

Speak My Language!

Why the KJV must yield to the 21st century

Going beyond the textual questions of the KJV to the practical one: can it be understood in our century?

Bob Faulkner

Copyright © 2020 Bob Faulkner

All rights reserved.

ISBN:9798571151238

DEDICATION

TO THOSE SAINTS WHO ARE WILLING TO SEE THAT THE
WORD OF GOD LIVES AND PROSPERS FOREVER,
REGARDLESS OF CHANGES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

CONTENTS

Introductory Comments, 6-10

“God Wrote One Bible,” 6

English, 8

Languages Change, 9

History and Origins, 11-61

The 1978 Preface, 11

Definitions, 13

Apocrypha, 14

Authorized? 15

Common Sense, 17

An Ecumenical Undertaking, 18

The King Named James, 19

Dedication to James in the KJV, 22

Dedication to Readers of KJV, 26

Other English Bibles, 35

The KJVO Movement, 38

Answering a KJVO Advocate, 49

Erasmus, 53

Westcott and Hort, 55

The KJV Text Examined, 62-89

“Error”-filled, 62

A Collection of Old English Terms, 65

The List not Exhaustive, 88

Final Thoughts, 90

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

“God wrote one Bible... and it’s the KJV...”

That’s what I hear in some quarters.

These folks seem to picture God at a table, writing a book, then passing it to us on golden plates. Kinda like the Book of Mormon.

No. Never happened. Not that way.

Some say the Earth is flat. We now right this off as silly talk. Well, most of us. Some have never let go of the concept and would fight to the death over it. Really. Some things are hard to let go of once you’ve taken a stand on their behalf.

Oh, and there was no Holocaust either...

Lots of myths out there, and this KJVO thing is a tough nut to crack.

All Scripture was indeed inspired of God. God spoke, men listened, and men wrote. In Hebrew. In Greek. We do not have those original writings. And it is they, the originals, that were inspired. Left to us is the task of finding, through a long series of translations, exactly what was said. We get constantly closer...

The *message* is unchanged from the beginning.

But all men and all translations are flawed. Tyndale. Coverdale. Luther. Erasmus. Westcott. Hort. But a perfect God has given us a perfect message that shines through *every translation*, calling us off the printed page into His Presence, where only is perfection.

Most pew sitters reading their pew Bibles have no idea what this King James battle is all about. They cling to the KJV because that’s how they were raised.

They got used to it.
It reminds them of their childhood days.
As with all prejudices.
Or the pastor insists.
Or it is the only Bible available at church.

John MacArthur and many lesser lights in the theological world were raised on the KJV. But they don't prefer it now. I wonder why?

Did you know that a person can be saved, filled, sanctified (name your process!) via any recognized version of the Bible? Some of the finest believers on earth have *never read the King James Version of the Bible*. And never will. Nor will they ever need to.

My contention in the following work is that, just as the Reformation did not stop with Luther, but continues to this day, so the translating of the Bible did not stop in England, 17th century. Improvements are always being made... *not improving on God's Word, don't even imagine that I said that!* But improving on finding exactly what that Word is.

However, write it down: there is enough correct text in that Christian Bible you own [excludes Jehovah Witness and other cult types, of course] to get you to Heaven in perfect shape if you will obey It.

English.

The apostles never used it. I say this in jest, but I would not be surprised if there are some who believe that the KJV was handed down from that august group.

No. The English Bible, English itself, does not date to the first century! That's obvious, but a related topic must be mentioned:

The English Bible does not exist in most of the world today!

How do the King-James-Version-Only (henceforth KJVO) people explain away the fact that English, though an important language, is not the language of the entire planet, and therefore not the language of the local Bible?

Over a billion people speak Chinese. Number one language of the planet.

Second is Spanish. About half as many as Chinese.

Third is English, with nearly 400 million speakers, though combined with ESL folks, the number approaches one billion. English is the main language of business and travel and a lot more, but say what you will, it is by far *not the only language where the Christian message is communicated Biblically.*

Do we dare even speak of the thousands of tribal languages that shall never have one word of the KJV in their language?

The argument for the King James as the "only" translation to read certainly weakens with these facts.

Languages change.

Truth does not change. Languages do. The KJV may be correct textually (and that still needs some proving) but it is way off, linguistically. Grammatically. In vocabulary.

All of these matters were not an issue in 1600, obviously. It was correct in all these ways then. *It is not correct today.*

Words matter! The wrong words in a Biblical text provide an unnecessary stumbling block for those wanting to get at God's truths.

Why should I speak like Shakespeare when I am reading Paul aloud, or Moses, or David?

More importantly, why should I give cause to unbelievers for ridicule? The Gospel itself already does that. Are we not despised enough as a people without presenting to the world a book written in another tongue?

Why add meaningless assaults on Christian teaching? Why increase the ignorance level of Christianity by a book whose language is obsolete? One educated man recently told me that he was convinced that "thy" in the Bible simply means "the".

That's just one example in millions...

Because you understand the KJV, having been fed it since childhood, you can't assume that others do, or want to.

There is an anti-scholarship attitude that prevails among many KJVO folks. "Don't touch my KJV with your book-learnin'", they imply. What they do not understand is that without scholarship, there would be no Bible at all.

The KJV may have been the best when it came out, *though it was attacked in many quarters*. It is definitely not now. Not because of the Greek text, but because of the clear evolution of the English language.

But the KJVO people disagree. They not only will fight for the superiority of the KJV, but for its exclusivity. Here is where I must part company with them, or rather, they with me. Once you have reached that conclusion, that the KJV is the only Bible we should read, you enter a cult-like group whose hateful doctrine divides families and churches for no good reason.

It is that spirit that has caused me to put a few paragraphs together for the edification of the church.

Yes, “God wrote one Bible”, and that Bible has been copied by men countless times in many translations, most of which, though flawed in the minutiae, are gloriously complete in the message they convey.

I shall not hate my brother if he dares to read a different version...

HISTORY and ORIGINS

The 1978 Preface.

In 1978, the National Publishing Company of Philadelphia distributed the King James Version of the Bible with the following historical notes preceding the text, which I share only in part:

“During the reign of Mary [aka “Bloody Mary” of Scotland] and the restoration of Catholicism, many Protestant leaders sought safety abroad. Among the company that gathered about Calvin at Geneva [Switzerland] were Myles Coverdale, John Knox, and William Whittingham. The latter, a brother-in-law of Calvin, and with probable assistance from Coverdale and others, made a new translation. The New Testament appeared in 1557, and the entire text in 1560. It became known as the Genevan Bible, and was the peoples’ Bible for nearly a century...

“Notations in the Genevan Bible displeased certain of the English bishops and its cordial reception by the people spurred on the making of still another version under Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury. It appeared in 1568, and came to be known as the Bishops’ Bible.

“When James I succeeded to the throne in 1603, he immediately found himself heir to the religious and political turmoil of the previous hundred years. He had been thoroughly schooled in theology, and in the hope of bringing some semblance of order out of the existing chaos he called a meeting of churchmen at Hampton Palace early in 1605.

“Old rivalries still existed and the Bible was still a basis of strife and differences. In considering this subject, Dr. John Reynolds, president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, brought forward the suggestion of a new translation. The king, who had literary ambitions and was something of a language scholar, gave the undertaking his wholehearted endorsement and support. The translation was to be from Hebrew and Greek. Fifty-four of the best scholars were selected, only forty-seven of whom... took part.

“So greatly beloved today, it seems strange to believe that the King James text took a long time to win its way into the favor of the people. The Genevan Bible continued to be published until 1644, and it was undoubtedly copies of this earlier version which came to America with the earliest colonists.

“It is interesting to know that even today in England and in Scotland the Bible is printed only under license... to assure the purity of its text. It is for this reason that the term *authorized* continues to appear in the title of this version.

“Apart from its religious significance, the King James text has come to be recognized as among the finest specimens of English literature. From a religious standpoint it is still, after more than 300 years, THE Bible in English.”

That was 1978. The last fact is not true today, the rest of the preface is good history. And you will note that the history given is not stated with animosity or religious bigotry. These are the facts of the case. The KJV was the successor of other great Bibles and is itself a great Bible.

But I wish to state unequivocally that neither the translators, nor I believe, God Himself, intended for the KJV to be the last and only translation for all time and for all peoples. Those who make this claim have become promoters of a deadly cult.

Let's back up a little and ask some questions along the way.

Definitions.

““The **King James Version** (KJV)... is an English translation of the Christian Bible **for the Church of England...**”

So says Wikipedia.

I'm wondering. Would any of our KJVO people have felt comfortable in the Church of England? Do they understand that the church of England was very Catholic-like, the main difference being the human headship of the church? That church saw the King of England as the head of the church. Rome saw the Pope in that position.

Various purifications of the English Church were to come, but the basic structure of its meetings and government were such as to make any modern fundamentalist quite uneasy.

It will be seen that some of the translation of the KJV was pointed in the direction of that English denomination of Christians, and not to the church at large. It was the church/government of England that demanded the translation, and certain guidelines were set in place. Certain interpretations were expected.

Take for example the word “baptize.” Where did that word come from, what does it mean? The Greek is *baptidzo*. It means to overwhelm, to immerse. In the Biblical context, it would mean an immersion in water or the Spirit. But the context of 17th century England demanded a sprinkling of water for new converts or even children. What is an honest translator to do?

What they did was coin a word, which to this day can mean anything one wants it to mean. But mark it down. The KJV translation, and all others that have followed, have yielded to compromise in this matter. We continue with Wikipedia...

“...commissioned in 1604 and completed as well as published in 1611 under the sponsorship of James VI [of Scotland, aka James I of England.]

The Apocrypha.

“The books of the King James Version include the 39 books of the Old Testament, **an intertestamental section containing 14 books of the Apocrypha**, and the 27 books of the New Testament.”

Whoa! Stop the quote. Serious explanation needed!

What?! The apocrypha in the KJV? Oh yes, as stated above, the church of England was still very Catholic. Some of the weekly readings for church services demanded use of apocryphal books.

But surely, you say, this was corrected in the 1769 version which is used today, and which, when pressed, is the KJVO of choice?

Yes, and no. Originally the 1769 version carried these books of doubtful origin also!

There had been a long-standing controversy about these 14 books, but the fact that most church fathers and reformers considered them helpful, though not inspired, kept them in *until the late 19th century!*

Finally, in 1880, the American Bible Society voted that they be removed. Five years later they were also removed officially from English printings by an act of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Nearly three centuries had passed. Those years saw a KJV that had 14 uninspired books in it! Now, here in 2020, we are asked to believe that the world's *only perfect English Bible* has been around to lead people to perfect truth for less than a century and a half of the church's history.

We continue.

Authorized?

“Noted for its ‘majesty of style’, the King James Version has been described as one of the most important books in English culture and a driving force in the shaping of the English-speaking world.”

No argument there!

“In January 1604, King James convened the Hampton Court Conference, where a new English version was conceived in response to the problems of the earlier translations perceived by the [Puritans](#)...

“James gave the translators instructions intended to ensure that the new version would conform to the [ecclesiology](#) — and reflect the [episcopal](#) structure — of the Church of England and its belief in an [ordained](#) clergy”

See what I mean? Bible translators being instructed to “conform” to the government’s wishes.

James sounds a lot like Emperor Constantine, who took the reins of the church after three hundred long years of persecution. Grateful Christians looked to their deliverer as God’s man of the hour and listened to his pronouncements without question.

Is it heretical for me to suggest that an earthly monarch, however gracious and loved by his people, is not God’s chosen instrument to lead God’s Church? Yet the church has yielded to this influence more than once, and paid the price.

Constantine did indeed free God’s people from the dungeons. But it wasn’t many years before favored Christians were persecuting pagans, who then decided it would be safer to join the church than practice their paganism outside of it. They brought their paganism with them, and we have suffered for it ever since.

We will speak more of James later.

“By the first half of the 18th century, the Authorized Version had become effectively unchallenged as the English translation used in Anglican and English Protestant churches, ... Over the course of

the 18th century, the *Authorized Version* [as it came to be known for governmental, not spiritual, reasons] supplanted the Latin Vulgate as the standard version of Scripture for English-speaking scholars... this version of the Bible became the most widely printed book in history...

“The title of the first edition of the translation, in [Early Modern English](#), was "THE HOLY BIBLE, Conteyning the Old Teftament, AND THE NEW: Newly Tranflated out of the Originall tongues: & with the former Tranflations diligently compared and reuifed, by his Maiesties [peciall Comandement".

Happily, this title did not survive the cut that the KJV has had to make of archaic English.

The title page carries the words "Appointed to be read in Churches",^[11] and F. F. Bruce suggests it was "probably **authorised** by order in council."

This is why we call it the “authorized” Bible. Not authorized by the church or the Lord, but by the government in England, where the mingling of church and state prevailed.

“The use of Authorized Version, capitalized and used as a name, is found as early as 1814.^[21] For some time before this, descriptive phrases such as "our present, and only publicly authorised version" (1783),^[22] "our Authorized version" (1792),^[23] and "the authorized version" (1801, uncapitalized)^[24] are found...The term is somewhat of a misnomer because the text itself was never formally "authorized", nor were English parish churches ever ordered to procure copies of it.”

So why a new translation in those early centuries of English Christianity?

Common sense.

Listen well, Church! The people who wanted a new version of the Bible wanted it for good reasons! These are the very reasons the KJV needs to take its place as great history, but not great modern-day reading:

Here are three examples of *problems the Puritans perceived* with the *Bishops* and *Great Bibles*, two major translations used in that same 17th century:

“First, Galatians iv. 25 (from the Bishops' Bible). The Greek word *susoichei* is not well translated as now it is, bordereth neither expressing the force of the word, nor the apostle's sense, nor the situation of the place. Secondly, psalm cv. 28 (from the Great Bible), 'They were not obedient;' the original being, 'They were not disobedient.' Thirdly, psalm cvi. 30 (also from the Great Bible), 'Then stood up Phinees and prayed,' the Hebrew hath, 'executed judgment.'”

Do you see it? Words translated improperly. Words that change their meaning over time. So common sense said, “Let’s revise and replace.”

But when today we say that there are archaic and misleading words in the KJV, the condemnations to hell are fast and furious from some quarters.

“Further, the King gave the translators instructions designed to guarantee that the new version would conform to the ecclesiology of the Church of England.^[8] Certain Greek and Hebrew words were to be *translated in a manner that reflected the traditional usage of the church.*^[8] For example, *old ecclesiastical words such as the word "church" were to be retained and not to be translated as "congregation".*^[8] *The new translation would reflect the episcopal structure of the Church of England and traditional beliefs about ordained clergy.*^[8]

An ecumenical undertaking.

“The task of translation was undertaken by 47 scholars, although 54 were originally approved.^[9] All were members of the Church of England and all except Sir Henry Savile were clergy.^[47] The scholars worked in six committees, two based in each of the University of Oxford, the University of Cambridge, and Westminster. The committees included scholars with Puritan sympathies, as well as High Churchmen.”

Would you, my dear KJVO scholar, have served on a committee with men who worshipped in the “High” (seriously formal, liturgical) way? With men who quite possibly were opposed to your Puritan views? Would you not have complained that the admixture of beliefs among these men would bring about a corrupted translation?

If you would have “mixed it up” then, why do you not hang out with such people today?

The King Named James.

A man calling himself head of the church sponsors a Bible and it is named after him. His government dictates some of the terms.

The original printing contains two prefatory texts; the first is a formal *Epistle Dedicatory* to "the most high and mighty Prince" King James. Many British printings of the Bible reproduce this introduction, while most non-British printings do not. Somehow, I remember reading about James in an early Bible I owned.

But "Most high and mighty?" Really?

Since we have introduced the "most high and mighty Prince" King James VI of Scotland [and James I of England, the same person], we should probably stop and describe the man a bit.

He was the son of Mary Queen of Scots, the infamous Catholic ruler of England who in the 16th century was the murderer of Protestants in her realm. She was aptly titled "Bloody Mary."

So, James was born (1566) into a very Catholic setting in Scotland. But he did not stay in that setting long. His mother was soon thereafter imprisoned by Protestant forces, and later executed. The politics and thus the religion of Scotland and England changed radically.

James was made her successor as an infant. At age 13 months, the coronation took place, with none other than John Knox serving as the preacher. Scotland was then ruled by a series of regents in an ever-evolving political climate.

By 1579 he was declared the "adult" ruler, though only thirteen years of age.

James seems to have been convinced of the Protestant position on many issues, sometimes to the extreme. He was known for some time as a propagator of the witch-hunt. Literal witches. He is known to have supervised the torture of women accused of being of that profession.

He was also a firm believer in “absolute monarchy.” He was in charge, no doubt. But at least, he attempted to rule within the traditions of Scripture.

The “divine right of kings” was another plank in his platform.

In 1603, Elizabeth, down in England, passed away with no heir. Our James VI of Scotland, because of a familial connection, was made James I of England, after 36 years of his Scottish rule.

The church was at that time dealing with a number of leftovers from Catholicism. The Puritans brought issues like confirmation, wedding rings, the term “priest” etc., before the newly installed monarch, hoping he would do away with all traces of their Catholic past.

James said no at first. The Puritans therefore felt they were being persecuted. But his issuance of the Bible subsequently named after him certainly brought him into a more favorable position with them, and several Puritan scholars were on the translation committee, along with Anglicans, as we mentioned.

James’ reign brought with it a measure of peace, lower taxes, and a colony in Jamestown, Virginia, to name a few accomplishments. Many of his subjects loved and honored him.

But many did not. There is some testimony that the king was bisexual. One note from a former assumed lover seems to seal this opinion.

Further, the King was known to be irresponsible in the area of finance.

With pain ravaging his body in later years, the king was driven to drink heavily. He suffered from gout, arthritis, kidney stones, and more. His end was tragic, but he was still remembered with favor when all was finished. He had reigned over fifty years.

Now, my question. Since all men are flawed, and this king was obviously no exception, should his name be on the cover of a Holy Bible? Should his name be associated with a version of the Holy

Scriptures? Should any man's name be associated with the holy church of Jesus and the writings thereof?

Suppose a new version of the Bible was suggested by Abraham Lincoln, or Ronald Reagan, or FDR? Good men, but flawed also. Would it be appropriate to have a "Lincoln Bible" or an "FDR Bible"?

How about a "Donald Trump Version" (DTV)? After all, Trump was seriously flawed but did many things worthy of praise, just like the fabled King James.

On the following page, I share what the translators said of their own "Trump" in 1611: It is repeated in the 1769 version, one of many revisions to the 'only' word of God called KJV. I have greatly condensed this message, words that were found in American versions of the KJV at one time.

I must say it must have been very confusing to seekers after truth to begin their study of the Scriptures by hearing of a "high and mighty Prince named James". What do you think?

I have added my comments to the dedication.

The dedication to King James, in the 1611/1769 versions.

“TO THE MOST HIGH AND MIGHTY PRINCE JAMES, [BY THE GRACE OF GOD,] KING OF GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE, AND IRELAND, DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, &c.

The Translators of the Bible wish Grace, Mercy, and Peace, through JESUS CHRIST our Lord.

“GREAT and manifold were the blessings, most dread Sovereign, which Almighty God, the Father of all mercies, bestowed upon us the people of [England], when first he sent Your Majesty's Royal Person to rule and reign over us. For whereas it was the expectation of many, who wished not well unto our [Sion], that upon the setting of that bright [Occidental Star], Queen [Elizabeth] of most happy memory, some thick and palpable clouds of darkness would so have overshadowed this Land, that men should have been in doubt which way they were to walk...”

This is political talk. Born again believers do not speak of darkness over a land because of a monarch's presence or absence. The light was clearly visible to the apostles who gave us the New Testament, though they lived under the scourge of Roman dictators.

“the appearance of Your Majesty, as of the [Sun] in his strength, instantly dispelled those supposed and surmised mists...”

Really?

“But among all our joys, there was no one that more filled our hearts, than the blessed continuance of the preaching of God's sacred Word among us; which is that inestimable treasure, which excelleth all the riches of earth; because the fruit thereof extendeth itself, not only to the time spent in this transitory world, but directeth and disposeth men unto that eternal happiness which is above in heaven.”

Thankfully, James restored the Scriptures and Protestant thinking and life to the realm after the bloody rule of his mother.

“...to go forward with the confidence and resolution of a Man in maintaining the truth of Christ, and propagating it far and near, is that which hath so bound and firmly knit the hearts of all Your Majesty's loyal and religious people unto You, that Your very name is precious among them: their eye doth behold You with comfort, and they bless You in their hearts, as that sanctified Person, who, under God, is the immediate Author of their true happiness.”

James is the Author of their happiness?

“And this their contentment doth not diminish or decay, but every day increaseth and taketh strength, when they observe, that the zeal of Your Majesty toward the house of God doth not slack or go backward, but is more and more kindled, manifesting itself abroad in the farthest parts of [Christendom], by writing in defence of the Truth, (which hath given such a blow unto that man of Sin, as will not be healed,) and every day at home, by religious and learned discourse, by frequenting the house of God, by hearing the Word preached, by cherishing the Teachers thereof, by caring for the Church, as a most tender and loving nursing Father.

“There are infinite arguments of this right Christian and religious affection in Your Majesty; but none is more forcible to declare it to others than the vehement and perpetuated desire of accomplishing and publishing of this work, which now with all humility we present unto Your Majesty... [the KJV]...”

“For when Your Highness had once out of deep judgment apprehended how convenient it was, that out of the Original Sacred Tongues, together with comparing of the labours, both in our own, and other foreign Languages, of many worthy men who went before us, there should be one more exact Translation of the holy Scriptures into the [English Tongue]...”

Whether “one more” or “one, more exact” is meant, the insight is important.

The KJV translators believed they were revising the Scriptures that had been used in the English church up until then. They considered it a duty and an honor, and the king complied.

But since that day, other godly men have arisen who have seen the very same need, to bring an even more “exact” rendering of the Scriptural texts into the hands of the believers. For this, the KJVO cult derides them, ridicules them, even burns their efforts in fires of hate.

A man I know has dumped non-KJV versions into the garbage!

There were those who fought the revision, for KJV was merely a revision, to be sure. They eventually stopped complaining and died out.

So it will be in the present controversy.

We continue...

“...we hold it our duty to offer it to Your Majesty, not only as to our King and Sovereign, but as to the principal Mover and Author of the work: humbly craving of Your most Sacred Majesty, that since things of this quality have ever been subject to the censures of ill-meaning and discontented persons...”

Indeed. As today. Censures on the NIV, the NASB, the ESV, even the NKJV have abounded. In some churches it is absolutely forbidden of the people to read from these “devil” translations!

“...it may receive approbation and patronage from so learned and judicious a Prince as Your Highness is...”

“So that if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by Popish Persons at home or abroad, who therefore will malign us, because we are poor instruments to make God's holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness; or if, on the other side, we shall be maligned by **self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their anvil...**”

I know some of these people. They still live among us.

“we may rest secure, supported within by the truth and innocency of a good conscience, ... which will ever give countenance to honest and Christian endeavors against **bitter censures and uncharitable imputations.**”

Would that these men could have lived to the present time and seen how efforts, like their own, have been so maligned.

“The Lord of heaven and earth bless Your Majesty with many and happy days, that, as his heavenly hand hath enriched Your Highness with many singular and extraordinary graces, so You may be the wonder of the world in this latter age for happiness and true felicity, to the honour of that great GOD, and the good of his Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord and only Saviour.”

James the wonder of the world? A bit extreme, but the point is taken, that the translators loved and appreciated their king for the opportunity of bringing a more perfect word to God's people.

Now read what these same translators addressed to their readers.

Translators to the Readers.

Wikipedia has published the second preface that was added to many of the original KJV's. I offer an edited portion of it as equally beneficial for modern readers, to see the hypocrisy of the current crop of KJVO adherents. Pay close attention to what the translators of what the KJVO folks believe to be their exclusive property, affirmed over four hundred years ago.

Introductory remarks:

"The second preface [to the original KJV] was called *Translators to the Reader*, a long and learned essay that defends the undertaking of the new version. It observes the translators' stated goal, that they, "never thought from the beginning that [they] should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one, ... but **to make a good one better**, or out of many good ones, one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavour, that our mark."

They wanted the best for their people. Understood. They gave it their best effort. True. They came up with a great product. Yes. But their goal was not "a new translation." They simply wanted to make the Bible of their day better than the one currently in use.

This has been the aim of most Christian translators since. Though there were some that wanted a Bible to fit their heresies, as the New World Translation of the Jehovah's Witnesses, there were many others who wanted to dig a little deeper, refine a little more, "make a good one (KJV in this case) better."

"They also give their opinion of previous English Bible translations, stating, 'We do not deny, nay, we affirm and avow, that the very meanest [poorest] translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession, (for we have seen none of theirs [Roman Catholics] of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God.'"

What a statement! Even the worst of the English translations are here called, by the KJV translators, "the word of God!" What would

they think then of translations that have taken the scholarship a step farther, yea many steps farther? These men would rejoice! They feared not innovation, change, when correction was the motivation.

“Zeale to promote the common good, whether it be by devising any thing our selves, or revising that which hath bene laboured by others, deserveth certainly much respect and esteeme, but yet findeth but cold intertainment in the world. It is welcommed with suspicion in stead of love, and with emulation in stead of thankes: ...For, was there ever any thing projected, that savoured any way of newnesse or renewing, but the same endured many a storme of gaine-saying, or opposition?”

True, brothers of England! Revisers are not trusted, whether in your day or ours!

“...these things which we speake of, are of most necessary use, and therefore, that none, either without absurditie can speake against them, or without note of wickednesse can spurne against them.”

*Yes. **To scorn the reviser is both absurd and wicked!***

“Yet for all that, the learned know that certain worthy **men have been brought to untimely death for none other fault, but for seeking to reduce their countrymen to good order and discipline;** and that in some commonweals it was made a capital crime, once to motion the making of a new law for the abrogating of an old, though the same were most pernicious; and that certain, which would be counted pillars of the state, and patterns of virtue and prudence, could not be brought for a long time to give way to good letters and refined speech, but bare themselves as averse from them, as from rocks or boxes of poison;”

Change, even for correction, is abominable to some.

“...Envy striketh most spitefully at the fairest, and at the chiefest. David was a worthy prince, and no man to be compared to him for his first deeds, and yet for as worthy as act as ever he did (even for bringing back the Ark of God in solemnity), **he was scorned and scoffed at by his own wife.**”

The greatest of Biblical men have been envied and scorned.

The essay goes on to cite examples in history of the same phenomenon. Then this,

“His Majesty that now reigneth (and long may he reign, and his offspring forever, "Himself and children, and children's children always") knew full well, according to the singular wisdom given unto him by God, and the rare learning and experience that he hath attained unto; namely that whosoever attempteth anything for the public (especially if it pertain to religion, and to the opening and clearing of the word of God), the same setteth himself upon a stage to be glouted upon by every evil eye; yea, he casteth himself headlong upon pikes, to be gored by every sharp tongue.

“For he that meddleth with men's religion in any part, meddleth with their custom, nay, with their freehold; and though they find no content in that which they have, yet they cannot abide to hear of altering.”

A perfect description of KJVOnlyism, by KJV translators! The KJV is the custom, the tradition of so many. And to come against it is to incur their wrath.

There follows a praise of Scripture. And a question:

“But how shall men meditate in that which they cannot understand? How shall they understand that which is kept close in

an unknown tongue? As it is written, 'Except I know the power of the voice, I shall be to him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian to me'. The apostle excepteth no tongue; not Hebrew the ancientest, not Greek the most copious, not Latin the finest."

Well put, yes? Speak to me in my language or do not speak at all!

A lengthy argument now ensues for translation of Scriptures into the tongue of the people. This argument could well be used against the KJV of our day, which simply is not in the tongue of modern English-speakers:

"Now though the Church were thus furnished with Greek and Latin translations...yet for all that the godly-learned were not content to have the Scriptures in the language which they themselves understood, Greek and Latin... but also for the behoof and edifying of the unlearned which hungered and thirsted after righteousness, and had souls to be saved as well as they, they provided translations into the vulgar for their countrymen..."

Godly people want all men to hear the truth in their own words.

"So that to have the Scriptures in the mother tongue is not a quaint conceit lately taken up, either by the Lord Cromwell in England, or by the Lord Radeville in Polony, or by the Lord Ungnadius in the emperor's dominion, but hath been thought upon and put in practice of old, even from the first times of the conversion of any nation; no doubt because it was esteemed most profitable, *to cause faith to grow in men's hearts the sooner*, and to make them to be able to say with the words of the Psalms, 'As we have heard, so we have seen'."

Yes, a KJV can save a soul, but note the words, "the sooner."

“The unwillingness of our chief adversaries that the Scriptures should be divulged in the mother tongue, etc. **Here is Rome’s refusal to allow the Scriptures in the tongue of the people.**”

Keeping God’s Word out of the tongue of the people is akin to what Rome did in those awful centuries known as the Dark Ages!

“Many men's mouths have been open a good while (and yet are not stopped) with speeches about the translation so long in hand, or rather perusals of translations made before, and ask what may be the reason, what the necessity of the employment. Hath the church been deceived, say they, all this while?”

The very accusations we deal with today. Why, if we dare bring to the fore a word or two that has been hidden, what are we saying about the people who did not have the advantage of those words for centuries? The obvious answer is that nothing that concerns our salvation or sanctification has been lacking from the very first century until now!

This argument continues...Have we been short-changed in the past?

“ ‘We hoped that we had been in the right way, that we had had the oracles of God delivered unto us, and that though all the world had cause to be offended and to complain, yet that we had none. Hath the nurse holden out the breast, and nothing but wind in it? Hath the bread been delivered by the Fathers of the Church, and the same proved to be lapidosus, as Seneca speaketh? What is it to handle the word of God deceitfully, if this be not?’

“Thus certain brethren.

“ ‘Was their translation good before? Why do they now mend it? Was it not good? Why then was it obruded to the people? Yea, why did the Catholics (meaning popish Romanists) always go in jeopardy, for refusing to go to hear it?’

“We will answer them both briefly; and the former, being brethren, thus, with St. Jerome, ‘Do we condemn the ancient? In no case, but after the endeavors of them that were before us, we take the best pains we can in the house of God.’ As if he said, ‘Being provoked by the example of the learned men that lived before my time, I have thought it my duty, to assay whether my talent in the knowledge of the tongues may be profitable in any measure to God's church’

*And we say today, “No, the KJV is not a bad translation. But we ‘take the best pains’ to make it better. **This humility is a hallmark of the KJV translators, totally missing in the KJVO community.***

Next, praise to the former translators! And yes, modern translators consistently praise the KJV for the work it represents. A fine translation, they will own. And now, let's move on, they will add.

“And to the same effect say we, that we are so far off from condemning any of their labors that travailed before us in this kind, either in this land or beyond sea, either in King Henry's time or King Edward's (if there were any translation or correction of a translation in his time), or Queen Elizabeth's of ever renowned memory, that **we acknowledge them to have been raised up of God**, for the building and furnishing of his church, and that they deserve to be had of us and of posterity in everlasting remembrance. The judgment of Aristotle is worthy and well known:

“Therefore blessed be they, and most honoured be their name, that break the ice, and give the onset upon that which helpeth forward to the saving of souls. Now what can be more available thereto, than to deliver God's book unto God's people in a tongue which they understand?”

In a tongue which they understand! That is the point!

“so, if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, do endeavor to make that better which they left so good, no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike us”

Would that it were true today!

“they, we persuade ourselves, if they were alive, would thank us.”

And the NASB, ESV, NKJV people do thank the KJV people for what they did, indeed!

“For by this means it cometh to pass, that whatsoever is sound already the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished; also, if anything be halting, or superfluous, or not so agreeable to the original, **the same may be corrected**, and the truth set in place.”

Truth is what we are after, not tradition.

“An answer to the imputations of our adversaries...

“Now to the latter we answer that we do not deny--nay, we affirm and avow--that the very meanest translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession, (for we have seen none of theirs of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the word of God, **nay, is the word of God.**”

Yet some KJVO folk will toss into the garbage or burn publicly, those translations that dare to veer from their Bible.

“As the king's speech, which he uttered in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin, is still the king's speech, though it be not interpreted by every translator with the like grace, nor peradventure so fitly for phrase, nor so expressly for sense, everywhere.

“The Romanists therefore, in refusing to hear, **and daring to burn the word translated, [take note KJVO!]** did no less than despite the Spirit of grace, from whom originally it proceeded, and whose sense and meaning, as well as man's weakness would enable, it did express.”

“The translation of the Seventy [the Septuagint] dissenteth from the original in many places; neither doth it come near it, for perspicuity, gravity, majesty; yet which of the apostles did condemn it? Condemn it? Nay, they used it (as it is apparent, and as St. Jerome and most learned men do confess), which they would not have done, nor by their example of using it so grace and commend it to the church, if it had been unworthy the appellation and name of the word of God.”

Even an imperfect translation like the Septuagint should be considered the Word of God, and was so considered by the apostles!

“Yet before we end, we must answer a third cavil and objection of theirs against us, for altering and amending our translations **so oft**; wherein truly they deal hardly and strangely with us.”

“But the difference that appeareth between our translations, and our **often correcting** of them, is the thing that we are specially charged with; let us see therefore whether they themselves be without fault this way (if it be to be counted a fault, to correct), and whether they be fit men to throw stones at us.”

Do we get the impression here that the KJV translators will somehow be offended if, down the road, it is necessary to amend even their beautiful work? I don't think so. They were sincerely giving it their best effort, but the implication is obvious that the good men who translated in the 1600's would not be disturbed in their graves to find that someone has dared to revise their labors.

Is it a fault to correct, Mr. KJVO? Has perfection ever come by a translation? Is it not the centuries long tradition of the church that only the original writings of the apostles in their original languages are considered perfect?

Can you dare to throw stones at godly men who want even more accuracy and modernity to the Holy Writings?

Other English Bibles.

The “oft amending” mentioned by the KJV translators is verified by the plethora of English Bibles over the centuries. Consider this list of translators and translations:

Wycliffe (1388 from the Latin Vulgate)

Tyndale (1526, from Erasmus and Luther)

Coverdale (1535, from Erasmus and Luther)

Matthew’s (1537, Erasmus, the Vulgate, Luther)

Great (1539, Roman Catholic)

Geneva (1557, from *Textus Receptus*)

Bishops (1568, from *Textus Receptus*)

KJV (1611, 1769, from *Textus Receptus*)

The study of the *Textus Receptus* is a fascinating one. Some KJVO people will gladly concede that though not every person on the planet can own, much less read, a KJV Bible, as long as the text is based on the *Textus Receptus*, all is well.

Then what was wrong with the Geneva Bible, or the Bishops, based on that text? And what was wrong with the 1611 KJV? And other versions of the KJV...?

Why so many translations? Why over two centuries’ worth of revising and correcting and perfecting? Simple:

1. Bible and Language Scholars have arisen who add more information because of manuscript research and discovery.

2. The language continues to evolve. The KJV was simply not written in the same English as Wycliffe spoke!

But KJVO advocates would have us believe that all scholarship was to be cut off from the year 1611. Or is it 1769? Or any number of KJV editions, with and without the apocrypha?

We are not to question the scholarship of these 17th (or 18th) century researchers and writers? They are to have the last word, and anyone who dares come against them is anathema, and their works will be discarded and even burned in public?

Foolishness! And an anathema to such teaching!

As early as 1885 Charles Spurgeon was praising the work of the creators of the *Revised Version*, based not on the *Textus Receptus* at all, but on the *Westcott-Hort* Greek New testament!

Spurgeon: "Concerning the fact of difference between the Revised and the Authorized Versions, I would say that **no Baptist should ever fear any honest attempt to produce the correct text**, and an accurate interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. ... [W]e have nothing but the Bible; and **we would have that as pure as ever we can get it**. By the best and most honest scholarship that can be found **we desire that the common version may be purged of every blunder of transcribers, or addition of human ignorance, or human knowledge, that so the word of God may come to us as it came from his own hand.**"

Refreshing wisdom from the Prince of preachers!

In the twentieth century came

The American Standard, in 1901.

The Revised Standard, in 1952.

The New American Standard in 1971.

The New International in 1978.

The New King James in 1982.

And in this century, a major translation:

The English Standard Version in 2001.

MacArthur is working on a revision of the NASB.

And there will be more.

True, some Bibles will be openly defiant of Christian tradition, trying to make their point. The New World Translation, for example, clearly denying the Deity of Christ. Or, Bibles with gender emphases, or other cultural objectives, will appear and should be avoided by God's people.

Bibles claiming a new "inspiration", as the *Passion Translation*, must also be consigned to the back shelf of Christian book collections, if purchased at all.

But hidden amongst these perversions are the works of dedicated men of God whose only desire is to have a more and more exact replica of those original autographs, as did the KJV men. These men must be found, praised, and honored among us.

The King James ONLY Movement

Wikipedia quotes Dr. James White – a great reference, by the way, for those wanting to delve deeper into this issue – in his subdivisions of the KJV only movement of today. I abbreviate his observations on the various types of KJVO people:

- "I Like the KJV Best" – ... This group simply regards the KJV as a very good translation and prefers it over other translations because the church which it attends uses it, has always used it, or prefers its style.

This is not technically KJVO in the sense I am using it.

- "The Textual Argument" – This group believes that the KJV's Hebrew and Greek textual base is more accurate than the alternative texts used by newer translations.

These people also are not violent in their pronouncements.

- "Textus Receptus Only"/"Received Text Only" – This group holds the position that the traditional Greek texts represented in the Textus Receptus were supernaturally (or providentially) preserved and that other Greek manuscripts not used in this compilation may be flawed.

These folks can be argumentative but often they are not judgmental.

- "The Inspired KJV Group" – This faction believes that the KJV itself was divinely inspired. They view the translation to be an English preservation of the very words of God and that they are as accurate as the original Greek and Hebrew manuscripts found in its underlying texts.

Now we describe the passionate. The farther from the truth, the more emotion is used by those holding to a cult-like belief.

- "The KJV As New Revelation" – This group claims that the KJV is a "new revelation" or "advanced revelation" from God, and it should be the standard from which all other translations originate.

And watch out if you do not agree!

"Adherents to this belief may also believe that the original languages, Hebrew and Greek, can be corrected by the KJV. This view is often called "Ruckmanism" after Peter Ruckman, a staunch advocate of this view.

Too far out to be worthy of comment.

White goes on to say,

"These classifications are not mutually exclusive, nor are they a comprehensive summary describing those who prefer the KJV. Douglas Wilson, for instance, argues that the KJV (or, in his preferred terminology, the Authorized Version) is superior because of its manuscript tradition, its translational philosophy (with updates to the language being regularly necessary), and its ecclesiastical authority, having been created by the church and authorized for use in the church."

Oh, and let's not forget the Mormons, says White:

"Although not expressly 'King James Only', The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints recommends the Latter-day Saint edition of the King James Version of the Bible."

What does that tell you?

It tells me that a cult lives among us, although the adherents of that cult would not claim you and me as part of itself in any way. Which is fine.

There is a history of cults among us that goes back to Bible times. “I am of Paul,” “I am of Peter” etc. There have always been exclusive groups that claimed exclusive rights to God’s favor. The Jehovah’s Witnesses in our own day claim they are the only people of God.

These people demand allegiance to concepts that God did not ordain. They are not fanatics for truth. We understand persons who cleave vehemently to belief in the resurrection of Christ. We understand why they are suspicious of, even disassociate from, persons who do not hold such a basic doctrine. This is not cultism. What God has said ought indeed to be guarded with zealous fortitude.

But to say, and even demand, something that God *never said*, for example, that a particular translation of the English Bible, 1600 years after Jesus lived and died here, is to be slavishly adopted by every born again child of God, to the utter exclusion and perhaps even condemnation of all children of God on the planet who are in disagreement... well, that is cultism.

Truly, God never said what they are saying. Therefore, I am not bound to say or believe it either. The Word of God that came from prophet and apostle is one thing. The translation of that word into a language foreign to those prophets and apostles is something else.

We’ve been talking of English. But look at this Wikipedia statement of the KJVO case:

“King James Only movement

The King James Only movement advocates the belief that the King James Version is superior to all other English translations of the Bible. Most adherents of the movement believe that the *Textus*

Receptus is very close, if not identical, to the original autographs, thereby making it the ideal Greek source for the translation. They argue that manuscripts such as the Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus, on which most modern English translations are based, are corrupted New Testament texts.

One of them, Perry Emopoulos, was a director of the **translation of the King James Bible into Russian**. In 2010 the Russian translation of the KJV of the New Testament was released in Kyiv, Ukraine. In 2017 the first complete edition of the **Russian King James Bible** was released.”

So now, we will take an English Bible that was translated from a Greek text, and translate the English, not the original Greek, into other languages!

Way too far, folks, way too far. Let the scholars of the nations translate from the Greek manuscripts directly, without the “benefit” of KJV errors... *which do abound*, though they are minor and do not affect one’s salvation or growth.

The following article I found online expresses, for the most part, my own feelings about the modern KJVO movement. It was written by Michael Houdmann, founder of “Got Questions”, a worthwhile Bible site you might want to check out. Info about Michael is available at his site.

“Thankfully, advocates of [KJV Onlyism](#) are not “hating” on us as frequently as they used to. I don't know if this is due to the movement dying out or due to its advocates becoming more civil (highly unlikely), but I am thankful that we do not have to deal with KJV Onlyism as much as we used to. I remember the first time I was exposed to KJV Onlyism. I thought it was utterly ridiculous. I did not know anything about the *Textus Receptus*, or Erasmus, or King James VI. All I knew was the idea that English speakers are required by God to use a Bible translation from 17th century England is

ludicrous. As I am now much more familiar with the arguments, I am still absolutely convinced that KJV Onlyism is terribly misguided and horribly destructive to the Body of Christ.

“What is the true origin of KJV Onlyism? My informed speculation is that it is due to a resistance to change. In the 20th century, when English translations of the Bible other than the KJV started becoming popular, those who were used to the KJV did not want to change and relearn all the Bible verses they knew. But, they couldn't just admit, "I'm an old fuddy-duddy and don't want to change," so they began developing arguments for the KJV and against all the new translations. These arguments have been improved upon, and have gained traction, and have been passed on to new generations of English-speaking Christians.

“While they rarely admit it, [some] advocates of KJV Onlyism essentially believe that God re-inspired the Bible in AD 1611. Ultimately, they must go there because if they place their loyalty on the *Textus Receptus* (the Greek manuscript compilation used by the KJV translators), that would open the door to new translations being created. And, we can't have that, so, God must have perfectly superintended the KJV translators into creating a perfect representation of His Word in English. From their writings, it appears advocates of KJV Onlyism hate the NKJV, KJ21, and MKJV [King James updates] just as much as they hate the NIV, NASB, ESV, NLT, CSB, etc. No, for KJV Onlyism to be true, God had to have re-inspired the Bible through the KJV translators.

“Does that make any sense to you? It sure doesn't make any sense to me. Now, the more scholarly KJV Onlyites will make arguments for the superiority of the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts behind the KJV. But, if you ask them if a new translation could be created from those manuscripts, watch out. I would advise body armor and earmuffs. Others will argue against the translation methodology of the new translations. But, with the more literal modern translations, like the NASB and ESV, the translation methodology is

not dissimilar from what the KJV translators employed. Still others will attack the integrity, morals, and motivations of the modern translators. So, evidently, the group of 17th century British Anglicans behind the King James Version were sinless, had perfect theology, and had absolutely no ulterior motives.

“KJV Onlyism is a good example of Solomon's words in Ecclesiastes that there is ‘nothing new under the sun’ ([Ecclesiastes 1:9](#)). When Jerome translated the Bible into Latin, he was labeled a heretic by some for daring to ‘change’ the Bible. Centuries later, when Jerome's Latin Vulgate became nearly universally accepted in the Western church, many who dared to attempt updates were murdered. Then, when believers in Germany, England, and other countries began translating the Bible into their common languages, they were labeled heretics, and some were burned at the stake for their vulgarity. KJV Onlyism makes the exact same mistake. Instead of focusing their loyalties on the original Hebrew and Greek, they make their preferred translation of the Bible the **only** true Bible and persecute anyone with a different preference. There are movements similar to KJV Onlyism in other languages as well, although, thankfully, not with nearly the same followings.

“Don't be deceived by KJV Onlyism. God did not re-inspire the Bible in AD 1611. The King James Version is not the only Bible we can use. The new translations are not a part of a grand conspiracy to spread false doctrine. When the Bible was written, it was written in the common and current language of the people of that time. When the Bible is translated, it should be translated into the common and current language of the people. My first reaction to being exposed to KJV Onlyism was precisely correct. To force the English-speaking world to use an archaic and antiquated translation is ridiculous. The KJV Onlyites can bemoan all they want, but their concupiscence for disputation [look up those words!] is verily brutish.”

S. Michael Houdmann

How I wish I had written that article myself! Well done, Sir!

You don't think our brother is speaking the truth about the hatred of non-KJV Bibles and their readers? He may have understated the case:

This one is by Jeff Maples:

"Independent Fundamental Baptists, the denomination of which the infamous preacher of the law, Steven Anderson, is part of, are a peculiar bunch. While, on some things, it seems that the fundamentalists have some things right that we wish would be translated into the modern Evangelical Church, [as their stand on the sexual innovations of our day] on most things, particularly on salvation and sanctification, they just don't seem to grasp it.

"One of the flagship doctrines of the IFB denomination is KJV-Onlyism — or, as some people like to say, 'if the king ain't on it, the King ain't in it!' One IFB preacher named Jonathan Shelley of Stedfast Baptist church — who recently preached a sermon titled 'People I Hate' — took his hatred of modern English translations to the extreme, making a spectacle of it, saying, 'Your Bible doesn't have thees and thous? Burn it! It's a Bible BBQ.'"

Burn a Bible? Why no Christian would do that, you say. Not in enlightened Western civilization. Only Muslims or Hindus, or Nazis, or Antifa, or...

No, no. Not just in other lands. Not just in our Portland, Oregon.

This pastor Shelley has an *annual Bible burning at his church*, now called — or has he moved to another location? — "Pure Words" Baptist Church. Yes, he invites all via an internet video, to gather up all false Bibles and bring them to church on a given Sunday. He will teach the "truth" about all these Bibles, then the delighted folks will

sit and watch the Word of God go up in flames as they sit and eat s'mores around the Bible-provided campfire.

Not sure how many other churches approve of such a practice. Not sure if there are others that may even do it themselves. But my heart is ripped out in anguish over one calling himself a man of God who would dare such a contemptible act.

This is exactly what happened to the Bibles of the Middle Ages, when Rome reigned over the hearts of men. What reigns over the hearts of these Independent Fundamentalist Baptists, I wonder? Fear? Tradition? Hatred?

False teaching, for sure. May God have mercy on "Pastor" Shelley in that Day, and on all who desecrate Scripture.

The KJV movement was not always "-only" based. Great independent Baptists decried the idea in the early years. Consider John R. Rice, no lightweight among fundamentalists:

Rice believed that "the various translations contain, together, the eternal, unchangeable Word of God...A perfect translation of the Bible is humanly impossible...there are no perfect translations. God does not inspire particular translations" (*Our God-Breathed Book—The Bible*, 1969, 376).

And we cannot leave out **Jack Hyles**, "a close friend and associate of Rice for over twenty-two years. He also valued other versions of the Bible early in his ministry. In Hyles' commentary on Revelation he repeatedly corrects the King James Version and the *Textus Receptus*!

"These examples show that KJV-Onlyism was not the standard for independent Baptists at least until the 1980s." (Josh Teis)

Then came Ruckman. Peter Ruckman's extreme teaching that the King James was not only an inspired translation, but also God's newly-inspired word that could be used to correct the Greek text itself (!) was part of package of strange views that catapulted the KJVO movement into unnecessary division and separation. The Cult had arrived.

Even Hyles, mentored by Rice, flipped his position when Rice died:

Per Teis:

"In a 1984 sermon he [Hyles] declared: 'It bothers me when people say, We believe that the Bible, in the original manuscripts, is the Word of God. If that's true, we have no Bible. Did you hear what I said? We have no Bible.'

"In the same sermon, having already rejected the traditional Baptist position on Bible translations, he further rejected his mentor John R. Rice's position (and even calling Rice's faith and fundamentalism into question):

"You say, I don't like your preaching. I don't give a flip. I don't like your liberalism either. I don't like your compromise. I don't like your dirty NIV Bible. I don't like your dirty ASV Bible. I don't like your dirty New ASV Bible, or your Revised Standard Version of the Bible. I'm trying to say, anybody that's got any sense to understand this Bible, and you can understand it, you've got the Holy Spirit that lives on the inside of you, and He said, He will lead you into all truth. So maybe you liberals ought to have a bigger Bible."

"Hyles' acerbic language and KJV-Only teaching reflected Peter Ruckman's language. With Hyles as the most dynamic and influential pastor at that time in large portions of independent Baptist fundamentalism, the KJV-Only position moved from the edges of independent Baptist life to the very center."

In response to Mr. Hyles, before we move on, I must add that if the “original autographs are inspired” doctrine is not true, then all the persons from the second century until 1611 *had no Bible*.

Hyles and company would have us believe that no true translation of the Bible from the days of the apostles until the days of the KJV translators, existed. Why those poor impoverished saints of 1,500 years!

Even the reformers and the English with their Coverdale and Genevan and Bishops’ Bibles were all hopelessly lost, reading a Bible that was from the enemy of their soul and worthy to be burned.

Ruckman, Hyles, Jack Chick (and his heir), and men like the one I will answer later in this book, are the few voices that have fired up a multitude of falsenesses and caused brother to come against brother needlessly. May their tribe decrease.

And just how widespread is the KJVO phenomenon? There are nearly 7,000 congregations worldwide that are listed as “KJV Independent Fundamentalist Baptist” churches. Over 5,000 are in the United States.

But this “doctrine” is not limited to the IFB people. Members of other brands of Baptist fellowships, along with the older Pentecostal groups, Mormons, Episcopalians (because derived from the church of England/Anglican), Presbyterian churches, Bible churches, and other individuals sprinkled throughout Christendom, will proudly hold up their KJV in your face and condemn you if you cannot match their gesture.

We must repeat, that not all who love the KJV are KJV-only, to whom this treatise is addressed. But too many are...

Is the KJV the most popular Bible today? Not really. The Christian Booksellers Association tells us:

“...through Aug. 3, 2013, the top Bible translations are: (1) New International Version; (2) King James Version; (3) New King James Version; (4) English Standard Version; (5) New Living Translation; (6) Holman Christian Standard Bible; (7) New American Standard; (8) Common English Bible; (9) New International Readers Version; (10) Reina Valera 1960 [Spanish].

Popularity proves nothing either way. But clearly the KJV is slowly eroding in its appeal. There will come a day, should Jesus tarry, when the KJV will be viewed by us as the Wycliffe and Tyndale were viewed by the KJV translators, namely, a great Bible in its time, but oh so out of date in a nation that speaks a totally different English.

If we were speaking of the secular world, you could think Chaucer vs Dickens.

Answering a KJVO advocate.

Today my bimonthly “Chick” publication arrived. I’ve always enjoyed reading their arguments – though somewhat exaggerated at times – against Rome and the modern liberal trends. But when they turn their guns against the Bible, I either ignore or – as I did this time – trash them.

Now, if KJVO people can trash, literally, a copy of the Scriptures, I do hope they will forgive me for trashing their publications. Oh, I didn’t explain to you what got me so angry this time.

Their parting shot to false doctrine this edition [Nov/Dec 2020] was a classic Chick-like cartoon [Mr. Chick passed some years back] featuring a professor-like man with a devil’s tail emerging from under his sport coat.

Seated at a desk in front of him was a young man reading his Bible. Of course, it was a KJV. The “professor”, smiling, pointed to the Book and proclaimed, “Those verses ***don’t belong*** in the Bible.”

Faith is pictured as flying away on a set of bird wings, and the poor student, with a **GULP** and a look of terror, asks, “Then can I trust ***John 3:16?***”

The expected answer is “No.” If the new translations dare to follow older manuscripts, opines “Chick”, regardless of the integrity of those texts or their translators, the new translation cannot be trusted.

Of course, what is not explained is that any variation in a Biblical text is of minute importance. Even when the older manuscripts leave out a verse or two, the truth(s) found in those verses can easily be found in other places in the same Bible. No one has ever suffered from eternal loss in Hell or spiritual malnutrition from a

“new” translation.

But countless millions have scratched their heads in wonder over archaic words or phrases, some of which mean, today, the opposite of what they originally meant! (e.g., “let”).

I have listed a huge collection of such items at the end of this work.

One more anecdote, and then I really must get down to the business of this section...

I was looking recently for a way to praise the Lord in my personal prayer time more effectively. One day I began paging through the Bible to find those passages that were specifically praise utterances. There are many. I was able to locate about seven pages’ worth. I began using a page every day in my private prayer time.

It then occurred to me that I ought to share this little treasure with my church, who might profit by doing something like this. I put the seven pages in a packet and announced to the church that they could have one after the service.

One taker was a KJVO brother. He took one look at the document and realized that alas! I had not used the KJV! Rather than give it back, he let me know that, since he valued what I had done, he would get my packet transferred over to the “Authorized” Version.

The brother could not even praise God in 21st century English! Funny. But true.

No. Sad. But true.

He must have been listening to/reading men like **David Otis Fuller**, Baptist Pastor, d. 1988. I want to take you through a 1977 pamphlet of his, entitled, *Is the King James Version nearest to the original*

autographs?

It's a strange question to ask since the "original autographs" were in Greek, not English. Certainly, the English is nowhere near to the first century. We assume he is talking about the *Textus Receptus* Greek manuscript that underlies the KJV (and several other translations, by the way!)

His first point is that the KJV has lasted from 1611 to 1977 (the year of this pamphlet) and therefore is to be honored. Granted. But does he mean the versions of the KJV that included the apocrypha all the way to 1880? Probably not. Now, from 1880 to 1977 is not even one hundred years. And surely there are other translations that have a larger life span and are equally honorable, yes? Like the Genevan?

His next idea is that, if a Bible has any errors in it, "we worship a God who is either careless or impotent to keep His Word pure through the ages." The KJV, said Fuller and many others, has no such errors!

His entire philosophy would fall apart if someone could come along and show even one mistake in the KJV. Was it God's intention that His people be so bound to a translation? No.

Did not the KJV translators admit that the Bible they were correcting was the Word of God before their KJV? Was not the Septuagint, which most scholars today charge with numerous errors, sufficient for the apostle Paul and other first-century readers, to find the way of Life in Christ? Yes, to both.

Mr. Fuller then goes on to anticipate the response that will come to his statement by drawing a line between changes and errors. He says that "changes" need to be made, but these are not "errors."

Interesting. And who, Mr. Fuller, will be guided to tell us what is the line we must draw between these two classes? It is clear to me that every time I find a bona fide error, and I have found them, the KJVO person will simply call it a needed change.

Fuller is convinced that the Holy Spirit brought together the learned men who gave us the KJV. Does he therefore mean to imply that the Holy Spirit did not bring together others to complete their work, and perfect the Scriptures even more? Sounds like it:

“These men,” he says, “were the greatest scholars of their day *or any day*, so erudite and learned that the scholarship of today pales in comparison.” He gives two illustrations of the incredible intelligence and spirituality of two of these men.

He is also forced to admit that some of the men were “High Churchmen” with whom we (Baptists) might disagree on minor points of doctrine. But all believed the Bible was the verbally inspired Word of God. Again, his implication is that many in the groups of translators of other versions were not of that persuasion. I believe that is a false assumption, that demands of the writer solid evidence and documentation.

Erasmus.

The author now paints for his readers a picture of Erasmus, whose work, he argues, resulted in the Received Text, or *Textus Receptus*. He praises Erasmus to the skies, and understandably so. He was a scholar without peer in his day.

Strangely enough, Erasmus was considered a humanist, which by modern definitions eliminates all possibility of religious beliefs, the supernatural etc. The human is to be the measure of all things, the center of the universe. But Erasmus

“embraced the **humanistic** belief in an individual's capacity for self-improvement and the fundamental role of education in raising human beings above the level of brute animals. The thrust of **Erasmus'** educational programme was the promotion of *docta pietas*, learned piety, or what he termed the “philosophy of Christ”. (Wikipedia)

He was therefore a leading figure in the Renaissance, and only secondarily in the Reformation. Also from Wikipedia: “Using humanist techniques for working on texts, he prepared important new Latin and Greek editions of the New Testament, which raised questions that would be influential in the Protestant Reformation.”

His approach to Scripture was intellectual. Human. *Keep that thought in mind.*

And, he was a Catholic.

What? Oh yes. A Catholic priest.

He “was critical of the abuses within the Catholic Church and called for reform, but he nonetheless kept his distance from Luther... and John Calvin, and continued to recognise the authority of

the pope,” (Wikipedia)

He remained a Catholic all his life, while the Reformation stormed around him, and was offered various honors by Papa, partly to keep him from his reforming ways and his dangerous literary work.

Doctrinally, Erasmus rejected the idea of “faith alone” for salvation. He believed that man cooperates with God in that saving process. In other words, faith plus works.

That was Erasmus.

Fast forward. 2020. Imaginary scenario. The IFB churches, well known for their stance on the elevated place of the King James Bible, are all getting together for a Bible conference. Whom shall they choose to be the main speaker? Got it! Let’s call in a Catholic priest, one honored by the Pope, respected worldwide for his humanistic views, one who approaches the texts of Scripture as the texts of all books, from a human perspective. One who rejects salvation by faith and preaches a works salvation. But of course, one who believes in the *Textus Receptus*. That fact alone will help us blur out those other secondary issues.

Absurd? Yes. But it was such a man who was responsible for the Greek text that indirectly produced the King James Bible.

They honor Erasmus. But will they honor Catholic Scholarship today?

I mean not to take away from Erasmus. What a light he was. But like all of us, he was seriously flawed. As were all the translators, then and now. And even the apostles.

Look what God has done through such flawed servants!

Westcott and Hort

Following Fuller's work on this subject, we must now deal with a Mr. Westcott and a Mr. Hort. Yes, the famous – to some infamous – team that formed the Westcott-Hort Greek text which became a standard for the more modern translations.

Much evil and much good has been attributed to these men. Quotes about them are abundant. Lies are told. Truths are told. When all the dust settles, we have two more flawed men dealing with God's revelation in the best way they could. Wikipedia says in describing Westcott:

"The student of Christian doctrine, because he strives after exactness of phrase, because he is conscious of the inadequacy of any one human formula to exhaust the truth, will be filled with sympathy for every genuine endeavour towards the embodiment of right opinion. Partial views attract and exist in virtue of the fragment of truth—be it great or small—which they include; and it is the work of the theologian to seize this no less than to detect the first spring of error ...*He who believes that every judgement on the highest matters different from his own is simply a heresy must have a mean idea of the faith...*

"His [Westcott's] theological work assigned great importance to Divine Revelation in Holy Scripture and in the teaching of history. His own studies have largely contributed in England to their current understanding of the doctrines of the Resurrection and the Incarnation. His work in conjunction with Hort upon the Greek text of the New Testament will endure as what is thought to be one of the greatest achievements of English Biblical criticism ...The place which it almost at once took among scientific scholars in Britain and throughout Europe was a recognition of the great advance which it represented in the use and classification of ancient authorities. His commentaries rank with Lightfoot's as the best type of Biblical exegesis produced by the English Church in the 19th century."

Nevertheless, says that same source,

*“Some American fundamentalists have denounced Westcott's and Hort's Greek text of the Bible as corrupt. Most of these critics subscribe to the King James Only movement. King James Only author Gail Riplinger quotes them in her book *New Age Bible Versions*. In it, she accuses Westcott of being involved in the occult. However, Westcott himself wrote,*

*“Many years ago, I had occasion to investigate spiritualistic phenomena with some care, and I came to a clear conclusion, which I feel bound to express It appears to me that in this, as in all spiritual questions, **Holy Scripture is our supreme guide**. I observe, then, that while spiritual ministries [supernatural occurrences] are constantly recorded in the Bible, there is not the faintest encouragement to seek them. The case, indeed, is far otherwise. I cannot, therefore, but regard every voluntary approach to beings such as those who are supposed to hold communication with men through mediums as **unlawful and perilous**. I find in the fact of the Incarnation all that man (so far as I can see) requires for life and hope.’“*

Charles Spurgeon was a contemporary of Westcott and Hort. He never attacked their character or beliefs, though he did indeed differ with some of their approaches to textual criticism. Spurgeon is not our ultimate guide, but it does seem strange that such a one as he would never speak against the Christian faith of these two men.

Oh, and Spurgeon used and approved of much of the Revised Version that was the ultimate result, in England, of their work.

For the unconvinced, I offer the following quotes from these men, letting them speak for themselves about what they believed regarding the Scriptures they so masterfully assembled from the documents they used; documents, by the way, many years closer to the originals of the apostles.

These quotes were compiled by the Westcott & Hort Resource Center. http://www.westcotthort.com/quotes2_scripture.html.

“However imperfectly this design has been carried out, I cannot but hope that such a method of inquiry will convey both the truest notion of the connexion of the written Word with the living body of Christ, and the surest conviction of its divine authority.” (A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament, 7th ed.; London: MacMillan & Co., 1896, p. vii)

"a belief in the authority of the books of the New Testament so widely spread throughout the Christian body, so deeply rooted in the inmost consciousness of the Christian Church, so perfectly accordant with all the facts which we do know, can only be explained by admitting that they are genuine and Apostolic, a written Rule of Christian Faith and Life." (History of the Canon of the New Testament, Westcott, p.14)

“The same Divine Power which watched over the fragmentary recital of the acts and words of the Lord and His disciples, so that nothing should be wanting which it concerns us to know, acted (as far as we can see) in like manner in preserving for our perpetual instruction those among the writings of the Apostles which had an abiding significance.” (History of the Canon of the New Testament, Westcott, pp. 42, 43)

“Their [the Holy Scriptures’] catholicity is the constant mark of their divine origin; and the undesigned harmony which results from every possible combination of their different parts is the surest pledge of their absolute truth.” (History of the Canon of the New Testament, Westcott, p. 46)

"My design in all change has been to place in a clearer light the great laws of the interpretation of Holy Scripture, which (as I believe) alone vindicate most completely its claim to be considered as a message of God *through* men and *to* men." (Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, Westcott, preface to the second edition)

“At the same time, it is gratifying to see the evidence everywhere apparent of the author's [Westcott's] convictions as a devout Christian, and a firm believer in the authority and inspiration of the Sacred Word. A tone of hearty confidence in the Scriptures, as true and the source of truth, pervades the work.” (An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, London: MacMillan & Co., 1902, p. viii)

"We have a Bible competent to calm our doubts, and able to speak to our weakness. It then becomes not an utterance in strange tongues, but in the words of wisdom and knowledge. It is authoritative, for it is the voice of GOD; it is intelligible, for it is in the language of men." (Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, Westcott, p.8)

"The world which was at first good is now full of evil; man who was at first blessed has fallen under the curse of sin; and such contingencies seem to be involved necessarily in the idea of a finite existence. But a redemption has been wrought for both; and so too on the historical side of our religion an uncorrupted Bible lies before us if we patiently and candidly search for it, and a true personal interpretation may be gained by sincere and faithful study." (Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, Westcott, pp.43-44)

Westcott had a "firm conviction of the unerring truthfulness of the Sacred writers" (Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, Westcott, p.45)

“The same divine messengers who committed to writing the original records of revelation, embodied their teaching in a visible society. The Bible and the Church trace back their claims to the same source, and each can appeal to the other to bear witness to its permanent integrity.” (An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, London: MacMillan & Co., 1902, p. 56)

“...for as the Son of God was made man for our redemption, so the Spirit of God spoke through men for our instruction.” (An

Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, London: MacMillan & Co., 1902, p. 219)

"The subject [the Bible in the Church] is one on which it is impossible to write without misgiving. If I have said anything which can be rightly construed as derogatory from the divine majesty of Holy Scripture, I am the first to wish it unsaid. If I have said anything inaccurately (and with all care it can scarcely be otherwise), I sincerely trust that I may be corrected. If I have said anything which may lead one student of the Bible to just and faithful views of its Divine authority, I thank God humbly for this fruit of painful and anxious work." (The Bible In The Church, Westcott, Preface p.xiii)

"It is only by acknowledging the variety and distinctness of the parts of which the Bible is composed that we can gain any adequate sense of its real unity, of its inherent completeness, of its internal witness to its proper Divine authority." (The Bible In The Church, Westcott, p.11)

"the Bible contains in itself the fullest witness to its Divine authority... legibly stamped with the Divine seal as 'inspired by God' in a sense in which no other writings are." (The Bible In The Church, Westcott, p.14-15)

"The utterance of Scripture is treated as the voice of God conversing with men. Through the written word the Wisdom of God addresses us." (The Epistle to the Hebrews, p.399)

"The Bible is the record, the inspired, authoritative record, of the divine education of the world." (The Epistle to the Hebrews, p.493)

Back to Mr. Fuller: His problem with the two scholars is that they "elevated antiquity above accuracy." First he assumes the older manuscripts used are inaccurate, then he must conclude, logically, that antiquity is not to be a standard for truth.

The arguments against the *Vaticanus* and *Sinaiticus*, the Greek manuscripts used by Westcott and Hort, along with the scholarly defense of them, are subjects into which this present work cannot descend. I only suggest here that whether with scholar Erasmus or scholars Westcott and Hort, we are dealing, as we have said, with imperfect men.

The marvel, in my thinking, is that there are *no significant doctrinal problems between the KJV and all the modern scholarly translations of our day!* The differences are slight and inconsequential. Nothing about our salvation or growth in Christ is affected!

Fuller is forced to admit, though unhappily: “Practically every version of the Bible from the publication of 1881 down to the present has followed the Westcott and Hort Greek text...”

Indeed! And to our day also, 2020. What an aspersion to cast on a host of Bible translators! What charges of ignorance against learned and spiritual men! What accusations regarding motivations! All the translators of this army of revisions and translations are heaped together and thrown to the dunghill by KJVO advocates!

Ah! But though most followed W/H, there is at least one that followed Erasmus and the *Textus Receptus*. Really? Oh yes, the NEW King James Version, whose only fault was to take 17th century English finally away from 20th-century readers. Surely the KJV folks will praise this volume?

I leave my reader to do the research. You will find that just as much calumny is heaped upon this New version as all the Westcott/Hort works. Some people are stuck in their ways, as we mentioned much earlier. Remember? Flat Earth? Holocaust?

As for Westcott-Hort, the battle continues, each side calling the other a promoter of a corrupt text.

Shameful. *Only the original autographs are incorrupt.* This is what we have believed and taught for centuries. Tiny changes have crept into all the subsequent manuscripts. All of them. No two are exactly the same. But in manuscript-bashing we have lost the point. I speak now to the born-again:

By what were you saved? I ask not which Bible translation. You were saved because faith in you reached out to the Word of God you heard preached, or you read yourself. The Word told you that you were a sinner. The Word told you what to do about that sin. The Word told you of the Spirit, which you called into your life.

And the Word will perfect you in your understanding and your progress in the Christian life. Whether Erasmus is in your background or not. Whether Westcott or Hort or Luther or Calvin or Macarthur or Spurgeon – flawed servants all – helped you to Christ, here you are, growing in Him.

Many KJVO advocates are going to Hell. Same with W/H people. Many on both sides will also be in heaven. So what is this battle all about?

THE KJV TEXT EXAMINED

“Error” filled and dangerous.

In my opinion, the King James Version is, and should be, on trial. It is *today* filled with errors, if by errors we mean out of date words which blur the meaning of a text.

I will show now examples of “errors” in the KJV based on the English language of 2020. More will occur as the language continues to evolve.

The KJV translators are not at fault. They did their best, with prayer and hard work, to provide a text that accurately portrayed the very Word, and Words, of God Himself. Words that were actually spoken and read in the 1600’s.

But the KJV is not *now* a true translation. I will leave the Textual battle to the scholars. My issue is communication. Does the KJV communicate the Word of God today? The clear answer is no.

The KJV is in fact misleading unless explained. The average layman will stumble over passages and come to wrong conclusions.

“Infallibility” refers to autographs, not translations, regardless of what Mr. Ruckman opined. The KJV is inaccurate *now*, in English.

Scholars who study and report on this issue have been so worried about miniscule manuscript differences and who to call heretics, that they have forgotten modern readers who can’t get through half a page of KJV English without mentally tripping up.

Still, the readers continue to read over and over it, assuming eventually that they know what it means, or that it doesn’t really matter anyway, and form wrong doctrines because of it.

The text is wrong. It is now in *error*.

God speaks all languages and wants to speak in twenty-first century English. Let Him. As Reformers wanted the Bible in the language of the people, so must we.

I will now browse through, with you, I hope, the New Testament, to point out what I have in mind. Multiply what you shall see by five or ten to cover what we would find in the Old Testament. I believe this sampling will make my case.

We will pass over most of the old English words that have become so common to us that we know them, but never use them. Also, we will try to ignore...

- Pronouns like “ye” and “thou” and “thee” and “thy” and “thine”.
- “st” endings on verbs such as *didst*.
- “th” endings on many verbs: *crieth*
- Differences in word usage and order from today: “did reign” vs “reigned”.
- Usage of words we know but don’t use today: “lo” “behold”
- Changed usages: “an hungered” for “hungry.”
- And many others... Believe me, many others.

We will try instead to focus on words and meanings that are completely misleading and/or distracting to a clear understanding of the text.

We understand that in every reading of every Bible there are words and ideas hard to be understood. For this we have Bible dictionaries and commentaries. We are not looking for a child’s Bible. The doctrines still must be carefully taught by qualified men.

We simply decry the use of words that no longer say what God meant them to say, and therefore must be brought up to date.

We are simply answering the claims of KJVO people that their book is to be honored above all. They should claim this no longer, in the light of the English errors I have discovered, all of which have been corrected by greater scholarship and more ancient texts, and a dictionary of modern English.

In the book of Matthew alone, for example, in addition to the types of English problems I have pointed out, you have these things to deal with: Let us begin...

A Collection of Old English terms.

Matthew.

1:18. **Esoused.** Your average person may look up this word and find that today it means “married.” We speak of our marriage partners as “spouse.” But Joseph and Mary were not married. They were “betrothed”, “pledged”, “engaged.” Those modern translations do no harm to the Greek, but make the English more understandable. Though it is true that betrothal was as secure as marriage in those days, the actual marriage, the union of bodies, had not taken place. KJV doesn’t tell us that. All versions call Mary his wife in verse 24. But the marriage was still only an intended one as we read there was no physical relationship between the two, until after Jesus was born. Hence the modern translations add the idea of “as wife”, implying not quite married yet.

7:14. **Strait and narrow.** This phrase has become “straight and narrow” today. But both Greek words mean narrow. The English “straight” is not intended. Though the older English “strait” does indeed mean narrow, the modern translators ended the confusion here by using “small” or “constricted” to translate one of the Greek words.

8:6. **Sick of the palsy.** Did you know that palsy means “paralyzed”? Most people don’t. The new Bibles make it clear.

9:20. **Issue of blood.** This is simply “bleeding” or “hemorrhaging.” Who would know?

10:10. **Scrip.** A bag filled with necessary goods. I would have guessed “something to write with and on.” See the problem?

13:15. **Waxed gross.** Really, what is a modern reader to do when he comes to this phrase? How in the world would they figure out intuitively that “waxed gross” really means “grown dull”? They could read another translation... which is my point.

13:20. **Anon.** Immediately.

14:8. **A charger.** John the Baptist's head was to be placed on a charger. Can you imagine how this is viewed? I was able to find no English translation, old or new, that uses this word. It simply means a dish, or a platter.

15:5. **by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me.** Jesus here speaks of gifts given to God, and how they sometimes slight our family responsibilities. Modern English simply says here, "whatever help you might otherwise have received from me," I have given to God. This verse was always a puzzler to me. In today's English it makes perfect sense.

15:17. **cast out into the draught.** This is the destination of all physical food, says Jesus. Mouth to belly to... what in the world is the "draught"? Is it pronounced "draft" or "drou" or what? Dictionary doesn't help. This word is not in there. I know He's talking about elimination of food from the body, but this word... Turns out that this old English word is simply a latrine. A sewer. Today, a toilet.

15:26. **Meet.** Adjective meaning "suitable", not our verb meaning get together.

16:11. **Leaven.** Yeast.

17:2. **Raiment.** Clothing.

17:12. They did to Jesus **whatsoever they listed.** So, the enemies knew what they were going to do to Jesus, and made a list, and carried it out? No. This old English word means "determined."

17:17. **Suffer.** Allow, permit, endure. Not, "experience pain."

18:34. **Wroth.** Angry.

19:6. **Twain.** Two.

19:28. **The regeneration** is the time when the Kingdom is set up. But I thought we were “regenerated” now. Paul uses the same Greek word to describe what happens to us now. The word means a re-birth of something. The translators should have seen that Paul’s idea of rebirth of a person is not the same as the rebirth or “renewal” of the planet, as some modern translations have rendered it. Once more, accurate but misleading.

20:2. **A penny** a day? The Greek says denarius, as in the New King. That was a day’s wage. So that the text would be forever accurate, the more modern translators called it that, a day’s wage. How misleading is the idea of a “penny” in our day. Ellicott’s commentary says, “Its real equivalent is to be found in its purchasing power, and, as the average price of the unskilled labour of the tiller of the soil, it may fairly be reckoned as equal to about half-a-crown of our [British] present currency. It was, that is, in itself, an adequate and just payment.” A penny, in whatever modern standard of measurement, is a worthless thing, and no worker would spend a whole day for it. Again, misleading.

20:11. **Goodman of the house.** The landowner. The man in charge.

21:34. **Husbandmen.** Vinedressers.

22:4. **Fatlings.** Fatted calves etc.

25:4. **Vessels** are not boats. They are flasks or simply jars.

26:25. **Thou hast said.** We would say, “You said it!” In other words, out of your own mouth has come the truth. “Thou hast said” does not communicate today!

26:65. **Rent** means “tore.” Rent his clothes gives a totally different picture to a modern reader.

27:9. **Jeremy** is Jeremiah.

You get the point? And I skipped over many others. These are anywhere from “bumps in the road” to seriously misleading expressions. Why have to deal with them? Above all, how can someone demand that modern readers must deal with them or be accused of not even reading the Word of God?!

We’ll move on to John, as Mark and Luke have similar issues to Matthew.

John.

2:6. **Firkin** does not translate the Greek. The word means simply “measure.” Modern translations place modern measures. Some just use “measure” as in the Greek.

4:32. **Meat** is food, not the product of an animal.

5:7. **Impotent** has a totally different meaning. Modern translations just say “sick” or “invalid.”

5:39. **Search the Scriptures... [SUPER PROBLEM]**. The Greek 2nd person can mean a command or a statement of fact. Grammatically, the first choice makes no real sense. This verse is used by erstwhile believers today in urging others to read their Bibles. But follow the text... Read your Bible because you “think” you have eternal life in them? Nonsense. This command is not a command after all, but a simple statement of the hypocrisy of the Pharisees before Him. You look all over your Bible because you think you’ll find life inside the scrolls. But the scrolls tell all about Me and you skip over those parts. Here I am in front of you, and you won’t come to me. Reading your Bible is pointless! Modern translations fixed this glaring error.

6:63. **Quicken** means to “give life to,” not make faster.

7:1. **Jewry** is Judea.

7:15. To **know letters** means to be learned, educated.

10:3. **Porter**. We immediately think of train attendants, if we know the word at all. The Greek word has to do with a watchman at the gate or door.

11:18. Modern translators have done the courtesy of changing

fifteen furlongs to “two miles.” Furlong is a correct translation, but it means nothing to us...

11:44. Everyone knows what a **napkin** is, right? But the modern way to talk about something wrapped around a dead man’s face is simply a “cloth.” Strange image when “napkin” is not corrected.

11:56. **What think ye, that He will not come to the feast?** The KJV leaves open the interpretation of the Jews’ question. All modern translations seem to agree that they paused after the first part, “What do you think?” Then added “Will He not come to the feast.” The KJV leaves open the possibility that they were asking people to make a judgment as to why He wasn’t coming.

12:6. Judas **had the bag**. Context helps us figure out what this old saying means. He held the money bag. He was the treasurer. Why not just say that?

12:24. **A corn of wheat** is a kernel or grain of wheat.

13:4. To **gird** is to clothe.

13:10. **Every whit** means completely.

13:23. The uncomfortable **leaning on Jesus’ bosom** simply means “next to Jesus”. Bosom is correct, the chest area, but has complications associated with it today.

13:26. A **sop** is merely a morsel, in this case a piece of bread.

14:2. **Mansions**. The Greek seems to indicate more than a “room” or “resting place” as some would have it. But mansions in the modern senses is not called for either. “Residences” comes closest to the idea. Jesus is preparing a place to stay for each of us, letting us know that the Kingdom, coming to earth, is quite literal and

physical.

16:13. The simple preposition **of** here is misleading and has been corrected in later versions. The Spirit will not speak **of** Himself implies the Spirit will not talk about Himself. But the meaning in context and in Greek is that the Spirit will not talk “from” or “out of” Himself. Instead He will be receiving from the Father and Son. Important idea covered up in KJV.

18:30. A **malefactor** is a criminal.

19:2. **Platted** means wove or twisted together.

19:14. **Sixth hour** in modern thinking, is noon.

19:29. **Vinegar** is sour wine.

Let's go a little more quickly through the rest of the New Testament:

Acts.

2:3. **Cloven tongues** are divided or separated tongues. As the KJV translates this word elsewhere.

2:47. **Such as should be saved** is better translated “those who were being saved.”

3:17. **I wot** means “I know.”

3:21. **Restitution** is better translated “restoration.”

4:17. **Straitly threaten** is an addition to the text. “Straitly” translates no Greek word in the Greek text. Only “threaten” should appear as in all modern translations.

5:5. **Gave up the ghost** simply means “died.”

6:11. **Suborn(ed)**. Instigated, persuaded, enticed.

7:6. **Seed**. Offspring, descendants.

7:24. **Smote**. Struck (down), killed.

7:38. **Lively oracles**. Living words.

7:53. **Disposition**. Arrangement, ordination, placement.

7:59. **And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God...** *A confusing order.* The KJV makes it look like the people were calling on Jesus as they killed Stephen! Modern versions clear this up. It was Stephen who prayed as he died.

7:60. **Fell asleep**. Died.

9:5. **It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.** Speaking of the action of the plowman against his ox, pricking it with a pointed rod.

This was a common proverb of the day, and hence it is thought to have been added to later manuscripts, as says Ellicott in his commentary: "There is a decisive preponderance of MS. authority against the appearance of these words here, and the conclusion of nearly all critics is that they have been inserted in the later MSS." I could not even find it in the *Textus Receptus* manuscript that I am using for this work.

9:33. **Kept his bed.** Was confined to his bed.

9:38. **Nigh.** Near.

10:29. **Gainsaying.** Denying. Objecting.

11:28. **Dearth.** Famine.

12:4. **Easter?** No other present Bible anywhere, to my knowledge, inserts the word "Easter" for the Greek *pascha*, Passover. This is a severe error, defended to the teeth by KJV people, just as Rome must defend all its errors or admit to mistaken conclusions. Barnes says this of the gaffe: "Intending after Easter - There never was a more absurd or unhappy translation than this. The original is simply after the Passover (μετὰ τὸ πάσχα meta to pascha.) The word 'Easter' now denotes the festival observed by many Christian churches in honor of the resurrection of the Saviour. But the original has no reference to that, nor is there the slightest evidence that any such festival was observed at the time when this book was written. The translation is not only unhappy, as it does not convey at all the meaning of the original, but because it may contribute to foster an opinion that such a festival was observed in the time of the apostles. The word 'Easter' is of Saxon origin, and is supposed to be derived from 'Eostre,' the goddess of Love, or the Venus of the North, in honor of whom a festival was celebrated by our pagan ancestors in the month of April (Webster). Since this festival

coincided with the Passover of the Jews, and with the feast observed by Christians in honor of the resurrection of Christ, the name came to be used to denote the latter. In the old Anglo-Saxon service-books the term 'Easter' is used frequently to translate the word 'Passover.' In the translation by Wycliffe, the word 'paske,' that is, 'Passover,' is used. But Tyndale and Coverdale used the word 'Easter,' and hence, it has very improperly crept into our King James Version. Nearly forty (40!) times in the KJV, *pascha* is translated 'Passover.' Only one time, here, is it 'Easter', indicating the church's substituting of this celebration with the death/resurrection of Jesus. The translators may have meant well, but the obvious mistranslation is unacceptable for a Bible student or scholar."

13:18. **Their manners** means their conduct.

13:42. **Besought (beseech)** simply means ask, or even beg.

15:17. **Residue of men.** The rest of men, the remainder, all the other men.

15:39. **Departed asunder.** Departed from one another. "Asunder" is not in the Greek, and is not necessary to the meaning of modern English.

16:13. **Prayer was wont to be made.** Prayer was accustomed to being there. It was a place of prayer. We hardly use "wont" any longer.

16:13. **Resorted thither.** Gathered there.

16:33. **Stripes.** Wounds from scourging.

17:4. **Consorted with.** Joined.

17:22. **Too superstitious.** Very religious. Literally, “very reverent to demons.” No modern translation uses “superstitious.”

17:27. **Haply.** Perhaps.

17:34. **Clave.** Joined. Became followers.

19:9. **Divers.** Diverse. Various people.

19:13. **Vagabond Jews, exorcists.** Itinerant Jewish exorcists.

19:19. **Curious arts.** Magic.

19:28. **Diana.** The Roman form for the Greek goddess Artemis. Since *Artemis* is in the Greek text, *Artemis* is used in all modern translations. One person comments: “Let’s face it, the [KJV] translators chose to alter what was said in order to provide what they considered a more “helpful” version [Diana is the name most English speaking persons use for this goddess.] They committed treason against the inspired text time and again.” Ever heard such a charge leveled against the KJV? Think it over. Altering the Greek text is pretty serious... Imagine though. The scene is Ephesus. Asia. Rome rules the world but Greek rules the culture. Do you really think the Ephesians were praising Diana (the Roman goddess) in the streets of their city?

19:38. **Implead.** Press charges.

19:40. **Concourse.** Disorderly gathering. Commotion.

21:11. **Girdle.** Per Strong and modern translations, the word should be “belt.” Using the KJV word will only produce suppressed giggles.

21:15. **Took up our carriages.** Packed our bags. Got ready to go.

21:39. **Mean city.** Unimportant or insignificant city.

22:25. **Thongs.** Not beach shoes. Leather straps.

23:18. **Prayed me.** Asked me. “Prayed” is now used only in reference to God, but the old English word simply means “asked.”

23:24. **Beasts.** Animals.

23:23. **Epistle.** Letter.

25:26. **After examination had.** As a result of the investigation. After he has been examined.

25:27. **Withal.** At the same time. Also. Together.

27:10. **Lading.** Cargo.

27:12. **Commodious.** Suitable. Favorable.

27:17. **Strake sail.** Actually, they lowered the anchor, and let the wind pull them along much more slowly. Here KJV assumes a “sail”, using a faulty understanding of the context.

27:37. **Threescore.** Sixty.

28:4. **Barbarians.** Natives (of the island).

28:8. **Bloody flux.** Dysentery (severe diarrhea involving blood).

28:13. **Fetches a compass.** Sailed around.

And in the letters...

Romans.

1:13. **Let.** Hindered.

1:25. **Creature.** Created being.

1:28. **Convenient.** Becoming. Fit. Proper.

1:29. **Debate.** Wrangling. Quarrel. Argument.

3:2. **Oracles.** Words, utterances.

4:20. **Staggered.** Wavered. Doubted.

5:7. **Peradventure.** Perhaps, maybe.

6:11. **Reckon.** Used colloquially today, it means to estimate or suppose.

7:5. **The motions of sin.** Our sinful passions.

7:8. **Concupiscence.** Covetousness. Covetous desire.

7:14. **Sold under sin.** Sold as a slave to sin.

11:14. **Emulation.** Envy, jealousy.

12:9. **Without dissimulation.** Without hypocrisy. Genuine. Sincere.

13:6. **Tribute** is taxes.

13:13. **Chambering and wantonness.** Sexual immorality and licentiousness.

14:1. **Doubtful disputations.** Arguments over opinions.

15:27. **Carnal things.** Often “carnal” can be understood the way we do today, that is, something of our evil fleshly nature. But here it simply means “material” things.

1 Corinthians.

3:9. **Husbandry.** Place for cultivation of plants. A field.

4:6. **In a figure.** Figuratively, in an applied sense.

4:13. **Offscouring.** Scum, rubbish.

6:9. **Effeminate.** Possibly, as in modern translations, a boy prostitute, kept by an adult male for sexual purposes.

6:9. **Abusers of themselves with mankind.** These would be the homosexuals in general, covering the victimizers of the young boys he has just mentioned.

7:3. **Render due benevolence.** Kindness yes, but in the context, do your duty. "Benevolence" alone does not communicate what Paul is saying.

7:4. **Power.** Better, authority.

7:5. **Defraud.** Deprive.

7:11. **Put away.** Divorce.

7:36. **Pass the flower of her age.** Aged beyond the prime of life. Getting older...

9:17. **Dispensation.** A trust. An assignment. A stewardship.

9:27. **Keep under.** Discipline.

9:27. **Castaway.** Unapproved. Rejected.

10:11. **Ensamples.** Examples.

10:16. **Communion.** Participation.

10:25. **The shambles.** The meat market.

11:27. **Unworthily.** Irreverently. In an unworthy manner. Speaking of the action, not the man himself. We are all “unworthy.”

12:23. **Uncomely.** Unattractive.

12:31. **Covet.** Desire in a positive sense.

13:1. **Charity.** This word has a totally different meaning in our day. To be preferred is what is in all modern translations: Love.

15:33. **Evil communications corrupt good manners.** Sounds like “Saying bad things is not acting politely.” Not at all. This is old English for “Bad company corrupts good morals.” Couldn’t be more different!

16:2. **Lay be him in store.** Set aside.

2 Corinthians.

1:12. **Conversation.** Not about talking, but about living: “way of life”.

1:18. **Yea and nay.** Yes and no.

2:7. **Contrariwise.** On the contrary.

5:5. **Wrought.** Made.

5:19. **To wit.** Namely.

6:2. **Succour(ed).** Help(ed).

6:12. **Straiten(ed).** Constrain(ed). Restrain(ed). Restrict(ed).

6:12. **Bowels.** Perfectly understood in the 17th century as a seat of emotion and compassion in the human spirit. Today, an eyebrow

raiser. The Greek is the word for “intestines”. Today’s English versions have rightly changed the word to “affection(s)”.

6:13. **Recompence.** Reward.

8:1. **We do you to wit.** We make known to you.

12:20. **Swellings.** Conceit, arrogance.

12:20. **Tumults.** Disorder.

12:21. **Lasciviousness.** Debauchery. Licentiousness. Sensuality.

Galatians.

2:4. **Privily.** Secretly.

2:13. **Dissembled.** Acted hypocritically.

4:24. **Gendereth to bondage.** Has children destined to be slaves.

5:12. **I would they were even cut off...** Greek and modernized: I wish they would castrate themselves...

Ephesians.

1:19. **To us-ward.** Toward us.

2:15. **Twain.** Two.

3:7. **Effectual working of His power.** “Effectual” added by translators. Greek and all English translations simply say, “working of His power.” “Effectual” simply means “effective”.

3:13. **Faint not.** Not grow weary or tired.

4:13. **Perfect.** Not “sinless”, as we use the word, but full-grown or complete.

4:14. **The sleight of men.** Trickery or craftiness of men.

5:4. **Jesting.** Vulgar indecent humor. We use the word to mean frivolous humor, which would be included under the “foolish talking” also mentioned in this verse.

5:5. **Whoremonger.** Fornicator.

5:15. **Circumspectly.** Carefully.

6:6. **Eyeservice.** Serving when being watched.

6:14. **Loins girt.** Waist fastened with a belt.

6:15. **Preparation.** Readiness.

Philippians.

1:23. **I am in a strait betwixt two.** I am torn between the two.

1:27. **Becometh.** Is worthy of.

2:6. **Robbery.** Something to be grasped or retained.

3:2. **Concision.** False circumcision, merely mutilators of the flesh.

Colossians.

2:15. **Shew.** Show.

2:20. **Rudiments.** Basic principles.

1 Thessalonians.

4:4. **Possess his vessel.** Control his body.

4:6. **Defraud.** Cheat, take advantage of.

4:11. **Study.** Try. Endeavor. (Has nothing to do with book-learning!)

5:14. **Feeble-minded.** Little-spirited/fainthearted. Not mentally challenged.

2 Thessalonians.

2:3. **That day shall not come.** These words are in no Greek text. They are in italics rightly in the KJV. Other more modern translations have removed the italics and assumed this is what Paul meant to say. But he never said this. The thought is, "Let no man deceive you, for there must come a falling away first etc."

2:7. **He who now letteth.** Someone is hindering Satan's appearing.

3:11. **Busybodies.** Meddlers.

1 Timothy.

1:5. **End.** Purpose, intent.

1:5. **Jangling.** Random talk, babble.

1:15. **Acceptation.** Acceptance.

2:15. **Sobriety.** Soundness of mind, self-control. Not related to drunkenness.

4:14. **Presbytery.** The elders.

5:4. **Requite.** Repay.

5:11. **Wax wanton.** Feel sensual (natural) desires.

6:4. **Railings.** Slanders. Defamations. Blasphemies.

6:15. **Potentate.** Sovereign. Ruler. Mighty One.

6:18. **Communicate.** Share. Give.

6:20. **Science.** Knowledge.

2 Timothy.

2:5. **Masteries.** Athlete's crown.

2:15. **Rightly dividing.** "Straightly cutting," handling accurately.

2:17. **Canker.** "gnaw". Ulcer. Gangrene.

3:3. **Trucebreakers.** Actually, truceless altogether, that is, implacable (unable to be appeased).

3:6. **Silly women.** Not just lightheaded and funny, but foolish women, weak-willed enough to be taken in by evil men.

Titus.

1:7. **Filthy lucre.** Not physically dirty, but shameful. Lucre is not money, originally, but gain or profit. God does not call cash filthy, but the gaining of it in a shameful way certainly is.

1:9. **Gainsayer.** Those who come against. Deniers.

1:12. **Slow bellies.** Lazy gluttons.

2:10. **Purloining.** Stealing, pilfering.

3:2. **No brawlers.** Simply, peaceful. No arguments, quarrels.

No new issues in Philemon.

Hebrews.

1:1. **Sundry times.** The Greek here reads, "in many parts." Variousy. Piecemeal.

2:10. **Captain.** Chief leader. Not a particular military post.

3:17. **Carcases.** Bodies.

5:2. **Compassed.** Subject to, liable to.

7:5. **Out of the loins of Abraham.** Externally, the loins would be the hip. Internally, the procreative power (per Strong). That is, descendants of Abraham.

7:18. **Disannulling.** Setting aside. Abrogation.

7:22. **Surety.** Guarantee.

9:10. **Reformation.** In this context, not merely reform is in mind, but “setting things right,” correcting.

10:29. **Despite.** Not our preposition, but a noun, here meaning “insult.”

10:33. **Gazingstock.** Public spectacle.

11:5. **Translated.** Nothing to do with languages. Meaning is “transfer.” In this context, taken up to Heaven.

11:29. **Assaying.** Trying, attempting.

12:8. **Bastards.** Illegitimate.

13:2. **Entertain.** Show hospitality.

James.

1:4. **Wanting.** Lacking or needing, not desiring, as we use it.

1:5. **Upbraid.** Defame, revile, find fault.

1:21. **Superfluity of naughtiness.** Surplus or superabundance, of badness or depravity. Excess evil.

1:24. **Straightway.** Immediately.

2:3. **Gay clothing.** An obvious reason for leaving 17th century English behind. Gay simply meant magnificent in appearance.

3:4. **Helm.** Rudder.

3:4. **List(eth).** Wants, desires (verb).

3:17. **Easy to be intreated.** Willing to yield.

4:13. **Go to now.** “Come now” is the expression we use. Or, “Look here.”

5:5. **Wanton.** Given to enjoyment of (sensual) pleasure.

1 Peter.

1:6. **Manifold.** Many, various.

1:22. **Unfeigned.** Sincere.

2:4. **Disallowed.** Disapproved, repudiated.

2:6. **Confounded.** Should be disappointed or put to shame, depending on the text from which James is quoting. Confounded carries the idea of “confusion” which is not central to the meaning here.

2:18. **Froward.** Not “forward”, but warped or perverse.

3:3. **Plaiting the hair.** Braiding the hair.

3:6. **Afraid with any amazement.** Let fear intimidate or alarm.

3:11. **Eschew.** Turn away from.

3:11. **Enssue.** Pursue.

3:21. **Answer.** Quite the opposite: an inquiry.

4:3. **Suffice.** Be enough.

2 Peter.

2:2. **Pernicious ways.** Literally, (eternal) ruin or loss. Translated “damnable” elsewhere.

2:18. **Clean escaped.** Barely escaped.

1 John.

2:2. **Propitiation.** Atoning sacrifice.

2:20. **Unction.** Anointing.

No new issues in 2 & 3 John.

Jude.

1:7. **Strange flesh.** Unnatural lust.

1:8. **Dignities.** High-ranking authorities.

1:16. **Having men’s persons in admiration because of advantage.**
Flattering people to gain an advantage over them.

And in the Revelation of John...

Revelation.

1:13. **Paps.** Breast, chest.

2:27. **Shivers.** Pieces.

3:16. **Spue.** Spit.

4:1. **Hither.** Here.

4:3. **Sardine stone.** Carnelian.

6:6. **Penny.** Denarius. (A day's wage, as in some translations.)

6:13. **Untimely.** Out of season. Unripe.

10:6. **Time no more.** Opportunity, delay, no longer. (i.e., Judgment has come.)

15:7. **Vials.** (Broad shallow) cups.

17:4. **Decked.** Adorned.

18:7. **Deliciously.** Luxuriously.

18:13. **Odours.** Aromas.

19:13. **Vesture.** Garment.

19:17. **Fowls.** Birds.

19:18. **Bond.** Slave.

21:16. **Furlongs.** Stadia (600 ft.)

And that list is not exhaustive!

Now, I have listed only *one time for each error*. Some of these words are used multiple times. I have skipped all repetitions of the same archaic usages.

And, I have skimmed. There are more issues, I am sure. I have browsed quickly through the New Testament and may have missed some.

Also, I deliberately gave a pass to many “borderline” cases.

Further, I have skipped words and phrases that truly are archaic, but which we have come to understand by frequent reading of the King James.

In other words, ***this list is far from complete***. There are constant hindrances to the modern-day reader as he tries to comprehend God’s message to him. Why would anyone want to put this roadblock in front of a new believer?

Add all of this to the other archaic usages I mentioned at the beginning of the list. A person would have to have a dictionary and a guide to grammar at his side every time he goes to his personal devotions.

Not necessary. Modern translators have done the work for us.

Try this if you don’t believe me:

Allow two Christians to participate in a friendly contest. One has never read the KJV, though he/she is a serious student of the Bible. The other was raised in the KJV and knows only that. Say these words or phrases to them, one at a time, to see if they make perfect sense to them... One will be befuddled. The other will sigh

contentedly.

We like the old songs, the old words, of the great hymns. The old English doesn't bother us. That's because of some precious memories, not about being doctrinally correct. This is how we were raised. We in fact resent changes to the old songwriters. Let them rest, we say. Don't dig them up and make them talk our way!

True enough. But no such sentimental feeling must exist for the Bible reader, and the KJV translators would have been the first to say so, as they were involved in radical changes of their own.

They would shout, Let God's Word be released!

The Holy Spirit is the "old songwriter" we are talking about here, but far from being disturbed about His old lyrics being disturbed, He is delighted when God's people are guided into a better understanding of the Word in a language appropriate to them.

Accuracy and ability to communicate in any generation are always the goals.

But, let me remind you, death at the stake was the norm for anyone who dared to place the Bible in the current language of the people! God's goals and men's are usually at odds with each other, yes?

Final thoughts.

I ask you, whether you be saint or scholar or both,

- What doctrine is missing in a “modern” Bible?
- What part of the plan of salvation is missing in a “modern” Bible?
- What would keep me from being a perfected complete Christians in a “modern” Bible?
- What verses would cause me to sin in a “modern” Bible?
- Which Bible, “modern” or KJV, is more likely to be read by a person new to the Christian faith?

Aren't the answers to these questions self-evident?

Hold on to your KJV Bible. It was a great book in its day. A classic it will be for many years. Use it as a reference! Like Strong's concordance, or Smith's Bible Dictionary, or your favorite commentaries.

But when you want a clear message from God Himself, in your language, consider a Bible that was written for that very purpose. Be very careful, for the heretic versions are out there too, as we discussed, but with some serious help from a trained pastor and your close friends in the Lord, you should be able to find the translation that will tell you the whole truth in your own language. You'll be happier at devotions time the sooner you make the switch! God's not into the old words just because they are old words. He hasn't changed His message, but we have changed our language. Be wise. Move on with God.

Bob Faulkner, 11-24-20