

Why the KJV Only?

By Bud Alavezos

Paul tells us in Heb 4:12,

"For the word of God [is] quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword..."

In the Revelation we are told,

Rev. 19:11-16 "And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him *was* called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes *were* as a flame of fire, and on his head *were* many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he *was* clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called **The Word of God**. And the armies *which were* in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on *his* vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.

John, speaking of this **Word** states,

1 Jn. 1:5 "This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is **no darkness at all.**"

Speaking of the last days Amos states,

Amos 8:11 "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord GOD, that I will send a famine in the land, not a **famine** of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the **words of the LORD:**"

How does this occur? Malachi gives some insight.

Mal. 1:6, 7 "...O priests, that despise my name. And ye say, Wherein have we despised thy name?

Ye offer **polluted bread** upon mine altar;..."

Jesus is not only the **Word**, He is the **Bread** of Life

The above texts are extremely important for those of us living in the time of the "great and solemn events" soon to take place on planet earth.

There is a great work to be done, not only in our own lives, but in the world at large. This can only be accomplished through the looking-glass of **God's pure unadulterated Word**. Satan knows this, and long ago set out to destroy confidence in God's Word by producing many counterfeits, all of which follow the corrupted New Testament produced by two heretics, BF Westcott and FJA Hort. More about them later. Some of Satan's greatest tools to cast doubt on God's Word are the footnotes in many of these new versions, stating suggestions such as: "The oldest and most accurate manuscripts state"; "other ancient mss. add"; "other ancient mss. omit". Some footnotes would even have you believe that the book of Mark ends at Mark 16:8, not verse 20, thus eliminating the resurrection and ascension of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Other footnotes would eliminate John 7:53-8:11.

How and where did this all begin?

Notice the origin of the two completely different texts claiming to be God's Word today:

I would like to draw your attention to a few important facts in this very revealing diagram posted above:

- First and foremost is the fact that the **KJV comes from the line of the apostles**, continuing through the devout Christians who, because of persecution had to flee into the wilderness and was the product of those very godly men (the KJV translators) who also had to flee from Roman oppression at the close of the Reformation. In their desire to produce an accurate translation, the KJV scholars rejected the corrupted translations of the Gnostic scholars.
- In contrast, **all of the new versions** are descendants of not only the Gnostics (Greek philosophy combined with Christianity) who believed that Jesus was not the Son of God, nor did they believe in any of the miracles which He performed; but, and more importantly, these versions all rely on the Greek New Testament that Westcott and Hort produced, using mainly the Vaticanus (found in the Vatican library); Sinaiticus (discovered in a monastery at the base of Mt. Sinai) and Alexandrinus and a few others. Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament was the basis of the Revised Version that was produced in

1881 at the close of the Oxford Movement. (1833-1883 Jesuits entered the universities of England as Anglican scholars in a covert effort to convert England back to Romanism).

- There are 5210 different fragments of Greek manuscripts which support the Majority/KJV/ Received Text and only 43 Greek manuscripts aside from the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus supporting the minority text. The new versions all follow the invented version produced by Westcott and Hort leaning towards Romanism.
- Vaticanus and Sinaiticus disagree with themselves over 3000 times in just the gospels alone.
- John W. Burgon declares Vaticanus and Sinaiticus "two of the least trustworthy documents in existence".
- Over 306 Greek words were added. 2987 Greek words were omitted. (most originate in the Westcott and Hort text)

These facts should be startling, as well as conclusive to all searching for eternal truth. However let's address a few other issues.

Does anyone really believe that God, who gave us His Word by His Holy Spirit, "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake *as they were* moved by the Holy Ghost" 2 Peter 1:21, and thereafter allow it to become lost for over 1500 years (during the 1260 years of papal persecution, followed by the Reformation) and suddenly permit it to be discovered in the Vatican library (the oppressors of His true church) or in a wastebasket at Saint Catherine's monastery (where also can be found a seven foot high pile of skulls of deceased monastics), when He has promised to preserve His Word forever?

"The words of the LORD *are* pure words: *as* silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." Ps 12:6, 7

It is reasonable to accept that God, not only divinely inspired the production of His Word, but that He divinely preserved that Word throughout history as well.

David W. Cloud in his book "*Myths about the Modern Bible Versions*" exposes the fallacy of many of the myths concerning the different Bible versions.

They are:

- **Erasmus [compiler of the Greek New Testament/Textus Receptus; the basis of the KJV] was merely a humanist.**

He did agree that Erasmus was an enigma. Though Erasmus never officially left Rome and did criticize Martin Luther as well as some of the Reformation leaders, on the other hand he publicly rebuked a number of the Roman blasphemies. In addition, it was his desire to place God's Word in the hands of the common people. Again on page 53 of Cloud's book *Myths about the Modern Bible Versions*, he quotes Erasmus: "These sacred words give you the very image of Christ speaking, healing, dying, rising again, and make Him so present, that were He before your very eyes you would not more truly see Him." These are not the words of a humanist as we understand the term.

- **The Reformation editors lacked sufficient manuscript evidence.**

This is a perversion of the actual history. On Page 74 in bold letters, Cloud states: "The Vaticanus Readings Were Known and Rejected by the Protestant Translators". He was speaking of Erasmus, Robert Stephanus, Theodore Beza, and other 16th century editors who had access to the Vaticanus (Westcott and Hort's preferred manuscript). On page 77, Cloud quotes Ellicott: "The manuscripts which Erasmus used differ, for the most part, only in small and insignificant details, from the great bulk of the cursive MSS. ... That pedigree stretches back to remote antiquity. THE FIRST ANCESTOR OF THE RECEIVED TEXT WAS AT LEAST CONTEMPORARY WITH THE OLDEST MSS, IF NOT OLDER THAN ANY ONE OF THEM." (Ellicott, *The Revisers and the Greek Text of the N.T. by two members of the N.T. Company*, pp. 11-12)

This is also a denial of the Christians in non-Greek speaking languages. David B. Loughran, quoting David Fuller, on p. 9 of his book *Bible Versions—Which is the REAL Word of God*, makes an important point that the modern Revisionists overlook: "It was at Antioch, capital of Syria, that the believers were first called Christians. And as time rolled on, the Syrian-speaking Christians could be numbered by the thousands. It is generally admitted that the Bible was translated from the original language into Syrian about 150 AD. This version is known as the **Peshitto** (the correct or simple). This Bible even today generally follows the Received Text."

Loughran also places the **Old Latin Vulgate** (common--not Jerome's Vulgate) at AD 157 and the **Waldensian** at 120 A.D. . These precede the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus by two centuries. However on page 10 he lists:

The Gallic Bible (Southern France, AD 177); **The Gothic Bible** (AD 330-350); **The Old Syriac** (AD 400); **The Armenian Bible** (AD 400, 1244 copies still exist); **The Palestinian Syriac** (AD 450); **The French Bible** of Oliveton (AD 1535); **The Czech Bible** (AD 1602); **The Italian Bible** of Diodati (AD 1606); and **the Greek Orthodox Bible** (from the time of the apostles and is still in use today). All of these versions are in agreement with the Majority/Received Text.

David Cloud on page 77, *Myths about the Modern Bible Versions*, also pointed out that Erasmus used the early church Fathers as independent witnesses and “proves the correctness of the Latin text [not Jerome’s Vulgate] through a reference to the Fathers whose wordings agree with the Latin text and not with the Greek. Often, however, there is agreement between the Greek manuscripts and the commentaries of the Fathers” (W. Schwarz, *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation*, p. 145).

- **The difference between texts and versions are insignificant and affect no doctrine.**

Again, David Cloud points out on p. 83 that there are almost 10,000 [9,970] word differences between the Received Greek Text underlying the KJV and the Greek (compiled by Wescott and Hort) upon which all the new versions are derived. This is the equivalent of the final two books (Jude and Revelation) in God’s Word.

1. G. Wilkinson states on p. 175 of his book “Our Authorized Bible Vindicated”:

“The Revisers apparently felt no constraint on this point [curse for changing God’s Word], for they made 36,000 changes in the English of the King James Version, and very nearly 6,000 [Cloud had more recent data] in the Greek Text.”

After stating that the Bible is the foundation of Christianity, David Cloud quotes Ps 11:3: “If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?” This is exactly what has been accomplished and most Christians are completely unaware of this fact.

On page 88 *Myths about the Modern Bible Versions*, David Cloud states: “There are 17 verses omitted outright in the New International Version—Mt. 17:21; 18:11; 23:14; Mk. 7:16; 9:44; 9:46; 11:26; 15:28; 17:36; 23:17; Jn. 5:4; Acts 8:37; 15:34; 24:7; 28:29; Rom 16:24; and 1 Jn. 5:7.

Further, the NIV separates Mark 16:9-20 from the rest of the chapter with a note that says, "The two most reliable manuscripts do not have Mk. 16:9-20," thus discounting the authority of this vital passage in the minds of the readers and effectively removing another 10 verses. John 7:53—8:11 is also separated from the rest of the text with this footnote: "the earliest and most reliable manuscripts do not have Jn. 7:53—8:11." Hence another 24 verses are effectively removed from the Bible. The NIV questions four other verses with footnotes—Matthew 12:47; 21:44; Luke 22:43; 22:44. THIS IS A TOTAL OF 55 ENTIRE VERSES WHICH ARE REMOVED ENTIRELY OR SERIOUSLY QUESTIONED. IN ADDITION THERE ARE 147 OTHER VERSES WITH SIGNIFICANT PORTIONS MISSING."

The above paragraph is a study in and of itself. Are we so Laodicean that we find this totally acceptable?

How can anyone seriously believe that the true intention of these modern Bible translators is not to change God's Word. The question is, "How can such a travesty on God's Word not effect doctrine? The following example will illustrate how substituting man's word for God's does affect doctrine. The KJV uses a specific term "fornication" which can only mean an unlawful relationship and all that it entails. Whereas new versions have replaced it with a very general subjective word "immoral". This can, and does open a floodgate of evils. There are those who feel it perfectly moral to be in a live-in relationship with "the love of their life" whether male or female. Others believe that it is perfectly moral to kill your unborn child. Some of those very same people adamantly believe that it is immoral to cut down trees or drive gasoline-operated automobiles, etc..

The above is addressing only one word and could be explored in much more detail. This should highlight the issue, however it is important to remember that the Revisers have made over 36,000 changes in the English, as quoted by B. G. Wilkinson above.

On pages 92-99 *Myths about the Modern Versions*, David Cloud lists 51 doctrines that have been affected by these modern versions. Included are:

Fasting; the virgin birth; withdrawing from those who deny doctrine (would that include Bibles that deny doctrine?); healing of Peter's mother-in-law;

calling sinners "to repentance"; "take up the cross" is omitted; "trust in riches" omitted, therefore it is hard to enter heaven; and "they worshipped Him" is removed; Christ "by himself" purged our sins is removed; confess our "sins" one to another rather than faults; Jesus came "in the (sarx/sinful) flesh" is eliminated; three person Godhead is omitted. [not listed however, purgatory "under punishment for the day of judgment" is taught in 2 Pet 2:9 and Mark 7:18, 19 teach that all foods are clean].

This list is incomplete, however it should be obvious to a sincere believer that multiple doctrines **have been altered** to accommodate a world loving church. This is the work of Satan.

- **Inspiration was infallible but preservation is fallible.**

This entire concept is in opposition to God's Word. God, who cannot lie, has promised in Psalms 12:6, 7 to preserve His Word. (note: even this verse has been changed in many modern bibles from "Thou hast promised to preserve them" (the words) to "Thou hast promised to preserve **us** from this generation forever.)" Following are other texts supporting divine preservation: Ps. 33:11; 100:5; 111:7-8; 117:2; 119:89; 119:152; 119:160; Isaiah 48:8; 59:21; Matt. 4:4; 5:18; 24:35

- **Biblical scholarship does not support the Received Text.**

This is simply a subjective comment that cannot be supported by fact. True, almost all textual critics today reject the Received Text, leaving a total void in most, if not all, Bible colleges. As humanists control the media, Textual Critics do the same in regards to textual scholarship that does not accept the validity of the Egyptian [Gnostic] manuscripts. On page 133 of *Myths About the Modern Versions*, Cloud writes, "Even the graduates of many Bible-believing schools are practically unaware of the existence of a scholarly "other side" of the issue. Because of evangelical "media blackout" on this subject, they are aware only of views closely paralleling Wescott-Hort's turn of the century theories: "Oldest and better manuscripts are to be preferred in the passages of question" (meaning Sinaiticus and Vaticanus...)."

On the same page he quotes Pickering directing us to John Burgon's support for the Received Text: "Of the considerable volume of unpublished materials that Dean Burgon left when he died, of special note is his index of New Testament citations by the Church Fathers of antiquity. It consists of sixteen thick manuscript volumes, to be found in the British Museum, and contains

86,489 quotations. It may be said that Burgon's scholarship in this facet of the total field has never been equaled (Pickering, *ibid.*, p 217)."

On page 132 Cloud, quoting Pickering, states that Burgon's work is "either ignored or misrepresented in every handbook (that the author has seen) published in English in this century that touches on the method of New Testament textual criticism" (Wilber N. Pickering, *"Contribution of John William Burgon to New Testament Criticism," True or False?*, p. 218)."

Finally Cloud lists these Biblical scholars who do support the Received Text: John Burgon; Robert Louis Dabney; Philip Mauro; the Trinitarian Bible Society (Terrance Harvey Brown); Dr. Edward Hills; Benjamin Franklin Dearmore; William Aberhart; The Fundamentalist Evangelistic Association with Marion H. Reynolds, Sr.; Dr. David Otis Fuller; Dr. Donald Waite; Dr. James Quorllo; Dr. Bruce Lackey; Jay P. Green, Sr.; Donald R. White; Dr. William Pickering and Dr. Thomas Strouse. Cloud then concludes with the thought that thousands of common men [God's faithful church in the wilderness] have come to the same conclusion through their own careful, prayerful private studies.

The author would also refer to the manuscripts, both Greek and non-Greek posted on page 4 of this article, supporting the Received Text.

- **Modern texts and versions are based upon Bible believing scholarship.**

On pages 172-258, *Myths about the Modern Versions*, Cloud quotes hundreds of statements by many of the often quoted Biblical critics themselves proving their modernistic skepticism regarding the infallibility/inerrancy of God's Word. On page 173 he states: "It is not difficult to prove that modern textual criticism is a product of end-time apostasy, and that is what I intend to do in this section of the book."

Two paragraphs later he states: "God has commanded me to "mark and avoid" false teachers (Romans 16:17). How is it possible that He would use false teachers to lead the teachers in the foundational issue of Bible texts and versions? I do not think it is possible. **For one, I would reject the modern versions if only for the fact that they are founded upon the work of men who are apostate from the faith.**"

"Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs? so *can* no fountain both yield salt water and fresh." James 3:12

On page 174, Cloud begins by contrasting the era in which the KJV was compiled (1611) to that of the modern bibles (1881-1984 and still coming). He correctly points out that 1611 was an “**age of belief**” (other authors identify all the KJV translators as extremely godly and learned scholars. Whereas the modern translations were compiled in an **age of unbelief**, including: Romanism (Westcott and Hort’s Revised Version was the end product of the Oxford Movement); Liberalism; Modernism; Socialism; Higher Criticism (according to Cloud, modern textual criticism is a form of rationalism and infidelity); and Darwinism (disbelief in the creator God).

The 1881 Revised Version Committee was ecumenical, howbeit skewed toward the liberal bent, led by Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. Cloud gives a brief glimpse of the makeup of the committee on pages 201-202, *Myths about the Modern Bible Versions*, citing how **George Vance Smith** (a Unitarian who did not accept Jesus’s divinity): “After he participated in a communion service with the other revisers, a letter was published in *The Times* (July 11, 1870) in which he proudly declared that though he had received communion, he had refused to recite the Creed since he would not compromise his ‘principles’ as one who denied the deity of Jesus Christ.”

Cloud then quotes A. G. Hobbs in the forward of the Centennial Edition of Burgon’s *Revision Revised*:

“[Smith’s participation in the communion service] led to a public protest signed by ‘some thousands of the clergy.’ The Upper House passed a Resolution that ‘no person who denies the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ ought to be invited to join either company to which was committed the Revision of the Authorized Version of Holy Scripture: and it is further the judgment of this House that any person now on either Company should cease to act therewith.’ This Resolution was also passed by the Lower House. And still they could not get this non-believer off the committee.”

Then Cloud states: “Dean Stanley, Westcott, Hort, and Bishop Thirlwall all refused to serve if Smith were dismissed.”

Can the character of the makeup of the Revision Committee be more obvious?

1. 202, “Unitarian Smith later gloried in the fact that many changes made in the English Revision reflected his own views on Jesus Christ. He

understood that the critical text and the modern versions support doctrinal heresy better than the Received Text.”

The above speaks volumes as to the composition of the committee that produced the bible that is the template for all the modern versions today.

The following is just a sample of quotes of some of the more well-known textual critics listed with the page numbers from David W. Cloud’s book.

205-207--**Philip Schaff** (the president of the American Committee/American Standard Bible):

#1 “[Schaff’s description of his visit to the Franciscan monastery of St. Francis in 1841] “in the chapel is the picture of the Madonna, who often spoke with St. Francis...” (spiritualism)

#2 “[Schaff’s description of his audience with pope Gregory XV1 in 1841] “passing through a door we found ourselves in the beautiful but plain sitting room of **His Holiness**, who was clad in white. ...He is certainly a good man. He gave me his blessing and I went out quite satisfied from his presence.”

207-208-- Both **Dr. Ezra Abbot** (foremost textual critic in America) and **Joseph Henry Thayer** were Unitarians and held views similar to George Vance Smith above.

210--**William Foxwell Albright** (served on OT committee of the Revised Standard Version):

“One cannot of course place John on the same level as the synoptic Gospels. ...”

210--**Walter Russell Bowie** (served on RSV New Testament committee/contributed to *The Interpreter’s Bible*):

#1—“The story of Abraham comes down from ancient times; and how much of it is fact and how much of it is LEGEND, no one can positively tell.”

#2—“The man of whom these words were written [Jacob] belongs to a time so long ago that it is uncertain whether its records are history or legend.”

#3—“The imprecatory psalms and other utterances like them reflect a God who is dead and ought to be dead—and never was alive except in unredeemed imagination.”

215—**Fleming James** (server on the RSV New Testament committee):

#1--"The narrative of calling down fire from heaven on the soldiers sent to arrest him is PLAINLY LEGENDARY."

#2—"What **REALLY** happened at the Red Sea WE CAN NO LONGER KNOW."

215-216—**James Moffatt**—(served on the RSV New Testament committee and produced two of his own versions):

#1—"The writers of the New Testament made mistakes in interpreting some of the Old Testament prophecies."

221-224--**C. H. Dodd**—(*New English Bible* director):

#1—"The Bible itself does not make any claim to infallible authority for all its parts..." (Dodd, *Library of Constructive Theology*, p. 15):

#2—"The old dogmatic view of the Bible therefore is not only open to attack from the standpoint of science and historical criticism, but if taken seriously it becomes a danger to religion and public morals." (Ibid P. 13)

#3—"Moses has left us no writings, and we know little of him with certainty." (Ibid P. 27)

#4—"[Moses] WAS A MAGICIAN, a medicine man, whose magical wand wrought wonders of deliverance and destruction. ...To separate history from LEGEND in the stories of his career is impossible and not very profitable." (Ibid p. 45)

#5—"The famous 'whale' or sea monster, is no zoological specimen. The ancient monster of chaos the dragon of darkness, was a familiar figure in MYTHOLOGIES of the ancient world."

#6—"Creation, The Fall of Man the Deluge and the building of Babel are symbolic MYTHS" (Dodd, *The Bible Today*, p112)

228-232—"Bruce Manning Metzger—(author of United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament/ head of the continuing RSV translation committee/ also chairman for the Reader's Digest Condensed Bible). He wrote the introduction to each book. Listed are just a few of his comments:

#1—"Nearly all modern scholars agree that, like the other books of the Pentateuch, [Genesis] is a composite of several sources, embodying traditions that go back in some cases to Moses."

#2—Exodus: "As with Genesis, several strands of literary tradition, some very ancient, some as late as the sixth century B. C., were combined in the makeup of the books."

#3—Deuteronomy: "It's compilation is generally assigned to the seventh century B. C., though it rests upon much older tradition, some of it from Moses' time."

#4—Daniel: "Most scholars hold that the book was compiled during the persecutions (168-165 B. C.) of the Jewish people by Antiochus Epiphanes."

235-239—**Robert Bratcher** (primary translator of *Today's English Version*):

#1—At a question and answer session on October 13, 1970 at Spartanburg, South Carolina, Bratcher was asked: "Is Jesus Christ God, or the same as God?" His answer: 'Jesus is not the same personality as God.'

#2—Another Question at same event: 'Why did you leave out the blood of Jesus Christ in Romans 5:9 and 14 and other places?' His answer: 'It is a matter of translation'

#3—Another question: 'Do you know Jesus Christ as your personal Saviour?' Dr. Bratcher would not answer.

#4—Another question: 'Is the human heart by nature Man-centered or God-centered?' His answer: 'Let us stick with questions about translations.'
(Donald T. Clarke, *Bible Version Manual*, pp. 98-99)

#5—"The New Testament scriptures were written to specific situations, at specific times, to specific groups or individuals and in response to some felt need. The New Testament writers probably never intended their work to be the gospel record of the future—so there is not a sterile order to the scriptures." (Robert Bratcher, *The Baptist Courier*, Feb. 22, 1968).

251-253—**John Bertram Phillips** (Anglican priest who wrote *Letters to Young Churches* and *The New Testament in Modern English*):

#1—"I felt at liberty to disentangle some of Paul's complex arguments, or to paraphrase where direct translation would not make sense." (Phillips, *Ring of truth*, p. 75).

#2—"Those who were sent to arrest him 'fell back to the ground'.

PREVIOUS PIOUS GENERATIONS ATTRIBUTE THIS TO SOME SUPERNATURAL POWER. I DON'T BELIEVE THIS FOR A MOMENT." (Ibid p. 88)

#3—"A 'MIRACLE' is by definition, something to be wondered at, and in the past, when laws then unknown were being used, it was commonly assumed that divine intervention was the cause of the wonder. People thought that God was somehow 'interfering' with the working of Nature. I do not regard such an action as 'impossible' (who are we to say what is 'possible' and what is 'impossible'), but I THINK THAT IT IS UNLIKELY" (Ibid p. 93)

254—**Herman Von Soden** (Influential textual scholar):

#1—"To this body of scripture the Christians then assigned determining authority, supporting its claims by a peculiar THEORY as to the origin of these writings—THE SO-CALLED doctrine of inspiration" (Von Soden, *Books of the New Testament* p. 5)

255—**Henry Clay Vedder** (authored *Our New Testament: How did We Get It*):

#1—"Most theologians and preachers declare very positively that there is a place called Heaven, where the 'saved' will forever be happy in the presence of God. There may be such a place; nobody can prove that there is not. But neither can the preachers prove that there is such a place. THERE IS NO ADEQUATE GROUND FOR THEIR CONFIDENT ASSERTIONS. When they tell us that there is a heaven, and all about its conditions and life, as if they had actually been there and had brought back plans drawn to scale and complete specifications, they are just 'pushing wind.' They know no more about it than you or I know, and that is just nothing at all." (Vedder, cited by *The Baptist Believer* April 1920)

Editor's Note: Posted above is just a sampling of the deceptiveness of the critics of the Received Text/ KJV, suggesting that those textual critics and modern Bible translators are Bible believing scholars. Cloud concludes this section with the thought that these new versions are accepted by Unitarians; modernists; neo-orthodox theologians; Roman Catholic; Jehovah Witnesses; and the World Council of Churches. This alone should be a 'red flag' to all who believe that God divinely inspired His Word and has promised to preserve it.

- **Evangelical scholarship can be trusted.**

First let's examine the original source of all of these modern Bibles. As presented in the chart on p. 2, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were the products of the Gnostic translators (who did not believe Jesus to be God, nor any of His

miracles). Many biblical scholars believe that these manuscripts were two of the 50 manuscripts Constantine commissioned Eusebius to compile in his effort to bring together both paganism and Christianity. (Can we see history repeating today?) Those manuscripts were filled with errors and as a result, were rejected by God's true followers who recognized their unfaithfulness to His Word. They remained forgotten until resurrected by Westcott and Hort in order to produce their own Greek Text. Vaticanus was discovered in the Vatican library in 1481, after being hidden for over 1100 years. Sinaiticus was discovered in 1844 where it lay in obscurity for over 1500 years. Less Garrett, on p. 149 of his book *Which Bible Can We Trust*, states that Sinaiticus has had "no less than ten different attempts of revision and correction". One paragraph later he quotes Scrivener: "the Codex is covered with alterations"—i.e., alterations of obviously correctional character—"brought in by at least ten different revisers,"

Contrast the above quote with the Masoretic Hebrew scholars:

"In making copies of the original manuscripts, the Jewish scribes exercised the greatest possible care. When they wrote the name of God in any form they were to reverently wipe their pen, and wash their whole body before writing "**Jehovah**" lest that holy name should be tainted even in writing. The new copy was examined and carefully checked with the original almost immediately, and it is said that **if only one incorrect letter was discovered** the whole copy was rejected. ..." Jasper J. Ray, *God Wrote Only One Bible*, p. 94

Les Garrett makes two valid arguments on p. 153, *Which Bible Can We Trust*, about the obsession to uphold these two manuscripts by modern translators which we should very carefully consider:

"1. That the most important and deplorable of the departures of the New Greek Text from the Received Text *have been made with the support of less than one percent of all the available witnesses; or in other words, the readings discarded by the Revisers have the support of over 99 percent of the surviving Greek Texts* (Besides [excluding] Versions and Fathers).

2. That the two Mss. which had the controlling influence in most of these departures [Vaticanus/Sinaiticus] are so corrupt upon their face as to justify the conclusion that they owe their survival solely to their bad reputation."

Westcott and Hort—1881—Revised Version—Can it be trusted?

Brooke Foss Wescott and Fenton John Hort were two Anglican scholars at the tail end of the Oxford Movement (inclined toward Romanism) commissioned by the church of England to update the KJV but not change the Greek Text. That was not their intent. Though the committee did include a few defenders of the Received Text, it was heavily weighted with heretics who favored the Alexandrian Text.

Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D., in his *Gipp's Understandable History of the Bible*, describes a clear picture of the thoughts and character of both these leaders of the Revision committee. Neither Westcott nor Hort were Bible believers. Both hated the Authorized Version and its underlying Greek.

Hort: Didn't believe in creation; loved the Tractarians (a force in the Oxford Movement); did not believe the Bible infallible; commenting on Darwin's book stated, "I am inclined to think it unanswerable" and "But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin, Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with... My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable."; admired philosophy more than Scripture; did not believe in a devil; accepted the idea of purgatory; rejected the Atonement; accepted baptismal regeneration; hated democracy; inclined toward Communism; admits occultism (both he and Westcott attended the Ghostly Guild weekly); hated America; hated D.L. Moody.

Westcott: Was even more anti-biblical than Hort, according to Gipp. Westcott also didn't believe in creation; thought heaven was just a state of mind, not a literal place; admired John Henry Newman (leader of the Oxford Movement); was a devout socialist; accepted icons; believed in purgatory; called the Oxford Movement the Oxford Revival; worshipped Mary; advocated communal living; supported a Peace Movement, including disarmament; though he did not believe Jesus performed miracles, had no doubt that a Roman Catholic priest could.

Samuel Gipp, on p. 263, 264, *Gipp's Understandable History of the Bible* gives a synopsis of what these two men accomplished:

"Through their subtle guidance Westcott and Hort had led the Revision committee in a direction one hundred and eighty degrees from what they had been instructed by the Convocation. These master deceivers had slowly, methodically introduced **their own personal Greek text** into the

committee and replaced the Textus Receptus with it. Their hypnotic ability had shielded them from discovery and in the end the Church of England had nothing more than a "Protestant translation, corrected by the Vulgate." It can be safely said that if Wescott and Hort were not two Jesuit priests acting on secret orders from the Vatican, then two Jesuit priests acting under such orders could not have done a better job of overthrowing the authority of God's true Bible and establishing the pro-Roman Catholic text of Alexandria, Egypt!"

Nestle-Aland

The first edition of the Nestle-Aland Greek Text was printed in 1898 and combined the readings of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and Weymouth. It became the text of the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament. Therefore Nestle-Aland is the offspring of Westcott and Hort's Revised Version. From the time that these 19th century textual critics have sought to bring us "God's true Word", Nestle-Aland is in its 28th edition with many readings reverting to the Received Text.

Consider this thought: Textual Criticism has been searching for God's true Word for over 138 years to date and it continues to elude them.

Less Garrett, on p.65 *Which Bible Can We Trust*, gives this absurd hypothetical:

"When a student turns to any one of these modern Greek texts he cannot possibly say that this is the Word of God. The men producing the modern text do not even claim to have the correct text. One Bible critic said when asked, Do we have an accurate translation of the Bible?" "No not yet, but we are working on it." ...God help us!"

In contrast, though textual critics suggest that the KJV has undergone over 30,000 (some even suggest 75,000) changes, G.A. Riplinger on page 600 of her book *In Awe of Thy Word* posts the type of changes to the KJV.

1. 1612: Typographical (from *Gothic* to **Roman** type).
2. 1629 & 1638: Correction of typographical errors
3. 1762 & 1769: Standardization of spelling

David Cloud *Myths of the Modern Bible Versions* points out another recent influence on modern Evangelical scholarship that helps us understand its untrustworthiness. By the mid 1950's there was a clear break between

Fundamentalists, who desired to remain true to biblical principles and Evangelicals leaning towards Ecumenicalism. The term "New Evangelicalism" no longer defines fundamental theology. There was a call for REPUDIATION OF SEPARATISM which was both initiated as well as accepted with open arms by the Roman church. On page 261 Cloud quotes Dr. George Dollar: "It has become a favorite pastime of new-evangelical writers, who know so little of historic Fundamentalism, to call it offensive names, as if to bury it by opprobrium. THE REAL DANGER IS NOT A STRONG FUNDAMENTALISM BUT A SOFT EFFEMINATE CHRISTIANITY—EXOTIC BUT COWARDLY." (Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, 1973, p. 208)

On the next page Cloud states: "God says, "Walk ye in the old paths," but the New Evangelical reassesses the old paths. God says, "Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set," but the New Evangelical has removed them one by one. God says, "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness," but the New Evangelical reasons that such fellowship is necessary. God says, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," but the New Evangelical thinks he can reform the already leavened lump. God says, "Evil communications corrupt good manners," but the New Evangelical thinks he can uplift evil communications. God says, "I will resist the proud and give grace to the humble," but the New Evangelical thinks the way to reach the world is by meeting them on their own proud territory, matching them scholarly degree with degree."

Cloud thereafter states that New Evangelicalism has paved the way for acceptance of the modern versions and that this apostasy is clearly identified by its cozy relationship with Roman Catholicism as well as questioning the infallibility of God's Word.

He identifies Evangelicalism today on page 275:

"Evangelicalism's apostasy is not only seen in its relationship with Rome and its downgrade of biblical inspiration, it is also seen in its repudiation of biblical holiness. The old Fundamentalism was staunchly and boldly opposed to worldliness. The New Evangelical crowd has rejected and redefined this. The result has been incredible to behold. R-rated and PG-13 movies are given positive reviews in Evangelical publications. Evangelical music groups look and sound exactly like the world. Many college campuses have the look and feel of secular colleges. The students wear the same clothes (or lack of

clothes) as the world; they drink the same liquor; they dance to the same music; they celebrate the same worldly events; they care about the same worldly concerns. Richard Quebedeaux documented this more than 20 years ago in his book, *The Worldly Evangelicals*."

He further states that New Evangelical apostasy can be seen in its acceptance of heretics; listing a number of examples: pp. 278, 279

- **S. Lewis**—believed in prayers for the dead; purgatory; confession of sins to Catholic priest; believed theistic evolution; rejected the Bible as the infallible Word of God; used profanity; told bawdy stories; often got drunk with his students; did not believe in the total depravity of man; and despised biblical separation.
- **Bruce Metzger**—questions the authorship, traditional date and supernatural inspiration of books by Moses, Daniel and Peter.
- **Robert Schuller**—(Was a mega-church leader whose mentor was Norman Vincent Peale, a spiritualist) Sin is merely the lack of self-esteem; Born again means change from a negative to positive self-image.

The final point he addresses suggesting the superiority of modern versions:

- **Dynamic Equivalency is a faithful method of Bible Translation.**

This flies in the face of the KJV, which is a word-for-word transliteration of what God spoke through His prophets and Bible authors.

Dynamic equivalency is the process of substituting words of a certain author with words or phrases which another author considers more understandable or relevant to an entirely different culture. From a human perspective, this appears reasonable; even advantageous. However when applying this concept to God's Word there are numerous pitfalls. Following are a few that must be considered:

#1—The Bible is God's Word and cannot be treated as any other book.

#2—How can one possibly, after examining the heresies of today's textual critics and Bible translators (as previously presented), believe that these heretics are capable of faithfully translating those original thoughts?

#3—God is not the author of confusion (1 Cor 14:33). How many of us have been in a congregation in which a passage of scripture is being read from either the pulpit, Sabbath School teacher, or even another person in class or

Bible study, that doesn't even remotely resemble (in some cases reading directly opposite) what we are reading in the KJV/Received Text? Far too often the thoughts that God is trying to portray are entirely obliterated. (Example: "Do two men walk together unless they have made an appointment?" Amos 3:3 NASB)

#4—In agreement with the above issue, using Strong's Concordance to research a subject is greatly hindered, if not made impossible, due to the multiple inconsistent word changes.

#5—On p. 315 Cloud makes two very important points. First, Dynamic Equivalency ignores God's warning about adding to or taking away from God's Word. Rev. 22:18-19, pronounces a curse on those who do. Secondly, it substitutes God's thoughts with man's thoughts. More importantly, those attempting to do so are heretics. (See note 2 above)

A Compilation of corrupted Texts

A sampling of corrupt Texts in the modern Bible versions: Job 19:25-26 —"in my flesh" substituted with "**without my flesh**";

Isa. 7:14—"virgin" changed to "**maiden**"—thus denying the virgin birth;

Matt. 5:44 "bless them that curse you" omitted;

Matt. 9:13—sinners "to repentance" omitted;

Matt. 18:2-3 —being "converted" no longer a requirement, just "**turn**";

Matt 24:3—"sign of thy coming and, of the end of the world?" replaced with "**end of the age**"— (second coming obscured);

Mk. 7:19—"Jesus declared **all foods are clean**";

Mark 2:17—sinners "to repentance" omitted;

Lk. 2:33—"Joseph and His mother" replaced with "**His father and mother**;

Lk. 4:8—"Get thee behind me Satan" omitted;

Lk 11:2-4 —"which art in heaven" omitted from the Lord's Prayer — (it can be prayed by pagans);

23:44-45 — "sun was darkened"—substituted with "**eclipse of the sun**"— (which was impossible during the Passover mid-month full moon);

Jn. 2:11—"miracles" become only "**signs**";

Jn. 5:39—the command to “search the scriptures” is omitted;

Jn. 7:8—“...I go not up yet unto this feast...”, new versions **omit “yet”** thereby essentially making Christ a liar;

Acts 3:19—“when the times of refreshing” changed to “**in order that times of refreshing may come**”;

Acts 13:42—Gentiles wanted to hear next Sabbath omitted;

Acts 16:7—deny 3rd person of Godhead;

1Cor. 5:7—Christ sacrificed, “for us” omitted;

1 Cor. 11:24—“this is my body which is broken for you” to “**this is my body which is for you**” supports the Eucharist;

1 Cor 15:47—Lord from heaven omitted;

Eph. 3:9—Jesus as creator is omitted;

1 Cor. 1:14—Through His blood eliminated;

Col. 1:15, 16—“worlds created by Him” changed to “**in him**”;

1 Tim 3:16—“God was manifest in the flesh” eliminated;

2 Tim. 3:16—“All scripture is given by inspiration of God” is replaced with “**every scripture inspired of God is also profitable**”

Heb. 1:3—“...he had by himself purged our sins” “**by himself**” omitted;

Heb. 7:21—“after the order of Melchisedec” omitted;

James 5:16—“confess your faults” changed to “**confess your sins**”;

1 Pet. 4:1—Christ suffered, “**for us**” omitted;

1 Pet. 4:6—supports praying for the dead;

2 Pet. 2:9—new versions support purgatory;

Rev. 1:7—“wail” about lost condition changed to “**mourn**” allowing for repentance at the Second Coming;

Rev 13:18—“666” changed to “**616**” in margin of some modern versions;

Rev 22:14—“do His commandments” changed to “**wash their robes**”.

Authors Note: Because Nestle-Aland is in its 28th edition, there is no consistency in any of the versions. As the Nestle-Aland Greek text has reverted, in some cases back to the Received Text, some of the modern versions do as well. However the overall bent is in favor of the Gnostic Alexandrian Texts.

CONCLUSION: Sadly, ALL of these modern versions are corruptions of God's true, pure, unadulterated Word, which He not only gave us through Divine providence (His Holy Spirit), but just as importantly, He has promised throughout His Word, to preserve the same. This He has done through that same Spirit, as well as His true church that has been scattered throughout the world because of persecution by Satan and his agencies.

At the conclusion of the 1260 years of papal persecution, Satan chose another attack. Compromise! This was accomplished on multiple fronts. First the Roman power introduced the Oxford Movement under the leadership of Cardinal Newman, in an effort to bring the Church of England back to Rome.

About the same time Evolution/Darwinism was introduced with the intent to bring about doubt on both God and His Word. Even prior to this time the beginnings of textual criticism began to raise its ugly head. The goal of textual criticism is to cause doubt on the Received Text/KJV and bring back a Bible that is more agreeable to the human heart.

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries modernism began its push towards humanism. The result was the mid-20th century in which fundamental Christianity took a back seat to Evangelical ecumenicalism, resulting in a church that can no longer differentiate between God's Word, as given to His Apostles (thereafter sent throughout the world), and Satan's counterfeits that are the product of unbelieving scholars (Gnostics/Arians/textual critics today).

Finally, Les Garrett on p. 236 of *Which Bible Can We Trust* quotes Dr. Frank Logsdon at a conference on modern versions, paraphrases and translations. He states that modern translations:

1. cause widespread confusion.
2. discourage memorization—Who is going to memorize when each one has a different translation?

3. Discourage the use of the concordance, because there would need to be a different one for each translation.
4. Provide opportunity for perverting the truth by giving different slants of meaning of verses. A marvelous opportunity for the devil to slip in and pervert the Word.
5. Make teaching of the Bible difficult.—How could a mathematics Professor or teacher teach a certain particular problem in a class if the class has about six or eight textbooks?
6. Incur an enormous waste of the Lord's money. One in just two years brought in \$22,000,000. That could have sent a lot of missionaries.

Floyd Nolan Jones, on p. 62 *Which Version is the Bible?* provides this quote from Dr. Frank Logsdon (the Co-founder of the New American Standard Version-NASV):

"I must under God renounce every attachment to the New American Standard Version. I'm afraid I'm in trouble with the Lord...I wrote the format; I helped interview some of the translators; I sat with the translator; I wrote the preface; When questions began to reach me, at first I was quite offended...I used to laugh with others...However, in attempting to answer, I began to sense that something was not right about the New American Standard Version. I can no longer ignore these criticisms I am hearing and I can't refute them...The deletions are absolutely frightening...there are so many...I wrote my very dear friend, Mr. Lockman, explaining that I was forced to renounce all attachment to the NASV. The product is grievous to my heart...I don't want anything to do with it. [T]he finest leaders that we have today...haven't gone into it [the new version's use of a corrupted Greek text], just as I hadn't gone into it...that's how easily one can be deceived. [Y]ou can say the Authorized Version [KJV] is absolutely correct. How correct? 100% correct!...I believe the Spirit of God led the translators of the Authorized Version. If you must stand against everyone else, stand..."

Final Point: NKJV omits "Lord" 66 times; omits "God" 51 times; omits "heaven" 50 times; omits "repent" 44 times; omits "Blood" 23 times; omits "hell" 22 times; omits "Jehovah" entirely; omits "new testament" entirely; omits "damnation" entirely; omits "devils" entirely; ignored the KJV Greek Textus Receptus over 1200 times; replaced the KJV Hebrew (ben Chayyim) with the corrupt Stuttgart edition (ben Asher) Old Testament.

"WHY?"