. I had many privileges to do so, in jails, rescue missions, churches, and on the streets. This culminated in my surrender to God's will and the beginning of many joyful years as a pastor, teacher, and evangelist.

Was it a book of errors which motivated my heart to preach? As any Bible preacher knows, a man will not stay in the ministry for very long unless he has a good reason. If that King James Version was not the word of God, I could have never fought battles and endured troubles, as millions of others have done. Rather, I can say with Jeremiah, "His word was in my heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones . . . and I could not stay." (Jer. 20:9).

By the way, I have no trouble with the fact that "his word" is italicized in that verse. The translators correctly added them because 1:4-5 made it clear that it was "the word of the Lord" that had called him in the first place!

There have been many instances when I was discouraged or perplexed, through the years. In every case, the remedy has been to go back to the same Bible which I had believed when I was saved and called to preach. The result has always been the same: renewed zeal, burning fire, another message from God that just had to be preached!

I am well aware that my subjective reasoning will be rejected by some, but I do not hesitate to use it, anyhow. We surely must not depend on experience when it is contrary to scripture, but experience which corroborates scripture has been told and re-told through the ages by God's people. The next chapter discusses this very matter.

It Proves Itself

In Heb. 4:12, God makes strong claims for His word, asserting that it is powerful, can divide the soul and spirit, and can discern the thoughts and intents of the heart. Many such verses exist in scripture. God evidently wanted us to have His evidence by which we could know His word. If we must depend on man to tell us where inspired scripture is, we are going to end up in hopeless uncertainty (which seems to be the condition of so many today).

The Bible carries its own proof, and we can thank God that it does. Imagine how helpless most people would have been, for 1800 years, when communications were so limited, if they had been dependent on textual critics to identify God's word. The majority of Christians throughout this church age have had absolutely no contact with the experts, nor was it possible. Could they have known where the Bible was? We can rejoice that God included His evidence in His word! A few of these verses will now be discussed.

I Pet. 1:23, "Being born again, not of cor-

ruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.”

God’s word produces the new birth! And, there is no doubt about whether a person has been born again, because, “if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.” (II Cor. 5:17)

If the King James Version is full of errors, it is not “incorruptible;” if it is not incorruptible, it is not the word of God and cannot produce the new birth. And if that is true, what has made millions of people become new creatures in Christ?

But what about those who claim to have been saved by believing another version? This question will be answered later in this chapter. For the moment, let us return to the Bible’s proofs of itself.

Psa. 19:7a, “The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.”

The Old Testament teaches the same as the New: I Pet. 1:23 agrees with Psa. 19:7 (and James 1:18 and John 5:24). The soul’s conversion is evidence that scripture has worked.

Psa. 19:7b, “The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.”

Godly people, for centuries, have obtained the wisdom necessary for the rearing of children, as well as wisdom for other vital areas of life, from the scripture. People who were without knowledge of

child psychology have followed the Bible and produced spiritual giants. Where did John Newton’s mother learn that the scripture would stay with her infant son until adulthood and would convert him, even after years of debauchery? Before she died, in John’s seventh year, she succeeded in getting him to memorize whole paragraphs of scripture. Years later, during a violent storm on the open sea, he remembered Prov. 1:24-33, along with other passages, and was brought by them to trust the Lord Jesus. Evidently, Mrs. Newton believed Prov. 22:6 (“Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it.”)! Various other translations of this verse have been made, but John Newton is a good example of the accuracy of the King James Version. When he was old, Newton unmistakably followed what his mother had taught him during those first seven years of his life.

Psa.19:8 “The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes.”

Countless millions have found joy from the King James Version, in spite of the miserable circumstances in which they lived. Of course, people can rejoice when reading other things, but the joy which comes from scripture is “pure, enlightening the eyes.” Could a corrupted Bible have produced such joy?

Acts 20:32, “. . . the word of his grace, which is able to build you up . . .”

The King James Version has certainly pointed

millions to the grace of God, then has built them up in the faith, enabling them to endure the worst that Satan could throw at them. To the contrary, the modern versions, which follow the Westcott-Hort Greek text, omit the last half of Rom. 11:6, weakening that wonderful contrast between grace and works. They also add a phrase in I Pet. 2:2, either stating or implying that one can grow into salvation. That verse in the Revised Standard Version says, "Like newborn babes, long for the pure spiritual milk, that by it you may grow up to salvation." The Phillips translation is the same. But, aside from these modern versions, the question remains: How could a corrupted Bible (as many charge the KJV to be) point people to God's grace and build them up? If a corrupted Bible could do what a pure Bible can, we would have no reason to believe that an inspired Bible is any better than man's books. But once again, we face the undeniable fact that the KJV has done, for 300+ years, just what God has said His word would do.

Rom. 10:17, "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

Can anyone deny that George Mueller got faith from the King James Version? How many parents have believed the promises in the KJV and seen their children saved? How many missionaries have proved God's faithfulness during impossible circumstances by clinging to verses as given in the KJV?

Many other verses could be discussed, but for the sake of brevity, will be mentioned, only. II Cor. 7:8-9 teaches that God's word makes people sor-

row unto repentance; Gal. 3:24 says that the law of God brings us to Christ; II Tim. 3:15 states that the holy scriptures are able to make one wise unto salvation. All these things have been done times without number, for these 300+ years, through the KJV, when people had no other Bible.

There are objections to this kind of reasoning; many will say that we do not prove the Bible by experience. But rather than trying to prove the Bible, this reasoning has been giving illustrations that the evidence which God claims for His word is seen by what the King James Version has produced for more than three centuries. The apostle Peter did basically the same thing in Acts 11, after describing God's working in the family of Cornelius, when he said, "Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God?" He demonstrated that his actions had been correct by appealing to the work that God did through his preaching.

Jer. 23 is another place where the same reasoning is applied; this time, it is God, Himself, who argues in this manner. In those days, before the Bible was complete, God revealed His word through prophets. It seemed to be a common thing in Jeremiah's day for false prophets to claim that they had heard from God. The common man certainly needed some way by which to recognize the true from the false, so God gave it in this chapter. He identifies the false prophet in v. 14 as one who commits adultery, walks in lies, and strengthens the hands of evildoers, resulting in the fact that none returned from his wickedness. In other words, the

false prophets not only lived in sin, but encouraged others to do so; worse, their preaching did not produce repentance. A further characteristic was that they promised peace to people who despised the Lord (v. 17). They also put a lot of emphasis on dreams (vv. 25-28). Sounds like some preachers in the 20th century! The matter of their failure to produce repentance seems to be the clincher. In v. 22, the Lord specifically said, "But if they had stood in my counsel, and had caused my people to hear my words, then they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings." Preaching which does not produce repentance is not biblical! Without question, then, God identified His word by that which it produces, and the false prophesyings likewise.

But others still object to this reasoning as proof of the King James Version by saying that these same results have been produced through other versions. To this objection, the following observations are submitted.

1. For approximately 300 years, the KJV was the only Bible available to the English-speaking masses. If it was fraught with errors, as so many insist, it could not have been the incorruptible word of God; therefore it could not have produced scriptural results. History, however, proves that it did so.

2. Other translations were made from the same Greek and Hebrew into German, Spanish, etc., producing the same results.

3. When a modern version produces a scriptural result, examination will prove that the particular

verse which did so is correctly translated. Of course, there are many verses in modern versions which teach the same truth as the KJV; it is those which are different that cause all the problems. For example, John 1:18 in the New American Standard Bible teaches two Gods: one which was begotten, and one which begat. When someone is begotten, that is his beginning. Did the eternal God produce another god? This would be heresy!

4. The purpose here is not to attack modern versions; rather, it is to defend the King James Version against those who say that modern versions are necessary because the KJV has so many errors in it.

5. The basic question is: did the masses of people have the word of God when they had only the KJV? If so, the attackers are barking up the wrong tree, baying at the moon, and erecting a straw man. The fact is that the people had a Bible which produced exactly what God had said His word would do!

Inspiration

Almost everyone limits inspiration to the original manuscripts. Every standard definition of inspiration, found in theology books, does so. Men usually appeal to reason in defending this definition, saying that it would be impossible to believe that God inspired every copyist and translator and printer, just as He did the original writer. However, in this matter, as in all others, we must be instructed by the Bible itself. We would expect that the Bible would have all the information we need on such an important subject as inspiration, and we can thank God that this is the case.

The word "inspiration" is found only in Job 32:8 and II Tim. 3:16, in the King James Version. We will be safe in ignoring Job 32:8 in this discussion, because it simply records the statement of one of Job's critics, Elihu. This man was so unimportant that the Lord ignored him when He came to correct Job and his three friends. Even if we were to take Elihu's statement as being truth, it would have nothing to do with the inspiration of scripture. Therefore, I will confine my study to the statement

in II Tim. 3:16, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

No matter how this verse is translated, it tells us that the thing which God has inspired is "all scripture." Before we try to put our own definition on that word, it would be wise to see how the New Testament uses it.

The first occurrence in the New Testament is Mat. 21:42, "Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders **rejected, the same** is become the head of the corner; this is the Lord's doing, **and** it is marvellous in our eyes?" The Saviour was referring to Psa. 118:22-23, which says, "The stone which the builders **refused** is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes." Looking at the words in bold print, we see that **refused** was changed to **rejected**; Matthew has **the same**, but Psalms does not; Matthew has **and** before "it is marvellous," but Psalms does not.

Obviously, these differences in no way affect the meaning, but since it is not a word-for-word quotation, nor was it given in Hebrew, we must take note that the Lord said, "Did ye never read in the scriptures." Christ called that which He quoted "scriptures." Therefore, it is correct to apply this word to a translation. If Christ had adhered to that which modern scholars tell us, He would have quoted the scripture in Hebrew; only then would He have been able to call it inspired. Now, we may not be able to prove exactly what language Christ spoke in;

scholars disagree on that, also. It does not matter; the significant thing is that, when the Holy Spirit inspired these words, He did not move Matthew to write them in Hebrew, but rather in Greek. And He still called them "scriptures!" Why should we hesitate to do so?

A comparison of Luke 4:18-19 and Isa. 61:1-2 will also show differences.

Luke 4:18-19

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
because he hath anointed me to
preach the gospel to the poor;
he hath sent me to heal the
brokenhearted,
to preach deliverance to the captives,
and recovering of sight to the blind,
to set at liberty them that are bruised,
To preach the acceptable year of
the Lord.

Isa. 61:1-2

The spirit of the Lord God is upon me;
because the Lord hath anointed me to
preach good tidings unto the meek;
he hath sent me to bind up the
brokenhearted,
to proclaim liberty to the captives
and the opening of the prison to them
that are bound;
To proclaim the acceptable year of
the Lord.

There can be no doubt that the Lord Jesus was reading from a translation of Isaiah. It may have been a translation into Aramaic (the language which some scholars believe was being spoken in Israel in the day of Christ) or into Greek, or some other language. There would be no way to prove or disprove the particular language. Many object to this, by saying that the Jews would have not allowed anything but Hebrew to be spoken in the synagogue; however, we have no proof of that from scripture. What we do have is the unmistakable language of the Bible, in the previous verse, "And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written . . ." Note: Christ "opened the book" and found the place "where it was written." Verses 18-19 are a quota-

tion of what he read, if the words of the Bible mean anything!

The significance here for us is that Christ called what He read "scripture," in v. 21. If "all scripture is given by inspiration of God," (II Tim. 3:16), and if this that Jesus read was scripture, then what He read must have been inspired. Yet, it was obviously a translation, since there are several differences from the Hebrew. From this practice of the Lord Jesus Himself, I cannot conclude other than that an accurate translation is inspired, as well as the original language.

Men may argue about primary or secondary inspiration, but since the Bible says nothing about such, I choose to ignore that. I have chosen to get my doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness from scripture.

The same situation exists in Acts 8:32-33, where the eunuch is said to have been reading from Isaiah. A comparison of those two verses with Isa. 53:7-8 would show that he must have been reading from a translation; yet this passage is called scripture in both v. 32 and v. 35.

The same thing is done in John 7:38; 13:18; 19:24, 36, 37, et al. With all these examples, how can we doubt that accurate translations are inspired? If "all scripture is given by inspiration," and if translations are called "scripture" in the Bible, the conclusion must be obvious. Could it be that many reject this conclusion because they do not want to appear unintellectual? Many of us could not bear to be classified as "unlearned and ignorant

16

men," as Peter and John were. But then, neither do we have the power or success that they had. There might be a correlation between those two things, if we dare seek it.

Inspiration must not be limited to the original manuscripts; the Bible does not do so. "Preach deliverance" is just as inspired as "proclaim liberty." Neither should inspiration be limited to the original word. "The Lord" is just as inspired as HO KURIOS. If this is not true, then no one has an inspired Bible today, since all agree that no one has the original manuscripts. If no one has an inspired Bible, then what is all this fuss about inerrancy good for? Why argue about something that no one has? The liberals must be laughing at the folly of so-called fundamentalists and conservatives and moderates who are arguing about the inspiration and inerrancy of something that no one has and that can not be found. It must be obvious that such an argument can never be settled, because we are not going to recover the originals this side of heaven.

Worse, if we have no inspired Bible, then what business do we have trying to preach? II Tim. 4:2 commands us to "Preach the word," which is an obvious reference to "the holy scriptures" (3:15) and the "scripture (which) is given by inspiration of God" (3:16), but how can we do this if we do not have it? Without an inspired Bible, the preacher has no message. Could this be the real reason behind the ineffective preaching of our day? Could it be that our problem is not inferior outlines, or lack of study, or bad illustrations, or poor delivery, but simply that we do not believe that we have inspired scriptures from which to preach? A man who

17

does not have an inspired Bible ought to quit preaching because he has no message from God. Such a man is no better than the liberal or the false cultist, who is simply giving his views on various matters, or the views of someone else. Why waste people's time with something they can get in the daily newspaper or in various magazines?

If I did not have inspired scriptures from which to preach, I would forget the ministry and go make an honest living working at a secular job.

These words are not meant to be a condemnation of all who disagree about inspiration. I am not calling such men heretics or apostates, although some of them may very well be. I know from personal experience that many good men have not thought these things through enough to realize the seriousness of saying that only the original manuscripts are inspired. All of us are in danger of simply repeating what respected men have taught us, without thinking about the implications. There was a time when I said that only the originals were inspired, because men whom I highly respected said so. I do rejoice, however, that I was challenged to study just what the Bible says about itself and began to see the things that have been discussed already in this chapter. I am not claiming originality for all of these, because some of them were given to me through others. However, some of these thoughts came directly from my study of the scripture; then I learned that others have seen the same truths also. Originality is not the important thing, but what the Bible says about itself is. A long time ago, I wrote these words in my Bible: I have read what men say about the Bible, and what it says about itself; I have

chosen to believe the latter. That conviction remains with me as I write these words, and, I trust, will continue until I meet the Saviour in the air.

It is a mistake to say that the translators were inspired; neither they nor the original writers were inspired. It was the scripture that was inspired (II Tim. 3:16); the writers "spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," (II Pet. 1:21). We may not be able to explain how a translation could have been inspired, especially when historical records tell us that men labored over their translation, having others to check them for errors, making corrections, etc. But while we do not understand the inspiration of a translation, it must be admitted that we do not understand the inspiration of the original writings. Scripture nowhere explains the process, referring to it only with such words as those quoted above in II Pet. 1:21, as well as II Sam. 23:2 ("The spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue,") and Mat. 1:22 ("that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet").

And while we are on the subject of "the originals," we need to inquire into just what was original? For instance, Rom. 16:22 indicates that Tertius wrote the epistle to the Romans, a statement which is understood to mean that Paul dictated the words and Tertius was his secretary. What was original, the spoken words of Paul, or the written words of Tertius? Since II Tim. 3:16 says that "scripture" is inspired, and since "scripture" refers to that which is written, would the written words of Tertius be inspired rather than the spoken words of Paul? Such reasoning would be foolish. It shows the fallacy of trying to limit inspiration to the "original."

Likewise, were the spoken words of Christ “original,” or were the words original only when Matthew wrote them? Which were more inspired, Christ’s spoken words, or Matthew’s written ones? These question should also show the folly of limiting inspiration to the “original words.”

When Moses spoke to Pharaoh, did he speak in Hebrew, or did he not rather speak in Pharaoh’s language? If so, then what was actually written down in the book of Exodus was a translation. Which is more original, more inspired, Moses’ words in Pharaoh’s language, or Moses’ written words in Hebrew?

When the men of Hezekiah copied Solomon’s proverbs (Prov. 25:1), which would be considered to be original? If Solomon’s proverbs were the only original, then in what condition were those words when Hezekiah’s men copied them? They were only a copy. Are copies inspired?

What about Prov. 31, “The words of king Lemuel, the prophecy that his mother taught him”? What was inspired, the spoken words of his mother, or the written words when they were put in scripture?

(I am indebted to Herb Evans for the ideas in the previous five paragraphs).

There is obviously no point in continuing these examples from scripture. The questions would be the same and the answers, also. It is unmitigated folly to try to limit inspiration to the “original words” because it is impossible to determine what

is “original” in these cases, as well as many others. We had better stick with scriptural usage when we speak of inspiration. Anything which qualifies to be called “scripture” is inspired.

Our first responsibility is to believe. The principle is stated in Heb. 11:3, “Through faith we understand.” If we decide to believe exactly what God said, without question, we can expect understanding to follow, in God’s own time. He knows when we are capable of understanding His truth. He knows what spiritual victories must be won before “the eyes of our understanding are enlightened.” Let us decide, once and for all, to believe what the Bible says about itself. If we are asked questions which we cannot answer, let us unashamedly say, “I don’t know.” Our responsibility in regard to answering questions is stated in I Pet. 3:15, “But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear.” If we “sanctify the Lord God in our hearts,” we will surely decide to believe His word, regardless of what men say or even of what we might fear. We do not hesitate to tell men that we believe in creation because the Bible teaches it, even though we cannot prove it in a test tube, nor can we answer all the questions that unbelievers may raise about it. The same is true of the doctrine of incarnation; who can understand God becoming man? But our lack of understanding in no way affects our faith in this wonderful doctrine. The same could be said about Christ’s bearing the sins of the whole world on the cross, his resurrection, or any number of other super-natural things which the Bible records and which all Bible-

believers believe. We should have no trouble saying the same thing about inspiration; let us believe what the Bible says, even if we are considered to be unlearned and ignorant men.

God takes note of them who tremble at His word (Isa. 66:2), and we can not miss the fact that such a person is also described in that verse as one who is "poor and of a contrite spirit." I have decided not to let the idol of intellectual pride rob me of God's word. My mind is made up: I intend to follow the example of Christ and the apostles, who used translations of scripture authoritatively to preach the gospel and show God's people how to live!

The Doctrine of Preservation

The doctrines of inspiration and preservation are similar to those of repentance and faith in this respect: although they may be studied as separate doctrines, they exist and work together in an inseparable manner. It is impossible for a person to repent without believing (scripturally), and it is impossible for scripture to be inspired without also being preserved. The reason for this statement is simple: in many places, God has promised to preserve His word for all generations. If those statements are inspired, then God must have done it.

There are questions about preservation which we have not been able to answer, as yet. It is much the same as creation; none of us witnessed creation, nor can we prove it in a test tube, but we believe it because God says it (Heb. 11:3, "Through faith, we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God."). Although we can not point to one particular Hebrew or Greek manuscript and say that it is an exact copy of the original, we can say that God has preserved His word for every generation because He said that He would. Our problem is that

we do not have the original manuscripts with which to compare anything. But to the Bible-believer, this presents no problem. Just as the nobleman of John 4:50, we believe God's word whether we have proof, or not.

Once our faith is established on scripture, we make conclusions that are based on God's word, rather than on man's. Here is the crux of the whole matter: must we depend on man to tell us what is scripture and what is error, or do we have a word from God on that matter?

Most emphatically, God has spoken! The following verses from various parts of the Bible clearly teach that God promised to preserve His word for all generations.

Psa. 12:7, "Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever."

Some Christians object to using this verse to teach the preservation of scripture, saying that it refers to "the poor . . . the needy" of vs. 5. Others insist that the word "them" refers to "the words of the Lord," of vs. 6. How can differences of interpretation like this be settled? The safest way is to consider parallel scripture. If an interpretation is taught elsewhere in the Bible, and if that interpretation does not violate the immediate context, it must be accepted as a possible one. The following scriptures unmistakably teach the preservation of scriptures, so that interpretation of this verse must be allowed.

Psa. 33:11, "The counsel of the Lord

standeth for ever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations."

Christians believe that God's counsel is expressed in His words. For examples, see Judges 20:18, 23 and Psa. 107:11. Also, it should be obvious that we could know God's thoughts only by knowing His words. Therefore, God expressly teaches, in this verse, that His words will stand "to all generations." Would that not include those 1400 years when the so-called "best" manuscripts were lost? If these recently-discovered manuscripts are the best, whereas those which were circulated were corrupt, then God would have broken His promise. Such would be unthinkable and impossible for Him who cannot lie (Heb. 6:18 and Tit. 1:2). Therefore, we evaluate manuscripts, not according to the preference of textual scholars, but according to God's word. If they have not been available to all generations, they cannot be "the counsel of the Lord . . . the thoughts of his heart."

Psa. 100:5, ". . . his truth endureth to all generations."

Here is another passage which some men deny teaches preservation. As a matter of fact, it has been translated differently in modern versions, to say that God's faithfulness, rather than His truth, endures to all generations. But why should this be done? Are people embarrassed by the doctrine of preservation? Why should any Christian object to this promise? Rather, it should be the normal thing to expect of the God who can do all things and loves all people of all generations. The following facts prove that this passage is correctly translated in the KJV:

(1) Although the Hebrew word EMUNAH is translated various ways in the KJV, it is rendered "truth" 12 times, just as it is in this verse. There should be nothing puzzling about this practice; it is common to all versions of the Bible. Hebrew and Greek words often have multiple meanings, even as English words do. It is the translator's challenge to find the proper meaning which best fits the context. Therefore, for someone to say that the KJV is inconsistent in translating the particular Hebrew word is to ignore that all versions do likewise.

(2) When translated "truth," this word is associated with scripture, in Psa. 33:4; 89:49; 96:13; 119:30; Jer. 7:28; and 9:3.

(3) When translated "faithful," it is also associated with scripture, in Psa. 119:138.

(4) When translated "faithfulness," it is likewise associated with scripture in Psa. 40:10; 89:33-34; 119:89-90; and Isa. 25:1.

(5) Although the American Standard, the New American Standard, the Living Bible, and the New Berkley Version translate it "faithfulness" in Psa. 100:5, it does not always have that meaning. For instance, it cannot mean mere faithfulness in Isa. 59:4 ("None calleth for justice, nor any pleadeth for truth") or Jer. 5:1 ("if there be any that executeth judgment, that seeketh the truth"). And it is interesting that several modern versions translated the word "truth" in these two verses, but not in Psa. 100:5! Why? Were they afraid of the doctrine of preservation?

In the light of all these facts, I conclude that the word is accurately rendered "truth" in the KJV. The question remains, "Why have modern translators changed this verse?" The answer seems to be obvious. If God kept His promise that His truth would endure to all generations, then those generations, which had only the KJV, had God's truth and the enemies of the KJV are falsely accusing it.

Psa. 111:7-8, "all his commandments are sure. They stand fast for ever and ever."

Man could not corrupt or lose God's commandments, if they stand fast for ever and ever! Of course, men have tried to do so, and have succeeded in part, with various perverted translations. But this verse clearly teaches that God will see to it that His commandments will be correct and available to every generation, no matter what man tries to do. The doctrine of preservation does not guarantee that every version will be accurate, but it does teach that God will see to it that His truth is always available to every generation.

Psa. 119:152, "Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them forever."

The psalmist believed that he still had the words of God, even after several hundred years of being copied by hand. Did any of those copyists make mistakes? Did any apostates during the time of the judges try to corrupt the scriptures? Human nature being what it is, we may assume that such hap-

pened. But God oversaw the whole thing and preserved His testimonies in spite of it all.

Psa. 119:160, "Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever."

It is not merely the basic thought, but "every one of thy righteous judgments" which endures forever.

Psa. 146:6 speaks of God, "which keepeth truth for ever."

Prov. 22:12, "The eyes of the Lord preserve knowledge."

We are again reminded that it is God who preserves His word, not man. Some textual critics repeatedly refer to copyists' errors, or to the changes made by apostates. No doubt, these have happened many times, but we must not forget that, in spite of these things, God has promised to preserve His truth. Believers have no trouble believing that He is perfectly capable of doing so.

Isa. 59:21, "As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever."

God can use even unbelievers and Christ-rejectors to fulfill His plan, if He so chooses! This promise was made to the nation of Israel, a nation which

was far from God. Verses 1-15 describe their sins; verses 16-19 show that God will defeat their enemies; verse 20 predicts the coming of the Redeemer to Zion; then verse 21 promises that God will preserve His word for every one of their generations. This would have to include all those generations during which most of Israel has been rebellious against His word and has rejected His Son. In other words, the preservation and accuracy of scripture do not depend on the devotion of the scribes, copyists, and printers, but on the living God who acts in grace toward His chosen! God has used even unbelieving Jews to preserve His word for all their generations. We can thank Him forever that He has taken it upon Himself to preserve His word, rather than being dependent on the textual critics.

Mat. 24:35, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

How could any statement be clearer? If Christ's words shall not pass away, they must be available; yet, most of the changes which have been made between the Westcott-Hort text and the Textus Receptus seem to be in the four Gospels, the very words of Christ. This promise is related to the next verse, also.

Mat. 28:19-20, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

It should be obvious that we are to obey this command “unto the end of the world.” But did Christ command us to do something that would be impossible? If we are to teach new converts to observe all that He commanded, then we would have to possess those commands. The clear implication is that we will have “all things whatsoever” He commanded unto the end of the world. Also, His presence is promised to His people unto the end of the world. How is this presence realized? Christ made that clear in John 14:23, “If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.” Christ’s presence is realized in His words. If His presence will be with His people until the end of the world, then His word will be also.

I Pet. 1:23, 25, “Being born again . . . of incorruptible (seed), by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever . . . But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.”

These words were written to “strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,” who “were not a people” (2:10) before they were saved; therefore they were not Jews, but Gentiles. Chapter 4, verse 3, also indicates that they were idolaters before being born again. This is another proof that they were Gentiles, since the Jews had been purged from their idolatry by the Babylonian captivity (see Hos. 3:4). It must be obvious that these Gentiles were not evangelized with the original manuscripts! If those originals had existed at that time, they would surely have been kept

under lock and key in the temple at Jerusalem. In no case would the priests have let Christians, whom they considered to be heretics, take the original manuscripts to far-away Cappadocia, Galatia, etc. Therefore, these people were evangelized and won to Christ with copies of the Hebrew scriptures, or with translations into their native languages. In either case, what they heard was far removed in time from the originals, yet the Holy Spirit, through Peter, said it was the incorruptible word of God!

With all these promises, statements, and examples from scripture, we must conclude that God has preserved His word for all generations. In spite of all this evidence, many scholars would have us believe that the best and most correct manuscripts were either hidden or lost for approximately 1400 years.

Although no one can prove by history that one inspired copy of entire scripture existed in every particular language during every year of this church age, this does not daunt the Bible-believer. We depend, not on history, but on scripture for our doctrines. For the Bible-believer, creation is true because God said so, not because it can be demonstrated from archaeology. Likewise, preservation is true because many scriptures teach it, whether or not it can be demonstrated by historical records.

Since God kept His promise to preserve His truth for all generations, the King James Version must be His word. Likewise, the Hebrew and Greek texts from which it was translated are the word of God, because they are the ones which were available,

copied, and circulated during all these generations of this church age. God did not promise to make sure that every person would have a copy of His word, but He did clearly say that it would be available to all generations. That which was available was His word; that which was hidden or lost was not His word.

Many object to this conclusion because various manuscripts within the Textus Receptus have different words. They are not all exact copies. But this objection ignores what the Bible demonstrates hundreds of times, when the New Testament quotes the Old. Sometimes words are changed and even paraphrases are made, but the meaning is the same and both are inspired, as is demonstrated in the following examples:

Mat. 1:23

be with child
bring forth
and they shall call

Mat. 4:14-16

That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, The land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles; the people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up.

Mat. 13:35

parables
things which have been kept secret
from the foundation of the world

John 19:36

A bone of him shall not be broken

Isa. 7:14

conceive
bear
and shall call

Isa. 9:1-2

The land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations. The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined.

Psa. 78:2

parable
dark saying
of old

Psa. 34:20

He keepeth all his bones: not one of them is broken.

Did the Holy Spirit violate inspiration when He changed these words from the Old Testament to the New? Of course not. Both testaments are equally inspired. I Tim. 5:18 quotes Deut. 25:4 and Luke 10:7, calling them both "scripture." It is significant that Paul would call the writing of his companion, Luke, scripture, along with the writings of Moses! Of course, when we remember that it was the Holy Spirit who said that through Paul, it becomes even more significant!

Does this practice mean that God preserved only the basic thought? Does it deny verbal inspiration? Perish the thought! Christ clearly taught verbal inspiration when He said, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," (Mat. 4:4, quoting Deut. 8:3).

What it does do is give us many examples showing that God's words are still His words when translated! We may not fully understand that, or be able to answer all the questions which may arise concerning it, but we can not deny the obvious fact that the Holy Spirit used different words when He translated from Hebrew to Greek, without harming inspiration in the least!

For a few more examples, compare Mark 11:17 with Isa. 56:7; John 12:38 with Isa. 53:1; John 19:37 with Zech. 12:10; Rom. 4:3 with Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:7-8 with Psa. 32:1-2; Rom. 9:15 with Exo. 33:19; I Cor. 15:54 with Isa. 25:8; and Eph. 4:8 with Psa. 68:18.

One more thought about preservation: it is well

to remember that God did not say He would preserve His word only in Hebrew and Greek. Reverent textual scholars have profited much by studying early translations, such as the Syriac, (4th-5th centuries), and old Italian (2nd-4th centuries), as well as the writings of Irenaeus (born, 130), Tertullian (155-222) and Cyprian (200-258). It is obvious that some of these translations and writings (which quoted scripture) are older than any Greek manuscripts which we have. They cannot be ignored, especially when some people put so much emphasis on age. Many of these old translations and writings quote verses which critics say were added to Greek in the 14th and 15th centuries. Somebody's time-machine is really out of adjustment!

When God's people get to heaven and learn all the facts of history, those who believed His promise of preservation will be glad they did; those who put too much stock on incomplete historical records to the detriment of scripture will be "ashamed before him at his coming" (I John 2:28).

Let us not worry about the qualifications or dedication of the copyists through the ages; let us not fret about their lack of spirituality, or even the fact that some were not converted. Let us rather rejoice in our sovereign God's power to keep His promises and carry out His plans!

"I am God, and there is none like me . . . I have spoken it, I will also bring it to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it." (Isa. 46:9-11).

King James Version Only?

The question, "Do you believe in the King James only?" is a loaded one. Before answering, it would be wise to determine what the inquirer means.

Remembering that God promised to preserve His words for all generations, I believe that inspired scripture existed and was circulated before the King James Version was translated. We probably will never in this life be able to determine exactly in what versions or languages it existed, because our historical records are so inadequate. Once again, we remind ourselves not to build doctrine on historical records, but on scripture.

Even liberal scholars admit that the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts from which the KJV was translated were the ones which were copied, circulated, and translated throughout the centuries. These were surely the word of God.

The Trinitarian Bible Society was formed in London in the 19th century to insure that accurate translations from the *Textus Receptus* would con-

tinue to be made and circulated in Spanish, Portuguese, and other world languages. Accurate translations which are based on the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts from which the KJV was translated would surely be the word of God for them, as the KJV is for English-speaking peoples.

I have not examined all those translations; therefore, I can not speak authoritatively of them. However, if reliable men can be believed, these translations are faithful to the Masoretic Hebrew and the Textus Receptus Greek. Neither have I read all the English versions which exist today. Only the more popular ones have been studied, such as the American Standard Version, the Revised Standard Version, the New American Standard Bible, the New English Bible, the New International Version, the Amplified Bible, the Phillips translation, the New Berkley Version, Good News For Modern Man (Today's English Version), The Living Bible, and the New King James Version.

The purpose here is not to attack or even to evaluate these versions, but rather to defend the KJV. These modern English versions differ significantly from the KJV. A careful comparison would prove that to anyone. I see no problem with putting scripture in modern English, as long as the meaning is not changed from that which has been available and circulated to all generations. The tragedy is that no modern version has done that! One cannot believe that two versions which have significant differences are both inspired. It is one thing to change some words (as the examples from the Old and New Testaments in the previous chapter); it is quite another to change meanings, or

omit words, phrases, sentences, and paragraphs, or add them (as in a few cases).

Until a modern English version comes along, which does not disagree with the KJV, I will believe that the only accurate copy of God's word in English is the King James Version, because it represents the Hebrew and Greek which was available through the centuries, and is the only Bible that English-speaking people had for two and one-half centuries.

Answers to Objections

In order to promote the modern versions, some people have resorted to attacks on the King James Bible. It would probably be impossible to discuss all the objections that have been raised to the KJV, but a few of the more common ones are answered in this chapter.

Italics

It is often claimed that the King James Version cannot be inspired because the italicized words were added by the translators. Many say that there is no Greek equivalent (or Hebrew, as the case may be) for these words in italics.

To show how foolish this objection is, we need only to remember that no version is a word-for-word translation from Hebrew and Greek. Such a translation would not make sense, in English. Every translator knows that it may be necessary to explain a word with a phrase, when going from one language to another. For example, it is virtually impossible to translate a Greek participle (one word)

with one English word. For another example. A word-for-word translation of Mat. 1:1 would read, "Book of generations of Jesus Christ, son David, son Abraham." Now, a comparison of this verse with any version which one might choose would show that everyone "adds" words when translating into English.

Italicized words were added to make sense to the English reader. For example, "word" is added in Deut. 8:3 because it would be incomplete to say, "man doth not live by bread only, but by every () that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live." Anyone can see that it must be a word which proceeds out of God's mouth, which He is requiring man to obey! The interesting thing is that, when the Holy Spirit inspired the quotation of this verse in Mat. 4:4, He chose to put a word for that "italicized" word. In Greek, one will find the word HREMA, which is translated "word." So much for saying that the italicized words are not inspired!

It has been said that the italicized words "to be" in Rom. 1:7 are misleading, because they imply that the Roman believers were not saints at that time (the verse says, "called to be saints"). This is supposed to show the "Church of England bias" of the KJV translators, teaching that only special people become saints and that they must wait until after death. Such a charge is reading between the lines, to say the least. If the same reasoning were to be applied to v. 1, we would have the KJV translators saying that Paul was not an apostle when he wrote Romans, but was "called TO BE an apostle" at some later time, possibly after death! Of course, such an interpretation would be ridiculous, but it

is no more ridiculous than the charge about v. 7. Some of these charges seem to be feeble attempts to build straw men. In any case, using common sense, how could anyone today think he could know what was in a translator's mind 3 1/2 centuries ago?

The same type of indictment is made regarding the word "unknown," which is italicized often in I Cor. 14. Some say that this implies that the tongue was a heavenly language, unknown to any men on earth. But again, this is assuming to know the translator's intention without any proof. It could just as well be a reference to the fact that the tongue was "unknown" to the ones who were speaking and hearing it. That must be obvious from the fact that both the gift of speaking in tongues and the gift of interpretation were supernatural. There would be nothing supernatural about speaking in a language that one was acquainted with. The word "unknown" was supplied by the translators, probably so the English reader would realize that this referred to a language which the speaker did not know. Consider, for instance, how I Cor. 14:2 might sound to someone who did not know the problems in Corinth: "He that speaketh in a tongue speaketh unto men, but unto God; for no man understandeth." Since *tongue* simply means *language* many places in scripture, an uninformed person might really wonder at such a statement. They might ask, "How is it that no man understands this person who is speaking in a language?" Of course, the reader in Greek would not have such a question, being familiar with the fact that Greek often leaves out words that are understood. The KJV translators were simply trying to make it clear to the English reader. By the way, it is interesting to me that I

never supposed the translators to be referring to a heavenly language, until somebody made that accusation!

The same people who charge “error” in the KJV’s italics recommend the New International Version as the most correct, etc. Yet, the NIV does not indicate the words it added, by italics. In I Cor. 14:1, the KJV puts the word *gifts* in italics, but the NIV does not. So it is obvious that other versions add words for which there is no exact Greek equivalent; the difference is that some of them do not let you know that by using italics. Clearly, they did not think it was an issue. But if it is wrong for the KJV to add them, it is wrong for all others. If the italics in the KJV are not reliable, where does that leave the other versions which do not italicize?

The phrase, “as though he heard them not” is italicized, in John 8:6. In the first edition of the KJV, it was not; perhaps because of some objections, it was put in italics after 1769. Is there any Greek authority for it? The English phrase actually comes from two Greek words, ME PROSPOIOUMENOS. It is found in E, G, H, K, and other manuscripts, as well as the Complutensian Polyglot, the first two editions of Stephanus’ Greek Testament, and the Bishops’ Bible. A parallel Old Testament scripture also shows that it should be there (see Psa. 38:12-14). No one need fear that these words are not scripture.

We need also to remember that there are many words, for which there is no exact Greek equivalent, which are not italicized. Back to Mat. 1:1 again: the first word in the New Testament (“The”) has

no Greek equivalent, yet, of all the versions which I have consulted, not one italicizes it.

It seems that those who attack the KJV regarding italics are either not aware of the same situations in other versions, or are unwilling to give the KJV translators the same privileges as all others.

Wrong Translations

“Charity” is supposed to be a “poor” translation, especially in I Cor. 13, the well-known love chapter. It is from the same Greek word which is rendered “love” many times, notably in John 3:16. Why then did the KJV translators choose “charity?” We need to remind ourselves that the word “love” may refer to godly, human, or even sinful love, in English. It is common in our day, for instance, for people to say *love* when they really mean *lust*. It is also important to remember that “charity” in 1611 was not the same as it is today; there were no tax deductions for contributions to charity, then. If someone were to give to the needy, it would be simply because he wanted to, not to get a tax deduction. “Charity,” then, was a good word to describe the kind of love that gives. John 3:16 shows that God so loved, that He gave, and gave the very best. Likewise, in every place where the word *charity* is used in the KJV, the emphasis is on the kind of love that gives to the loved one its very best, and it is always a pure love. Thus, there is no error in this translation; there is only the need to do a little thinking. When all is said and done, *charity* tells us a lot more than *love*, in the places where it is so translated.

“Atonement,” in Rom. 5:11, is said to be another error, since it comes from the Greek word (KATALLAGE) which is always translated “reconciliation” in other places. It is also supposed to show doctrinal error, since “atonement” describes a temporary condition which the Old Testament saint had, whereas “reconciliation” describes the permanent condition of the New Testament believer. If all this is so, why did the KJV translators choose a different word in this place, from all others in the New Testament? The word *now* indicates that they evidently believed the Old Testament doctrine of atonement to be fulfilled in the one great sacrifice of the Lord Jesus. We have *now* received that which was only foreshadowed and promised in every bloody sacrifice that was made before the cross. There is no error here; if the KJV translators were intelligent enough to use “reconciliation” every other instance in the New Testament, they surely must have had a good reason for choosing “atonement” in Rom. 5:11. Every translator knows that in all translation there will be some interpretation. Such is unavoidable. This instance is obviously a matter of their interpretation, which, by the way, is clearly a correct one. Every Bible-believer knows that the sacrifice of Christ fulfilled all that was foreshadowed in the many sacrifices of the Old Testament. Again we see that, before one charges error, it is a good idea to stop and think about what is actually being said and try to find a reason why a different word was chosen. When such is done, there will always be a great and precious truth learned.

“Devils” is another word that the critics delight in pouncing on, as a wrong translation. Everyone

knows, they say, that there is only one devil (Satan), but many demons. Also, the Greek word from which *devils* comes (DAIMON, and cognates) is different from that which refers to Satan (DIABOLOS). Again, a little investigation will prove this charge to be foolish, to say the least, and ignorant, at the most. Consider:

(1) The word translated *devil*, when referring to Satan, does not always refer to him; DIABOLOS is translated *slanders* in I Tim. 3:11, *false accusers* in II Tim 3:3 and Tit. 2:3. In all three places, it refers to human beings. Again, we see the necessity of translating in a manner which will be understood by the readers.

(2) *Devil* in the English language has multiple meanings; it may refer to Satan, demons, a very wicked person, an unlucky person (that poor devil), a printer’s devil (apprentice or errand boy), and various other persons, as any good English dictionary would show. To say that *devil* is an erroneous translation, because it can only refer to Satan, is to ignore the dictionary!

We must say, again, that no translation always renders a particular Greek word with the same English word in all places. In all translations there is some interpretation. Translators must use words which the people will understand. To say that calling a demon a devil is an error is to show ignorance of the English language.

Then, someone is always trying to show that a particular verb tense has been wrongly translated. It has been well said that a little knowledge is a

dangerous thing, and this can correctly be applied to a little knowledge of Greek. To assume that the aorist tense, for instance, always means punctiliar action, is to ignore what Greek grammars teach: Greek tenses have flexible meanings and must be interpreted according to context. For example, the word *building* in John 2:20 is aorist, but it cannot describe action which happened "at once," as some people insist that the aorist always does. In that sentence, the Jews were referring to the 46 years which were required for the building of the temple. Forty-six years is certainly not "at once!"

II Cor. 11:4 is supposed to be one of those places where a verb tense is wrongly translated, when it says, "ye might well bear with him." The tense is imperfect, which some people insist always means continuous action in the past. Why then does the KJV put this in the future? Is that an error? **A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament**, by Dana and Mantey, gives several uses of the imperfect tense in just the way it is used here, saying that it may refer to "the lack of a sense of attainment." In other words, it may refer to something which has not yet been attained, therefore, future! In this light, no error exists in the KJV. They chose these words carefully, because the context shows that Paul was concerned about what might happen, rather than what had already occurred. In v. 3, he was afraid that their minds might be corrupted; in v. 4, he referred to the possibility of false preachers coming to them when he said, "For if he that cometh . . ." the word *if* clearly shows a possibility in the future. Once again we see that a careful examination of grammar and the context would show any honest inquirer that there is no error. Although

the translation may be unusual, it is a possible one and cannot be called a mistake. Anyone has the privilege of disagreeing with a translator's interpretation, but if the translation be grammatically and contextually possible, it cannot be called an error.

"Easter" in Acts 12:4 is another favorite of the KJV critics. It comes from a Greek word which is always translated "passover" in other places, so why did they choose "Easter" here? For the serious inquirer, this author recommends the Trinitarian Bible Society Quarterly Record of January-March, 1980, where there is an excellent discussion of this word, on pages 15-16. (The society may be contacted at 39 Caldwell Cres., Brampton, Ontario, Canada, L6W 1A2.) Suffice it to say here that both William Tyndale and Martin Luther used the word "Easter" in their translations often, because their people understood it to refer to the same time as the Jewish passover. Also, Tyndale was the first to use "Easter" in an English translation, and he was also the first to use "passover." His renderings influenced all subsequent English translations, some using one, and some the other, until in course of time "passover" prevailed. In the same way that passover and unleavened bread are sometimes used interchangeably to refer to the same general time (compare Luke 22:1, 7 and Mark 14:1, 12), passover and Easter refer to the same general time. The translators were simply using a word which even their uneducated English readers would understand.

Of course, this list could go on and on, but there is no real need. Some people will never be convinced. This author, however, has learned many

precious truths, through the years, by meditating on these and other such places, trying to find out why an unusual translation was made. Rather than treat these places as errors, why not remember that the KJV translators were intelligent and reverent scholars, and try to find out why they did a particular thing in the way that they did?

Archaic English

Of course there are many words in the King James Version which are not popularly used today. As stated before, this author would have no problem with a translation in modern English, if it were accurate and did not disagree with the KJV. Sadly, no such translation has been made. But it will not hurt anyone to use the dictionary and learn some new words! The average person's vocabulary has suffered demonstrably in recent years, preachers included. Why not get a good dictionary, one which gives "archaic" or "obsolete" meanings (or some such term) and broaden one's ability to understand and explain the scriptures?

While the modern versions do not use archaic English, they do use many words which are not understood by the average person and must be explained by the Bible expositor. Everyone who has done any witnessing to the average person, especially to many young people who are the products of modern public schools, knows that very few would understand phrases such as "having pursued a course of sensuality," "the same excess of dissipation," (from the New American Standard, I Peter 4). How many know what a tunic is (NIV, Mat.

5:40)? Or obstinate (NIV, Rom. 10:21)? Or retribution (NIV, Rom. 11:9)? There is no way to make the Bible so simple that no explanation would be required. We need to be reminded that the Ethiopian eunuch said that he could not understand scripture unless some man would guide him (Acts 8:31). That situation will never change as long as we are in these mortal bodies.

Ecclesiastical Words

This objection is similar to the previous one, so there is no need to elaborate. It will be profitable, however, to consider the words of Dr. Martin Lloyd-Jones, as he spoke in the Royal Albert Hall Bible Rally, in 1961: "Take this argument that the modern man does not understand such terms as justification, sanctification and so on. I want to ask a question. When did the ordinary man ever understand those terms? . . . Did the colliers to whom John Wesley and George Whitefield preached in the 18th century understand?" Then he went on to say that Biblical terminology is spiritual, something that is not understood at all by the natural man. Explanation is always required. And no one can deny that God blessed the explanations of Wesley and Whitefield to those uneducated miners with the inspiring results of revival and conversion.

Let us not be afraid of ecclesiastical words such as baptism, bishop, sanctification, etc. Let us rather explain them so that people may not only understand them, but develop a vocabulary that is peculiarly scriptural. Physicians have a particular vocabulary; so do various kinds of technicians, and even the followers of drugs and rock music. Why should the Christian be afraid of good, scriptural words?

Certain words, even in the Greek New Testament, were invested with meanings which were not commonly known to the heathen in those days. The ordinary Greek certainly did not understand EKKLESIA (church) in the way that the New Testament used it. Explanation was necessary. The same situation prevails today. There is certainly nothing wrong with the "ecclesiastical language" of the King James Version.

Numerical Discrepancies

When comparing parallel scriptures in the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, the numbers of years or ages of kings do not always agree. This is supposed to be another one of those errors in the KJV. The fact is, that these problems exist in the Hebrew text. They were not errors by the KJV translators. One would have to look beyond translation for the solution to these problems. A careful study of context and related scripture often shows that what was supposed to be a discrepancy or erroneous translation is not at all.

An example is II Sam. 15:7, "after forty years." The Living Bible says "four" here, while the New American Standard says "forty." The objection is that Absalom was not yet forty years old, nor could this have referred to David's reign, because he reigned only forty years in all, and there were several years yet to go. So, it is common to charge error here, saying that some manuscripts were corrupted and the KJV followed the wrong ones. But there is another explanation: the forty years could be after the anointing of David. According to chronology accepted by many reputable authors,

David was anointed in 1063 (I Sam. 16:13), began to reign in 1048 (II Sam. 5:4), begat Absalom in 1055 (II Sam.3:3), and this instance took place in 1021. So, it could mean forty years after the anointing. Keil and Delitzsch point out (even though they disagree) that both Martin Luther and J.B. Lightfoot explained it this way. So we are not in bad company if we adopt this solution.

There is an explanation for all the numerical problems. We may not know every explanation as yet, but it is wise to keep a reverent attitude and seek the solution rather than impetuously charging or assuming error.

I John 5:7

The Johannine Comma, as it is called, is supposed to be the most glaring error in the KJV, by some people. It is common to read or hear that there is no Greek manuscript which has this verse in it, but that Erasmus copied it out of Latin because of pressure from Roman Catholics. However, E.F. Hills, in "Believing Bible Study," pointed out that it was in several Latin translations in the early centuries; it was quoted by Cyprian, about 250 A.D.; also, by two 4th century Spanish bishops; by Priscillian (who died in 385); by several orthodox African writers of the 5th century; by Cassiodorus (480-570); and by the old Latin manuscript R of the 5th or 6th century. Once again, we must remind ourselves that God nowhere promised that He would limit His act of preservation to Hebrew and Greek manuscripts. The ancient writings of church "fathers" and old versions must also be considered. With all this evidence, it is obvious that the state-

ment, "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one," has older authority than nearly all of the Greek manuscripts which we possess! If age carries so much weight with some scholars, why not take this into account? Besides that the verse is found in several Greek manuscripts: 61 (16th century), 629 (14th), 88mg (12th), 635 (11th). See the footnote in the Greek New Testament published by the United Bible Societies.

Besides all this, there is certainly no heresy taught in the verse. The only ones who would object to it are Unitarians and false cults! The doctrine of the Trinity is well established in scripture.

Acts 8:37

This is another verse which is supposed to be inserted by late manuscripts only, having no ancient authority. The KJV is therefore charged with following inferior manuscripts in this passage. But the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament shows the following authority for it: the old Italian version (2nd-4th centuries), the Vulgate (4th-5th centuries), the Syriac (4th-7th centuries), the Armenian (5th century), the Georgian (5th century), Irenaeus (born 130), Tertullian (155-222), Cyprian (200-258), and Augustine (354-430). Therefore, there is much ancient evidence for it, some of which is older than most of the Greek manuscripts in existence.

Jehovah

There has been a considerable amount of disagreement among scholars about the proper way

to pronounce (and spell) the name of God. Rejecting the spelling *Jehovah*, as found in the KJV, some prefer *Yahweh*, others choose *Yahve*, and other variations.

In connection with this, some criticism has been leveled at the KJV for not making more of a difference between Jehovah and Adonai. There is a slight difference made, as in Psa. 110:1, putting Jehovah in all capital letters and Adonai in regular type, saying, "The LORD said unto my Lord." There are other names of God in Hebrew which have specific meanings; the study of these yields a blessing. However, it is my opinion that such a study should be left to the teacher, who may expound these truths to God's people in a Bible class. But for the translator, it is almost impossible to bring out all the various aspects of meaning which these names may have in a given setting, without making a sentence or paragraph out of one word. It seems that the Holy Spirit Himself has given us the model to follow, when He inspired the translation of Psa. 110:1 in Mat. 22:44. Rather than translating or transliterating Jehovah and Adonai, He simply said "The Lord . . . my Lord," and that is a literal translation from Greek. The Greek words here are KURIOS and KURIOS, the very same Greek word for the two different Hebrew ones. There surely must be a lesson in this. If the Spirit of God had meant for us to make a big issue about the various names of God the Father, this would have been the perfect place to do it. After all, other names from the Old Testament were transliterated into Greek, such as Abraham, David, etc. Why did He not do the same with Jehovah and Adonai? We certainly would not conclude that the names are

unimportant, or that the various meanings have no value to us, but we would be correct in concluding that we have here our example, when translating. Both Jehovah and Adonai are translated into Greek as "the Lord," and we can do no better than follow the Holy Spirit's example! Is it not amazing that the King James translators had the wisdom and reverence to do just that!

The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures (the Bible of Jehovah's Witnesses) is not faithful to the Greek words, in this place. They translate Mat. 22:44, "Jehovah said to my Lord." Why did they not say "Jehovah said to Jehovah?" The Greek words are exactly the same (except the first being in the nominative case and the second in the dative). They changed "the Lord" to read "Jehovah" when it suited them, but not when there was Greek authority for it. Another passage which they mis-translated in this regard is Phil. 2:10-11. A comparison of that passage with Isa. 45:23-24, even in their Bible, would show that Isaiah quoted Jehovah as saying that every knee would bow to Him and every tongue would confess to Him. Why did the JW's not say that "Jesus Christ is Jehovah to the glory of God the Father?" The answer is obvious: such a translation would have been devastating to their heresy about the Lord Jesus. But if they had been true to their purpose of changing all references from "the Lord" to Jehovah, they would have had to do so. This is but another example of the way people take unwarranted liberties with the scripture when it suits their purpose.

Jesus or Joshua?

Another charge against the KJV is that an error is made when it says *Jesus*, whereas the reference is to Joshua. Consider the two verses:

"Acts 7:45, "Which also our fathers that came after brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles, whom God drove out before the face of our fathers, unto the days of David." It should be obvious that Stephen was referring to the tabernacle (v. 44) which the Jews brought into the land of Palestine, when Joshua led them in.

Heb. 4:8, "For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day." Verses 3-7 refer to Psa. 95:7-11, where David exhorted Israel not to harden their hearts, as their fathers had, at Kadesh-Barnea. Verse 7 emphasizes that this was said many years after Israel first entered the promised land; then v. 8 teaches that, if the promised land had been the rest to which God referred, He would not have spoken of another day through the psalmist. Therefore, "Jesus" must refer to Joshua, with this meaning: if that which Joshua gave them had been God's rest, God would not have spoken of another rest four hundred years later, through Psa. 95.

Why then did the KJV say "Jesus?" Is this an error? Or is it a "poor" or "misleading" translation? As a matter of fact, the KJV translators were simply being consistent. "Jesus" is from the Greek word *IESOUS*, the very same word which refers to the Lord Jesus Christ. The KJV New Testament transliterates names from Greek to English; that is why Isaiah is spelled *Esaias*, Elijah is spelled *Elias*, etc. Many people criticize the KJV for doing that, saying that the names should be rendered as they are in the Old Testament so that we would see the reference. But if these critics were consistent, they would always render the name *Jesus* as Joshua, for

that is its equivalent! Would modern translators say "Lord Joshua Christ?"

It must be obvious that we cannot have things both ways; it is either wrong to be inconsistent, or it is wrong to be consistent, but it cannot be both! If the KJV was wrong when it inconsistently translated AGAPE as both *charity* and *love*, it could not have been wrong to consistently translate IESOUS as *Jesus*. It seems that people are condemning inconsistency when it is convenient to do so, then turning right around and condemning consistency when it is likewise convenient. Are people looking for reasons to condemn the King James Version so much that they resort to such inconsistency? (!)

The fact is, that no one is always consistent. As has been said before, in all translation there is some interpretation; there is no way to avoid that and have an understandable translation. There will always be a need for teachers to explain and expound God's word. No translation can ever take the place of God-appointed teachers.

It is a mistake to assume that the Bible is supposed to be perfectly clear to the surface reader, needing no explanation. To the contrary, Peter said that there were some things in Paul's writings which were "hard to be understood," and that was before they were translated! Mat. 13:10-13 indicates that Christ spoke in a certain way to hide the truth from those whose heart had waxed gross, whose ears were dull of hearing, and who had closed their eyes. The enlightening of the Holy Spirit is required for our understanding of scripture (Eph. 1:17-18). Also,

God evidently expects to use teachers throughout this church age (see I Cor. 12:28 and Mat. 28:19-20).

There are still many people, as there were in both Isaiah's and Christ's day, who honor God with their lips, but whose hearts are far removed from Him. He knows very well that these are only going through the motions of religion, but do not really want to know His truth so that they might obey it. It is only the serious Christian, who intends to obey and practice the truth he learns, who will be able to understand God's word. Likewise, it is only the unbeliever who wants to know God and His forgiveness, who will be able to understand the gospel and receive it. God knows these people and is fully capable of using His appointed methods of teaching them His truth!

Significant Differences With Other Versions

One of the most common claims regarding the many versions which exist in English is that they all basically agree, that there is no doctrinal difference between them. What if this were true? One might sensibly ask, "Then why were so many made?"

But without trying to answer that one, we must say that there certainly are some very important differences which do affect doctrine. Let us consider the following comparisons of the New American Standard Bible and the King James Version.

KJV
Deut. 33:25, "Thy shoes shall be iron and brass; and as thy days, so shall thy strength be."

NASB
Deut. 33:25, "Your locks shall be iron and bronze, and according to your days, so shall your leisurely walk be."

There is certainly a difference between shoes and locks (assuming this to mean one's hair), and there is absolutely no comparison between "strength" and "leisurely walk." It must be obvious to any thinking Christian who has read very much scripture that God has not promised a "leisurely walk" to His people for all their days! In any case, even

if one prefers the NASB here, he must admit that the two versions are not the same. There is a significant difference; significant, I say, because this promise has sustained many of God's people through the ages in their multitudinous trials. Were they wrong to believe the KJV?

KJV
Num. 23:21, "He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath he seen perverseness in Israel."

NASB
Num. 23:21, "He has not observed misfortune in Jacob; Nor has He seen trouble in Israel."

There is a big difference between iniquity and misfortune. One might have a flat tire and call it a misfortune, but people go to hell for iniquity! It is one thing to say that God, in grace, did not look on Israel's sin; it is quite another to say that He did not see their trouble. He most certainly did see their trouble in Egypt, and sent Moses to deliver them from it (see Exo. 2:24-25). Again, we say that a person may prefer the KJV or the NASB, but he certainly could not believe them both to be correct, in this place.

KJV
1 Sam. 1:24, "And when she had weaned him, she took him up with her, with three bullocks, and one ephah of flour."

NASB
1 Sam. 1:24, "Now when she had weaned him, she took him up with her, with a three-year-old bull and one ephah of flour."

It must be either three bullocks, or one three-year-old, but it surely could not be both! Have the people who say that there is no basic difference in the various versions read them? One wonders. By the way, parallel scripture shows the KJV to be correct. Num. 15:8-9 commands that one bullock be offered with three-tenths of an ephah of flour, so three bullocks and one ephah would have been exactly right.

KJV
Prov. 19:18, "Chasten thy son while there is hope, and let not thy soul spare for his crying."

NASB
Prov. 19:18, "Discipline your son while there is hope, and do not desire his death."

This is so obvious that it needs no comment. You might prefer one or the other, but you could not believe them both to be correct.

KJV
John 1:18, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

NASB
John 1:18, "No man has seen God at any time; the only begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him."

The NASB translation teaches two Gods: the only-begotten God, and the God who begot Him. If this God were begotten, He must have had a beginning, so this would be a denial of the eternal existence of God the Son. Also, it would be a denial of the obvious Bible doctrine that there is only one true God; all others who are called gods are false. Here is a serious breach of a fundamental doctrine: the deity of Christ. When people say that no doctrines are affected by the various changes in the versions, they must not have read this one.

By the way, it is interesting that neither The Living Bible, nor the New International Version, nor the Revised Standard Version, nor the Phillips translation, nor the New English Bible, nor the New Berkley Version, followed the NASB here. They all say "Son," even though they all preferred the Westcott-Hort text.

Christ is the only-begotten Son, because He had a beginning, as a human. But as God, "his goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting," (Micah 5:2).

KJV
Rom. 4:19, "He considered not his own body now dead . . ."

NASB
Rom. 4:19, "he contemplated his own body, now as good as dead . . ."

Either he did, or he did not; you cannot believe them both. But is this important? It has everything to do with the faith of Abraham, which is held up in this chapter as the example of saving faith. Bible-believers through the years have been blessed by the fact that this verse teaches what real faith is: it is not the consideration of one's own abilities, but of the power of God. Abraham did not consider his own "now dead body," but rather believed that "what he had promised, he was able also to perform." (see vv. 20-21).

But even if one does not like this explanation, he must make a choice between the KJV and the NASB; he cannot believe both. This is a significant difference.

By the way, the RSV, Phillips, NEB, NIV, and Amplified all follow the NASB here.

The New International Version

KJV
Mat. 5:22, "whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause"

NIV
Mat. 5:22, "anyone who is angry with his brother will be subject to judgment"

The phrase "without a cause" is omitted. These two pronouncements are quite different. The NIV would condemn all anger, and in so doing, would condemn Christ, or rather, would have Christ contradicting Himself. In Mark 3:5, Christ looked "round about on them with anger," but He clearly was not doing this "without a cause," since the verse goes on to say, "being grieved for the hardness of their hearts." And the NIV points this out

also. If the phrase "without a cause" be omitted, we would have the Saviour breaking His own command and thus would not be sinless. Rather than fulfilling the scripture, as He claimed in Mat. 5:17, He would be breaking it. This is a significant difference and affects vital doctrine.

KJV
Mat. 5:32, "whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication . . ."

NIV
Mat. 5:32, "anyone who divorces his wife, except for marital unfaithfulness . . ."

This is not only a significant difference, it greatly weakens the word which is translated "fornication" and throws the door for divorce wide open for almost any cause. "Marital unfaithfulness" might be interpreted as kissing another woman romantically, or supporting her financially, but not supporting one's own wife, and on and on it could go.

Divorce is a big enough problem as it is; we certainly do not need a version of scripture which will add to it.

KJV
Mat. 6:22, 23, "if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil . . ."

NIV
Mat. 6:22, 23, "If your eyes are good, your whole body will be full of light. But if your eyes are bad . . ."

Good and bad eyes have nothing to do with the amount of spiritual light which a person has; if they did, poor eyesight would make poor Christians. And there is no textual disagreement here in Greek; the word should be translated "single" and "evil," just as the KJV does. In the context, Christ has made quite clear what is meant by "single," so a wealth of information and lessons is lost by saying "good" and "bad."

Spirituality is a vital thing to the Christian life; anything which affects or weakens it is significant, as this different translation clearly is.

KJV	NIV
Mat. 11:23, "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell."	Mat. 11:23, "And you, Capernaum, will you be lifted up to the skies? No, you will go down to the depths."

Aside from taking a lot of liberty with Greek, the NIV certainly weakens this pronouncement. What a difference there is between heaven and the skies; and between hell and the depths! Anytime people start weakening the Bible doctrine of hell, it is significant.

KJV	NIV
Mat. 17:20, "Because of your unbelief."	Mat. 17:20, "Because you have so little faith."

There is a definite difference between "unbelief" and "little faith." If Christ had said "little faith," He would have contradicted Himself in the very next statement, by saying, "If you have faith as small as a mustard seed, you can say to this mountain . . ." (NIV). The two verses would stand in opposition to each other. This certainly affects the vital doctrine of God's words being unchangeable.

KJV	NIV
Mat. 18:22, "until seventy times seven . . ."	Mat. 18:22, "seventy-seven times."

No one can believe both these to be correct! Again we wonder; have these people who say that there are no significant differences actually read the various versions?

KJV	NIV
Mat. 21:32, "repented not afterward, that ye might believe him."	Mat. 21:32, "you did not repent and believe him."

The NIV completely omits the vital doctrine that repentance enables one to believe. Besides that, it did not translate correctly the aorist infinitive, as the KJV did. Therefore, both doctrinally and grammatically, it is wrong. We must note again that one cannot believe both of these to be correct; a choice must be made.

KJV	NIV
Mat. 23:32, "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers."	Mat. 23:32, "Fill up, then, the measure of the sin of your forefathers!"

There is no Greek for the phrase "of the sin" in the NIV, not even in the Westcott-Hort text. This is taking quite a lot of liberty with translation, to say the least. It is certainly a significant difference to insert a phrase without any Greek authority, especially if that phrase attributes sin to someone!

KJV	NIV
Mat. 26:55, "Are ye come out as against a thief with swords and staves for to take me?"	Mat. 26:55, "Am I leading a rebellion, that you have come out with swords and clubs to capture me?"

Even the Westcott-Hort text reads just as the KJV translates, "as a thief." As anyone knows, there is a world of difference between being a thief and leading a rebellion! Both cannot be correct; one must choose.

The New King James Version

On page 1234 of the NKJV, we read that "the purpose of the New King James Version was 'to apply the best knowledge available — of ancient Hebrew and Greek, seventeenth-century English and contemporary English — to sensitively polish the archaisms and vocabulary of the 1611 (King James) version in order to preserve and enhance its

originally intended beauty and content.' ” In the following examples, it will be obvious that they did not follow that stated purpose in quite a few places. They did not “preserve . . . its originally intended beauty and content,” but rather made definite changes in that content with the result that a different meaning is conveyed.

KJV	NKJV
Gen. 12:7, “And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, Abram and said, ‘To your descendants Unto thy seed will I give this land . . .’ ”	Gen. 12:7, “Then the Lord appeared to Abram and said, ‘To your descendants I will give this land.’ ”

The problem here is not the change from “seed” to descendant,” but from singular to plural. Gal. 3:16 refers to this very passage and emphasizes that God specifically said the singular word “seed,” and that it referred to Christ. The NKJV translates Gal. 3:16 properly, and footnotes it as referring to Gen. 12:7; 13:15; and 24:7, but in all those instances, it uses the plural word “descendants.” This is an obviously significant difference, and it certainly affects the very vital doctrine of Christ, so it cannot be dismissed lightly.

KJV	NKJV
Gen. 24:22, “the man took a golden earring . . .”	Gen. 24:22, “the man took a golden nose ring . . .”

Can anyone miss this difference? The Hebrew word which the KJV translates “earring” is the same one which is used in Gen. 35:4, where it obviously means earrings on ears, and cannot mean anything else. And the NKJV says it that way; why did they change it in 24:22? This is not a vital doctrinal matter, but is a curiosity, to say the least. In any case, you cannot believe both versions to be correct in this place.

KJV	NKJV
Gen. 29:31, “And when the Lord saw that Leah was hated . . .”	Gen. 29:31, “When the Lord saw that Leah was unloved . . .”

The difference between being hated and being unloved is so obvious that it does not need to be discussed.

KJV	NKJV
Gen. 32:28, “And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel: for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and has prevailed.”	Gen. 32:28, “And He said, ‘Your name shall no longer be called Jacob, but Israel; for you have struggled with God and with men, and have prevailed.’ ”

The phrase “as a prince” is omitted in the NKJV. They must have been trying to do more than just put the old KJV in modern English.

KJV	NKJV
Prov. 1:32, “the prosperity of fools shall destroy them	Prov. 1:32, “the complacency of fools will destroy them.”

The Hebrew word which is translated “prosperity” here is rendered the same in Psa. 122:7 and Jer. 22:21, and “abundance” in Ezk. 16:49. Why change it here? There is certainly a great difference between being complacent and being prosperous! Translating it “prosperity” certainly agrees with the warning in I Tim. 6:10, “the love of money is the root of all evil.” In any case, the two words are quite different; they do not mean the same. One cannot believe them both.

KJV	NKJV
Prov. 6:11, “So shall thy poverty come as one that travelleth.”	Prov. 6:11, “So shall your poverty come on you like a robber.”

There is a great difference between being a traveller and a robber! The Hebrew word here is translated “walk” in Prov. 2:7; 6:12; 7:19; 10:9; 13:20; 14:2; 19:1; 20:7; 28:6, 18, 26. It is rendered

by similar words in other places. It is clearly correct to translated it "travelleth." Why did they say robber, here?

KJV	NKJV
Prov. 6:13, "he speaketh with his feet."	Prov. 6:13, "He shuffles his feet."

Again we note that the Hebrew word which is translated "speaketh" in the old KJV has that meaning in Gen. 21:7; Job 33:3 and 8:2; Psa. 106:2. It never means to shuffle, in other places that I have investigated. Why change it?

KJV	NKJV
Prov. 8:30, "Then I was by him, as one brought up with him."	Prov. 8:30, "Then I was beside Him, as a master craftsman."

The footnote in the NKJV says that "one brought up" comes from a Jewish tradition; the implication is that it has no Hebrew manuscript evidence. If so, this is a tacit way of saying that the old KJV was in error and we have corrected it. In any case, we must again note that one cannot believe both translations.

KJV	NKJV
Prov. 10:3, "he casteth away the substance of the wicked."	Prov. 10:3, "He casts away the desire of the wicked."

The contrast is obvious; no comment necessary.

KJV	NKJV
Prov. 11:3, "the perverseness of transgressors shall destroy them."	Prov. 11:3, "the perversity of the unfaithful will destroy them."

Strong's concordance says that the Hebrew word which is translated "transgressors" means to deal deceitfully, to offend, to transgress, to be treacherous. Why then did they weaken it to being "unfaithful?"

KJV	NKJV
Prov. 11:16, "strong men retain riches."	Prov. 11:16, "ruthless men retain riches."

Aside from noting that there is much difference between being strong and being ruthless, we also note that the Hebrew word is rendered "mighty, in great power, strong," as well as "oppressor, terrible, violent." The context should determine. Why change it here?

KJV	NKJV
Prov. 12:4, "A virtuous woman."	Prov. 12:4, "An excellent wife."

The new agrees with the old in Prov. 31:10 and Ruth 3:11, by saying "virtuous." Why not agree here? A woman might be excellent in some ways or even in many ways, without being virtuous.

KJV	NKJV
Prov. 12:26, "The righteous is more excellent than his neighbour."	Prov. 12:26, "The righteous should choose his friends carefully."

No comment necessary!

KJV	NKJV
Prov. 16:1, "The preparations of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue, is from the Lord."	Prov. 16:1, "The preparations of the heart belong to man, But the answer of the tongue is from the Lord."

The old version attributes the preparations of the heart to the Lord, but the new, to man. What a difference! And it was deliberately interpreted that way, because the word "belong" in the NKJV is in italics, showing that they purposely added it.

KJV	NKJV
Prov. 18:1, "Through desire a man, having separated himself, seeketh and intermeddeth with all wisdom."	Prov. 18:1, "A man who isolates himself seeks his own desire; he rages against all wise judgment."

Translators have been arguing about this verse as it is given in the old KJV for years, so I surely

will not be able to settle it now. Suffice it to say that we cannot believe them both. This is more than putting something into modern English. It is a different translation and a quite different meaning.

KJV
Prov. 18:2, "but that his heart may discover itself."

NKJV
Prov. 18:2, "But in expressing his own heart."

No comment necessary.

KJV
Prov. 18:8, "The words of a talebearer are as wounds."

NKJV
Prov. 18:8, "The words of a talebearer are like tasty trifles."

Can there be a greater difference? The Hebrew word is found only here and in Prov. 26:22, where the two versions are consistent with themselves. Since we have no other verse with which to compare it, we may rely on the definitions given by others. Strong's concordance says that the basic meaning is "to burn in, to rankle." Therefore, there is nothing wrong with the KJV! Why change it? What purpose is served? Certainly not putting old English into modern.

KJV
Prov. 19:16, "but he that despiseth his ways shall die."

NKJV
Prov. 19:16, "But he who is careless of his ways will die."

The NKJV agrees with the KJV by translating this Hebrew word "despise" in Psa. 69:33; 119:41; Prov. 14:2 and 15:20; Mal. 1:6; Oba. 2; why not here?

KJV
Prov. 19:18, "and let not thy soul spare for his crying."

NKJV
Prov. 19:18, "And do not set your heart on his destruction."

The NKJV agrees with the New American Standard, in this place. Quite a difference.

KJV
Prov. 20:25, "It is a snare to the man who devoureth that which is holy, and after vows to make inquiry."

NKJV
Prov. 20:25, "It is a snare for a man to devote rashly something as holy, And afterward to reconsider his vows."

No comment necessary.

KJV
Prov. 23:4, "Labour not to be rich: cease from thine own wisdom."

NKJV
Prov. 23:4, "Do not overwork to be rich; because of your own understanding, cease!"

No comment necessary.

KJV
Prov. 26:7, "The legs of the lame are not equal."

NKJV
Prov. 26:7, "Like the legs of the lame that hang limp."

No comment necessary.

KJV
Prov. 26:23, "Burning Lips."

NKJV
Prov. 26:23, "Fervent lips."

One could be fervent in speech, such as in preaching or prayer, without being coupled with a wicked heart.

KJV
Prov. 29:18, "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

NKJV
Prov. 29:18, "Where there is no revelation, the people cast off restraint."

Both cannot be correct!

KJV
Prov. 29:24, "he heareth cursing, and bewrayeth it not."

NKJV
Prov. 29:24, "He swears to tell the truth, but reveals nothing."

KJV
Mat. 6:22, "if therefore thine eye be single . . ."

NKJV
Mat. 6:22, "If therefore your eye is good . . ."

The Greek word for "single" is HAPLOUS, which never means "good." Why did the NKJV translators follow the other modern versions here? There is nothing archaic about the word "single;"

as a matter of fact, it is the consistent theme of this chapter. Verses 1-4 teach that we should have a single eye in doing alms, that single eye being focused on God, instead of man. The same is taught in vss. 5-15 about prayer, vss. 16-18 about fasting, vss. 19-22, about treasure, and vss. 24-34 about serving. In each case, Christ taught us not to be looking at God and man, but to God only. That is the single eye. Is that archaic, or hard to understand? Why did they change it?

KJV
1 John 4:17, "Herein is
our love made perfect . . ."

NKJV
1 John 4:17, "Love has been among
us in this . . ."

There is no disagreement between the various Greek texts, in this verse. Why did the NKJV translators change it? There is a great difference between our love being made perfect, and in its being among us. And the subject of love between God's people is certainly a most important one, being one of the major themes of John's first epistle. They must have been doing more than putting the old KJV into modern English, here!

One final comparison between the KJV and several modern versions. The KJV, in 1 Cor. 3:15, says, "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." Several modern versions translate this verse in a manner which sounds as if they believe in purgatory. Consider the following:

NIV, "but only as one escaping through the flames."

Amplified, "but only as (one who has passed) through fire."

Phillips, "He personally will be safe, though rather like a man rescued from a fire."

NEB, "yet he will escape with his life, as one might from a fire."

New Berkley Version, "though he himself will be saved, yet only as passing through fire."

The Living Bible, "but like a man escaping through a wall of flames."

The King James Version is about as close to Greek as one could get and still be understandable. There is not the slightest hint that the man himself will pass through the fire. Rather, verse 13 specifically says that the fire shall try every man's work, and verse 15 states, "if any man's work shall be burned . . ." The Bible nowhere teaches purgatory; that is a doctrine of Romanism, which may well have been a holdover from the old Babylonianism. Why do the modern translations indicate that the person may go through the fire? Unquestionably, there is a significant difference, here!

Other references could be noted for all these versions, as well as those in The Living Bible, Today's English Version, etc., but these should be sufficient to show that a person cannot believe that all versions teach the same thing. Why would people say that they do? Are they merely echoing what others have said, without checking to see if it is true? Are they deliberately deceiving, or trying to deceive? It would be hard to think so. Are they simply ignorant of all these differences? Do they not see the significance of them? If any of these are true, these

people are not worthy counselors regarding Bible versions. The fact remains that there are many significant differences which, in many cases, do affect vital doctrine.

It is necessary to say, one more time, that one cannot believe all the versions; he must make a choice. For the reasons given in the preceding chapters, this author has already chosen the old King James Version and has no intention of departing from it.

Revisions of the 1611 King James Version?

It has often been said that the current King James Version is not the same as the original, since the original has been revised four times (in 1629, 1638, 1762, and 1769). The 1762 revision is called "a major revision" on page 1230 of the New King James Bible. Describing these revisions, some say that thousands of changes have been made; others say tens of thousands. This is usually said to try to prove that the current King James Bible is not the same as the original, or that the New King James Bible is but another in the string of revisions.

The fact is that the "revisions" which have been made since the original 1611 edition was produced do not resemble in any way the revisions which have been made in the New King James Bible, or in any other modern versions. I have read and carefully compared the old 1611 edition with the current one in the following books: Genesis, Psalms, Proverbs, Ezekiel through Malachi, and the entire New Testament, and have noted all the changes which have been made. This comparison was based on the "Holy Bible, 1611 King James Version," publish-

ed by Thomas Nelson Publishers in 1982, and described by them as "A word-for-word reprint of the First Edition of the Authorized Version, presented in roman letters for easy reading and comparison with subsequent editions." If this claim is correct, then I gladly submit the following information which proves that the current King James Bible is the same as the original. The so-called revisions are not worthy to be compared with the revisions which modern versions have made.

The most obvious changes which have been made are the changing from the old alphabet and spelling, as well as printing practices. It was common for them to use & for and, to divide words without concern for the syllables, etc. But the changes with which we are concerned fall into the following ten categories:

1. Making spelling consistent
2. Changing old English to modern
3. Changing the "space-savers"
4. Omissions
5. Additions
6. Changing one word for another
7. Changes in italicized words
8. Obvious printer's errors
9. Probable printer's errors
10. Word order.

As we examine these changes it will be obvious that they are insignificant and do not affect the meaning. In each category, the first word or phrase will always be from the original 1611 edition; the following will be from our current Bible. I usually

listed only one reference for those places where the changes occurred in many places.

1. Making Spelling Consistent

Mt.	10:1-2,	Hee, he
	10:17,	we, wee
	12:20,	shal, shall
	14:7,	oath, othes
	18:7,	woe, wo
	22:10,	ghests; 22:11, guests
	17:20,	unpossible; Mk. 10:27, im- possible. Also, Mt. 19:26; Lk. 1:37; 18:27 vs. Lk. 17:1; Heb. 6:4, 18; 11:6.
	27:22,	sayde, & 27:23, said
Ezk.	27:27,	midst, middest (et al)

Also, various names were not always spelled the same.

2. Changing Old English to Modern

accompt for account, Mt. 12:36, et al
amongst, among, Lk. 16:15, et al
burnt, burned, I Cor. 3:15, et al
besides for beside, Lk. 16:26, et al
bide, abide, Rom. 11:23
eight, eighth, Lk. 1:59 (also sixt for sixth, etc.)
farre, afar, II Pt. 1:9
farther, further, Acts 21:28
further, farther, Mt. 26:39
high wayes for highway, Mk. 10:46
hundreth, hundred, Rev. 14:1, 3 et al

least, for lest, Mt. 17:27, et al
 lift for lifted, Mk. 1:31, et al. Cp. lifted, Ezk. 47:14 et al
 ought for owed, Mt. 18:24, 28 et al
 rent for rend, Mt. 7:6; Jn. 19:24; Ezk. 13:11, 13, et al
 shamefastnesse for shamefacedness, I Tim. 2:9
 shoot for shot (a bowshot), Gen 21:16
 sprang for sprung, Gen. 41:6 (cp. :23, where it is SPRUNG)
 stroke, for struck, Mt. 26:51, et al
 then for than, Gen 4:13, et al
 thorow, for through, Mt. 11:1, et al
 towards for toward, Mt. 28:1, et al
 ware for aware, Mt. 24:50
 wayes, for way, Lk. 8:5
 whilest for while, Heb. 9:17
 wives for wife's, Mk. 1:30, et al (apostrophes were not used)
 yere for years, Rom. 4:19 (omitting the s could have been a printer's error)

3. Changing the "Space-Savers"

&, and (frequently)
 cōcerning, concerning, II Pt. 3:9
 cōfessing, confessing, Mk. 1:5
 fet, fetched, Acts 28:13
 frō, from, Mt. 10:25 et al
 mōe, more, Mt. 21:36, et al
 moūt, mount, Ps. 48:2

thē, them, Mk. 14:48
 wēt, went, Lk. 2:4
 whē, when, Lk. 2:2
 y with a small e above, for the, often
 y for the, Mt. 8:28, et al (small e was in 1611 Facsimile apparently omitted in Nelson's edition in error.)
 y with small t above, for that, Mk. 9:30 et al
 ye for the, Mt. 10:24, et al

4. Omissions (in the 1611, but not in the current)

Ezk. 40:13, Hee measured then the gate from the rooffe of (the) one little chamber
 Zech. 11:2, (all) the mighty are spoiled
 Mt. 13:46, Who when hee had found one pearle of great price, (he) went and sole
 Lk. 3:21, Now when all the people were baptized, (and) it came to passe
 I Cor. 12:28, helpes (in) governmets
 II. Cor. 5:20, we pray you in Christs stead, (that) ye be reconciled to God.
 Eph. 2:18, For through him wee both have (an) access by one Spirit unto the Father.
 II Tim. 1:12, and (I) am persuaded
 Heb. 12:1, let us runne with patience (un- to) the race that is set before us.

5. Additions (not in 1611, but in the current)

Gen. 19:21, concerning this thing (also)
 Gen. 22:7, the fire and (the) wood
 Ps. 115:3, Whatsoever he (hath) pleased
 Prov. 7:21, With (her) much fair speech

Ezk. 3:11, get thee to them of the captivity, unto (the children of) thy people (could be a printer's error)

Ezk. 7:23, the land is full of bloody crimes (and) the city is full of violence.

11:24, Afterwards the spirit took me up and brought me in (a) vision

12:19, because of the violence of (all) of them that dwell therein

24:7, she poured it (not) upon the ground to cover it with dust. (Could be a printer's error; more possible errors will be listed later)

26:9 (And) he shall set engines of war against thy walls

Dan. 1:12, and let them give (us) pulse to eat and water to drink.

Mal. 4:2, and (ye) shall go forth

Mt. 12:23, Is (not) this the sonne of David?

Acts 2:22, by miracles (and) wonders and signs

Rom. 14:10, (For) we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ

Gal. 5:15, take heed (that) ye be not consumed one of another

I Tim. 1:4, rather then (godly) edifying. (Is in the TR; could be a Printer's error)

II Tim. 1:7, but of power (and) of love and of a sound mind.

II Tim. 4:8, but unto (all) them also that love his appearing.

I Pt. 2:1, and envies, and (all) evil speakings

I Jn. 5:12, hath not the Sonne (of God) hath not life

6. Changing One Word From the 1611 for Another in the Current

a for an, Lk. 21:18; I Cor. 5:5, 11; II Cor. 12:2; Gal. 6:1; Phm. 9; Ps. 50:21; Ps. 68:21; Ezk. 40:42

at for in, Ezk. 39:11

calleth for called, Mk. 7:6

came for ran, Mk. 5:6

flee for fly, Ps. 55:6; Hos. 9:11

grinnes for gins, Ps. 140:5 & 141:9

had for hath, Eph. 1:9

heat for heated, Dan. 3:19

her for his, Gen. 39:16

hid for hidden, Oba. 6

in for into, Lk. 23:19

it for that, Hos. 13:3

men for them, Ezk. 44:23

mine for my, Lk. 7:46; Zeph. 3:11

no man for none, Mk. 10:18

not for no, Mt. 13:6 (the opposite is done in I Cor. 13:2)

of for and, Zech. 7:7 (the South of (and) the plain)

one for first, Gen. 8:13 (sixth hundredth and ONE yeere)

returned for turned, Ezk. 1:17

some for one, I Cor. 14:23

shewed for hewed, Hos. 6:5 (Printer's error?)

that for and, Rom 12:2

that for the, Gen. 15:18 (in that same day)

they for thou, Ezk. 26:14
they for ye, Ezk. 48:8
the for a, Lk. 19:9; 20:12
the for their, Joel 3:13
the for thy, Nah. 3:17
the for his, Jn. 15:20
the for her, Rom. 7:2
the for this, II Tim. 2:19
this for thy, Hos. 4:4
those for these, Ps. 107:43 (Printer's error?)
thy for thine, Lk. 13:12
to for unto, Lk. 20:42
told for tell, Jn. 12:22
ye for you, Ezk. 11:15
you for ye, Mk. 4:24; Lk. 11:42; 13:25, 27;
Rom. 1:11; I Cor. 7:5; 9:1; 11:2, 17; II Cor.
9:4; Ps. 58:2
your for our, Joel 1:16 (Printer's error?)

7. Changes in Italicized Words

Gen. 39:23, THAT which he did (now italicized)
Jn. 1:6, whose name WAS John (now ital.)
Gal. 1:8, ANY OTHER GOSPEL, ital. in 1611, not now.

There could be others, but this is insignificant. I have seen a modern KJV NT which has no italicized words at all.

8. Obvious Printer's Errors

Gen. 22:14, Iehovah-ijreh

Ps. 69:32, good should be God (Heb., Elohim; no translator would have made this error)

Ps. 137:7, oi should be OF

Prov. 7:21, suerty should be SURETY

Ezk. 18:24, fro, FROM (perhaps the - was omitted)

Ezk. 20:17, the should be THEM (- again?)

Ezk. 34:18, fonle, FOULE

Ezk. 37:26, wich, WITH

Ezk. 43:7, uor, NOR

Ezk. 44:5, ehe, THE

Mic. 7:7, YOU was added. Must be an error because the sentence does not make sense with the word in it.

Zech. 11:7, and I took (And I took)

Mal. 1:8, And if hee offer the blind (should be YE, because of the rest of the verse)

Lk. 10:36, himt hat, HIM THAT

Acts 15:33, breehren, BRETHREN. Correctly spelled elsewhere

Acts 20:26, co, TO

Acts 27:7, Gaidus, CNIDUS

Rom. 15:28, hane, HAVE (U and V are reversed in old print)

Eph. 1:9, Himselse, HIMSELF

I Tim. 6:11, thon, THOU

Jas. 1:27, Facher, FATHER

9. Probable Printer's Errors

Gen. 23:18, at the gates (now, gate)

Gen. 24:44, the woman who (now, whom) the Lord hath appointed.

Ps. 138:8, perfit (now, perfect)
Ps. 139:7, flie (now, flee. See also 143:9)
Ps. 141:9, snare (now, snares)
Ezk. 6:8, he, YE
Ezk. 10:2, IN, after WENT, was omitted
Ezk. 34:31, And yee my flocke (the flock)
of my pasture. Current has the words in par.
44:22, or NOR
44:29, dedicate, DEDICATED
46:23, new, ROW (Heb. word means
row)
48:2, SIDE was omitted after WEST.
Included in all later verses.
Dan. 3:15, BURNING was omitted before
FIERIE, but included in :17, 20, 21, 23, 26
Mt. 26:34, MIGHT should be NIGHT
Mk. 10:1, rose, AROSE
Mk. 11:8, of, OFF
Mk. 14:36, that, WHAT
Lk. 1:74 & Acts 7:35, hands, HAND
Lk. 11:16, other, OTHERS
Jn. 8:33, Abraham, ABRAHAM'S (Since
apostrophes were not used then, this could
have been an accidental omission of the s)
I Cor. 15:6, and, AFTER. The verse #5 and
its first word AND is repeated, instead of say-
ing "6 After"
Phil 4:6, request, REQUESTS
I Jn. 3:22, commandment,
COMMANDMENTS
Rev. 13:6, dwelt, DWELL

10. Word Order

Ps. 132:12, their children ALSO SHALL
(current has SHALL ALSO)

None of these changes affects the meaning ex-
cept Ezk. 24:7, "she poured it (not) upon the
ground to cover it with dust. The word "not" was
omitted in the 1611, but was probably a printer's
error, since it makes more sense to include it.

We might ask, "How could so many errors have
been made?" The answer lies in a comment on page
1230 of the New King James Bible, which says that
in 1724 a major change was made "for those who
translated and edited the Scriptures. 'Those
employed in so grave a work should receive com-
petent salaries for their pains and skills.' Until this
time Bible translation was always a demanding ex-
tra task added to preaching or teaching. No man
could give his full service to this vital service. Now
that was to be changed." It is easy to see that when
people are overworked, more errors are likely to be
made, and there could easily be a shortage of
qualified personnel to serve as editors. Every per-
son who has ever done any printing knows that it
is necessary for different people to check the work
of others for errors. It is easy for a person to
overlook his own mistakes when trying to proof-
read. Also, there might have been deadlines to meet.
In any case, the errors which were made and cor-
rected cannot be classified as new translations, in
the same way that modern versions have been.

The editions of 1629, 1638, 1762, and 1769 were
certainly not new translations in the manner of the

New King James Bible, but merely cleaned up the printing and editing errors of the earlier editions. A simple comparison between the original 1611 edition, the current one, and the New King James Bible would prove that to be true. To further illustrate this fact, I have made the following comparisons in the three editions.

1611

Mt. 26:45, "Then commeth he to his Disciples, and saith vnto them, Sleepe on now, and take your rest, behold, the houre is at hand, and the sonne of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners."

Current

"Then cometh he to his disciples and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take your rest: behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners."

NKJB

"Then He came to His disciples and said to them, "Are you still sleeping and resting? Behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of Man is being betrayed into the hands of sinners."

1611

II Pt. 2:5, "And spared not the old world, but sauēd Noah the eight person a preacher of righteousnesse, bringing in the flood vpon the world of the vngodly:"

Current

"And spared not the old world, but saved Noah

the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly;"

NKJB

"and did not spare the ancient world, but saved Noah, one of eight people, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood on the world of the ungodly;"

1611

I Jn. 4:17, "Herein is our love made perfect, that wee may haue boldnesse in the day of Iudgement, because as hee is, so are we in this world."

Current

"Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment: because as he is, so are we in this world."

NKJB

"Love has been among us in this: that we may have boldness in the day of judgment; because as He is, so are we in this world."

1611

Jude 12, "These are spottes in your feasts of charitie, when they feast with you, feeding themselues without feare: cloudes they are without water, caried about of winds, trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twise dead, plucked vp by the rootes."

Current

"These are spots in your feasts of charity, when

they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear: clouds they are without water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withereth without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots.”

NKJB

“These are spots in your love feasts, while they feast with you without fear, serving only themselves; they are clouds without water, carried about by the winds; late autumn trees without fruit, twice dead, pulled up by the roots;”

1611

Jude 19, “These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the spirit.”

Current

“These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit.”

NKJB

“These are sensual persons, who cause divisions, not having the Spirit.

1611

II Cor. 5:20, “Now then we are Ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by vs; we pray you in Christs stead, that be ye reconciled to God.”

Current

“Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God.”

NKJB

“Therefore we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God were pleading through us: we implore you on Christ’s behalf, be reconciled to God.”

1611

Mt. 12:23, “And all the people were amazed, and said, Is this the sonne of David?”

Current

“And all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of David?”

NKJB

“And all the multitudes were amazed and said, “Could this be the Son of David?”

The only change in Mat. 26:45 from 1611 to the current edition is in the spelling, but look at the difference in the NKJB. Instead of a command, Christ is said to be asking a question.

Likewise, the only change in II Pet. 2:5 is updated spelling, but the NKJB says that God saved Noah, “one of eight people.” What can that mean? Did He not also save the other seven? The Greek word for “eighth” is the accusative of OGDOS, which is translated “eighth” in Luke 1:59; Acts 7:8; Rev. 17:11; 21:20 in both the current KJB and the NKJB. If God had intended to say “eight” instead of “eighth,” the Greek word would have been OKTO.

The other references are similar; I John 4:17, Jude 12, 19 are simply updated spelling, whereas the NKJB does a lot more, especially in I John 4:17.

The 1611 edition added “that” in II Cor. 5:20, which does not affect the sense; the NKJB changes several words, although the meaning is the same. The omission of “not” in Mat. 12:23 could have been a printer’s error, but even if it were not, the meaning would not be changed. The NKJB in that place certainly could not be called a printer’s error.

The point here is not to attack the NKJB, but to show that it is not a revision in the same sense that the others were. Quite a bit more is done than update spelling and printing practices. Several references were shown in the previous chapter as examples of significant changes which affect major doctrines. When people imply that the NKJB is only one more revision of the old 1611, they show that they are not aware of the changes or that they are deliberately deceitful.

Conclusions

Based on the foregoing chapters, I submit the following conclusions.

1. The King James Version which we possess today is the same as the 1611 edition. The various changes which have been made have in no way changed the meaning. There has not been a re-translation of a single verse.

2. We have the same Bible which the English-speaking masses have had for the past 3 1/2 centuries. We have God’s preserved word: that which He has made available to every generation. It is the Bible which has produced millions of great conversions, great revivals which we read about and are thrilled to learn of; it is the one which has motivated many believers to be missionaries to the ends of the earth, making great sacrifices to take the gospel to those who did not have it; it has moved many of God’s people to build schools, colleges, seminaries, hospitals, children’s homes. This Bible has edified believers and produced godly, spiritual Christians. We have God’s preserved word!

3. We can speak, teach, and preach from this Bible with authority. Today, people will not listen to a person, in any walk of life, unless that person knows what he is talking about. Not a single one of us would go to a physician who was uncertain about the causes and cures of disease, no matter how many medical schools he had graduated from. We would avoid a doctor who would only give various, conflicting opinions from different "schools of thought" in the medical profession. The same would be true of automobile mechanics, electricians, plumbers, or any other person whose help we might need. How much more necessary is it that those who speak of God do so with authority? The world is not going to pay attention to a message which is ambiguous, vague, or general.

Years ago, I was struck with the force and contemporary value of Mat. 7:28-29, "And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: For he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes." The preaching of Christ was startlingly different from that which the people usually heard from the scribes! The tragedy of this situation is that the scribes should have spoken with authority, since they were more familiar with scripture than any one. It was their full-time occupation to copy and teach God's word. No doubt, the average person did not have his personal copy of scripture, because the price of such a hand-written copy would have been prohibitive for most of them. They had to rely on the scribes, who would read and expound the Bible at the various religious gatherings through the year. Why did they not speak with authority? They were closer to the Bible than anyone and were con-

versant with it. They often engaged in arguments with the Lord Jesus about one verse or another. Could it be that they had the same problem as our modern textual critics? Did they spend much of their time arguing with one another about the best reading or translation or manuscript? Scholars agree that the Jews of the time of Christ did not speak the same Hebrew as that of the scripture, so some amount of translating or explaining was necessary. Since the scribes did not have the originals, did they argue about this word or that? Something like this could have happened; we know that something robbed them of speaking with authority.

So it is today. Many a man, who has had the benefit of a fine education, learning at the feet of scholars, exposed to the great libraries of the world, whose minds have been developed and are considered to be intellectual, who of all men should be able to say "Thus saith the Lord, thus it is written," are unsure of the actual words of God and are telling us that we probably will never be able to recover the specific original words. Could this be the reason that their preaching lacks authority?

To the contrary, I say that we can speak from the King James Version with authority. We have the same Bible as the 1611 edition, which came from the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts that were copied, translated, and circulated all through the centuries of this church age. In other words, God's word which He had preserved for every generation.

4. We need not fear believing this Bible. In my experiences of personal witnessing and counseling,

I have found that many are afraid to believe the Bible specifically. Many times, I have asked people to read a verse which was directly related to their problem; then I have asked them to explain what it meant or how it supplied the answer. Many have been afraid to do so. One reason for this, I am sure, is that they have heard so many people abuse the scripture, or pervert it for their own purposes, that they do not want to be found in the same category. I certainly respect that kind of caution and fear of misusing the Bible.

However, there is also another reason. Many people have heard preachers, who were supposed to be educationally qualified in the Bible, tell them that the KJV is not accurate in a particular verse. Then they have referred them to another version, which reads differently and changes the direction regarding a particular situation. Here is an example. The New American Standard Bible translates Deut. 24:1-4 quite differently from the KJV. It does not give permission for divorce, but says that if a man divorces his wife, and if she marries another, and if that second husband dies, she may not return to the first. The KJV, however, says specifically, "she may go and be another man's wife." (v. 3). No matter what one believes about divorce and remarriage, a simple comparison of the KJV and the NASB in Deut. 24:1-4 would show that they teach very different regulations. The fact that the KJV is correct should be obvious, when we read the argument which the Pharisees presented to Christ, in Mat. 19. The Lord acknowledged that the Deuteronomy passage gave permission for divorce, when He said "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so." (Mat. 19:8).

The point here is that the two Bibles are different. Some preachers prefer one, some the other. The average person, in the pew, is not always sure which one is correct. He can see that it is impossible to believe them both. This has led to a hesitation to actually commit one's self to a verse in any translation, especially when it deals with a controversial subject. The average church member has heard so many Bible-correctors ("popelings, fresh from college," as Spurgeon called them) re-translate verses or words, or refer to this version or that, whichever suits their particular view on a subject, that he is not sure which one is correct. This is a very real existing problem. It is serious. It has resulted in the condition that many are afraid to rely on the specific wording of any version especially if it deals with an important subject.

To the contrary, I say that we need not be afraid of committing ourselves to the wording of any verse in the King James Bible!

5. No person is an inferior Christian because he or she does not know Hebrew or Greek. This is not to belittle education; I am persuaded that we should learn all that we can which might be helpful in our understanding of God's word and will for us. However, the person who does not know the original languages is not a second-class Bible student! The believer who has the King James Bible, who has surrendered his will to the Lord, who is willing to put into practice that which he learns, can understand God's word. Such a person can be positive about what God has to say for everyday Christian living. That Christian should not be intimidated by another who has more education,

especially if the educated person is trying to correct his Bible!

If one can learn Hebrew and/or Greek, he should go to it. I thank God for the ability to read and study the Textus Receptus Greek New Testament. I am glad that I can read the footnotes in the critical version of the Greek New Testament, so I can know what the enemies as well as the friends of God have to say.

However, no one has to think he is unsure of God's truth if he has only the King James Bible. The word of God is still inspired when it is translated. I urge every reader to have confidence in the KJV, believing what it says about salvation, holy living, prayer, soul-winning, heaven and hell.

Finally, I confess that I have not discussed every possible issue regarding this matter. For one reason, I do not know them all! I have, however, treated those details and questions which have been brought to my attention through the years. I would be happy to entertain other questions about the KJV which are not covered in this small book, and would try to give a scriptural answer. My address is on the cover.

I have not said very much about the plan of salvation herein. In the first chapter, I did mention my conversion and the scripture which the Lord used to bring me to Christ. If the reader has any question about salvation, I would encourage the reading of chapter one, again. I promise that, if one believes the same promise which I did (John 1:12), the Lord will do the same as He did for me: He will save,

enable to be His child, make one a new creature in Christ, and give the same resulting victory and joyful life of service for the Saviour.

May the Lord bless your desire to learn and live His precious word.

Scripture Index

GENESIS	JUDGES
4:13 78	20:18, 23 25
8:13 81	RUTH
12:7 66	3:11 69
13:15 66	I SAMUEL
15:6 33	1:24 60
15:18 81	16:13 51
19:21 79	II SAMUEL
21:7 67	3:3 51
21:16 78	5:4 51
22:7 79	15:7 50
22:14 82	23:2 19
23:18 83	JOB
24:7 66	8:2 68
24:22 66	32:8 13
24:44 83	33:3 68
29:31 67	PSALMS
32:28 67	12:7 24
35:4 66	19:7 6
39:16 81	19:8 7
39:23 82	32:1-2 33
41:6, 23 78	33:4 26
EXODUS	33:11 24
2:24-25 60	34:20 32
33:19 33	38:12-14 42
NUMBERS	40:10 26
15:8-9 60	48:2 78
23:21 60	50:21 81
DEUTERONOMY	55:6 81
8:3 33, 40	58:2 82
24:1-4 94	68:18 33
25:4 33	
33:25 59-60	

68:21	81
69:32	83
69:33	70
78:2	32
89:33-34	26
89:49	26
95:7-11	55
96:13	26
100:5	25, 26
106:2	68
107:11	25
107:43	82
110:1	53
111:7-8	27
115:3	79
118:22-23	14
119:30	26
119:41	70
119:89-90	26
119:138	26
119:152	27
119:160	28
122:7	67
132:12	85
137:7	83
138:8	84
139:7	84
140:5	81
141:9	81, 84
146:6	28

PROVERBS

1:24-33	7
1:32	67
2:7	67
6:11	67
6:12	67
6:13	67

7:19	67
7:21	79, 83
8:30	68
10:3	68
10:9	67
11:3	68
11:16	69
12:4	69
12:26	69
13:20	67
14:2	67, 70
15:20	70
16:1	69
18:1, 2, 8	69, 70
19:1	67
19:16, 18	61, 70
20:7	67
20:25	71
22:6	7
22:12	28
23:4	71
25:1	20
26:7	71
26:22	70
26:23	71
28:6, 18, 26	67
29:18	71
29:24	71
31:1	20
31:10	69

ISAIAH

7:14	32
9:1-2	32
25:1	26
25:8	33
45:23-24	54
46:9-11	34

53:1	33
53:7-8	16
56:7	33
59:1-15	29
59:4	26
59:16-19	29
59:20	29
59:21	28, 29
61:1-2	15
66:2	22

JEREMIAH

1:4-5	3
5:1	26
7:28	26
9:3	26
20:9	3
22:21	67
23	9-10

EZEKIEL

1:17	81
3:11	80
6:8	84
7:23	80
10:2	84
11:15	82
11:24	80
12:19	80
13:11, 13	78
16:49	67
18:24	83
20:17	83
24:7	80, 85
26:9	80
26:14	82
27:27	77
34:18	83

34:31	84
37:26	83
39:11	81
40:13	79
40:42	81
43:7	83
44:5	83
44:22	84
44:23	81
44:29	84
46:23	84
47:14	78
48:2	84
48:8	82

DANIEL

1:12	80
3:15	84
3:19	81

HOSEA

3:4	30
4:4	82
6:5	81
9:11	81
13:3	81

JOEL

1:16	82
3:13	82

OBADIAH

2	70
6	81

MICAH

5:2	61
7:7	83

NAHUM	10:17	77
3:17		82
ZEPHANIAH	10:24	79
3:11		81
ZECHARIAH	10:25	78
7:7	11:1	78
11:2	11:23	64
11:7	12:20	77
12:10	12:23	80, 89, 90
	12:36	77
	13:6	81
	13:10-13	56
	13:35	32
	13:46	79
	14:7	77
	17:20	64, 77
	17:27	78
	18:7	77
	18:22	64
	18:24, 28	78
	19:8	94
	19:26	77
	21:32	64-65
	21:36	78
	21:42	14
	22:10-11	77
	22:44	53, 54
	23:32	65
	24:35	29
	24:50	78
	26:34	84
	26:39	77
	26:45	86, 89
	26:51	78
	26:55	65
	27:22-23	77
	28:1	78
	28:19-20	29, 57

MARK	1:5	78
1:30		78
1:31		78
3:5		62
4:24		82
5:6		81
7:6		81
9:30		79
10:1		84
10:18		81
10:27		77
10:46		77
11:8		84
11:17		33
14:1, 12		47
14:36		84
14:48		79

LUKE	1:37	77
1:59		77, 89
1:74		84
2:2		79
2:4		79
3:21		79
4:18-19		15
7:46		81
8:5		78
10:7		33
10:36		83
11:16		84
11:42		82
13:12		82
13:25, 27		82
16:15		77
16:26		77
17:1		77

18:27	77
19:9	82
20:12	82
20:42	82
21:18	81
22:1, 7	47
23:19	81

JOHN	1:6	82
1:12	1, 2, 96	
1:18	11, 61	
2:20	46	
3:16	43	
4:50	24	
5:24	6	
7:38	16	
8:6	42	
8:33	84	
12:22	82	
12:38	33	
13:18	16	
14:23	30	
15:20	82	
19:24	16, 78	
19:36	16, 32	
19:37	16, 33	

ACTS	2:22	80
7:8		89
7:35		84
7:45		55
8:31		49
8:32-33		16
8:37		52
11		9
12:4		47

15:33	83
20:26	83
20:32	7
21:28	77
27:7	83
28:13	78

ROMANS

1:1	40
1:7	40
1:11	82
4:3	33
4:7-8	33
4:19	62, 78
4:19-21	62
5:11	44
7:2	82
9:15	33
10:17	8
10:21	49
11:6	8
11:9	49
11:23	77
12:2	81
14:1	3
14:10	80
15:28	83
16:22	19

I CORINTHIANS

3:15	72, 77
5:5, 11	81
7:5	82
9:1	82
11:2, 17	82
12:28	57, 79
13	43
13:2	81

14:1	41-42
14:2	41
14:23	81
15:5-6	84
15:54	33

II CORINTHIANS

5:17	1, 6
5:20	79, 88-89, 90
7:8-9	8
9:4	82
11:4	46
12:2	81

GALATIANS

1:8	82
3:16	66
3:24	9
5:15	80

EPHESIANS

1:9	81, 83
1:17-18	56
2:18	79
4:8	33

PHILIPPIANS

2:10-11	54
4:6	84

I TIMOTHY

1:4	80
2:9	78
3:11	45
5:18	33
6:11	83

II TIMOTHY

1:7	80
1:12	79
2:19	82
3:3	45
3:15	9, 17
3:16	13, 14, 17, 19
4:2	17
4:8	80

TITUS

1:2	25
2:3	45

PHILEMON

9	81
---	----

HEBREWS

4:3-8	55
4:12	5
6:4	77
6:18	25, 77
9:17	78
11:3	21, 23
11:6	77
12:1	79

JAMES

1:18	6
1:27	83

I PETER

1:23, 25	1, 5, 6, 30
2:1	80
2:2	8
2:10	30
3:15	21
4:3	30

II PETER

1:9	77
1:21	19
2:5	86, 89
3:9	78

I JOHN

2:28	34
3:22	84
4:17	72, 87, 89
5:7	51-52
5:12	80

JUDE

12, 19	87-88-89
--------	----------

REVELATION

13:6	84
14:1, 3	77
17:11	89
21:20	89