

## Answering the Typical Anti-King James Bible Site

During the past several years since I have been involved in the Bible version discussion I have come into contact with many Bible believers and with many whom I refer to as “Bible Agnostics”.

The Bible believers are those who believe God has been faithful and true to His promises to preserve His words in “the book of the LORD” (Isaiah 34:16) and that He did not lie nor exaggerate when the Lord Jesus Christ said “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.” (Matthew 24:35) We believe all the evidence points to the Authorized King James Holy Bible as being this Book.

The Bible agnostic, on the other hand, without exception does not know of ANY Bible in ANY language that either IS now or ever was the complete, inspired and 100% historically true words of God and he couldn't tell you where to get a copy of these inspired words if his life depended on it. They are “part time” Bible believers. They believe parts of their contradictory multiple bible versions and other parts they doubt. **They believe some of all, but all of none.**

On several occasions over the years I have run into people who post this particular anti-King James Bible site with its alleged “proofs” that the King James Bible is riddled with errors and cannot be the infallible words of God. The people who put up this site don't believe that ANY Bible is the infallible words of God and they even tell us this in their list of Questions (See #23) when they say “we maintain that all translations have errors and none were translated under the inspired supervision of God.”

In this article I would like to take a closer look at the arguments these Bible agnostic, "part time" believers present and refute them. It is my desire and prayer that God will be pleased to open the spiritual eyes of more of His people to the truth of where His inspired and preserved words are found today and have been for more than 400 years now - in the English text of the King James Holy Bible.

Here is the site that many have referred to when trying to discredit the King James Bible. We will take a look at their arguments and the mind set typically found among the “Bible agnostics” today.

<http://www.bible.ca/b-kjv-only.htm>

They start off their very long article with their Introductory notes.

They state “This outline is designed to refute the view that the King James Version (KJV) is the only modern Bible on earth that is 100% accurate and error free.

1. “Foremost, we feel that the KJV is an EXCELLENT translation, but not the ONLY excellent translation.”

Notice the typical “praise” and then “bash” method these Bible critics use. On the one hand they tell us the KJV is an “EXCELLENT” translation (Caps are theirs!), and then they proceed to tell us the King James Bible is riddled with what they call “Indisputable, universally recognized errors in the KJV” and “spurious passages”.

This "first praise" and "then bash" methodology is typified by the liberal RSV and the new, ever changing, gender bender “Catholic” NIVs in the comments made by their editors. For example:

In the Preface of the RSV we find them first saying: “The King James Version has with good reason been termed “the noblest monument of English prose. We owe to it an incalculable debt.” Then in the very next sentence they say: “Yet the King James Version HAS GRAVE DEFECTS....these defects are so many and so serious as to call for revision of the English translation....The KJV of the N.T. was based upon a Greek text that was marred by mistakes.”

The RSV continues attacking the King James Bible by further stating: "The King James Version of the New Testament was based upon a Greek text that was marred by mistakes, containing the accumulated errors of fourteen centuries of manuscript copying....We now possess many more ancient manuscripts of the N.T. and are far better equipped to seek to recover the original wording of the Greek text." - page vii of the RSV Preface. (This argument sounds Oh, sooo familiar, doesn't it? ;-)

For more information see “Why do you KJB only people “cause divisions” and “attack” the word of God?” here-

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/attackthewordofgod.htm>

If the Bible agnostics are right about all these alleged errors and spurious passages (and they are not right, as we shall soon see) then their standard of “excellence” is very low indeed.

They proceed:

2. "In over 90 percent of the New Testament, readings are identical word-for-word, regardless of the family. Of the remaining ten percent, MOST of the differences between the texts are fairly irrelevant, such as calling the Lord "Christ Jesus" instead of "Jesus Christ," or putting the word "the" before a noun. Less than two percent would significantly alter the meaning of a passage, and NONE of them would contradict or alter any of the basic points of Christian doctrine. What we have, then, is a dispute concerning less than one-half of one percent of the Bible. The other 99.5% we all agree on!"

This is the typical mumbo jumbo of outright lies and deception these bible agnostics give us to try to make us think this whole "Bible Version" issue is nothing more than a tempest in a teapot and is of no real importance. The truth of the matter is there are far, far more textual differences than this "99.5" and there are several fundamental Christian doctrines that most definitely *are* affected - especially the doctrine of the Infallibility of Scripture.

To see the FACTS about whether or not "all bible versions are 99% the same" See

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/arebibles995same.htm>

And for an article concerning "No Doctrines Are Changed?" See

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/nodoctrinechanged.htm>

They continue - 3. "Because there are over 14,000 manuscript copies of the New Testament we can absolutely be confident of its accuracy. With this large number of manuscripts, comparing manuscripts easily reveals any place where a scribe has made an error or where there is a variation. There are approximately 150,000 variations in the manuscripts we have today. However, these variations represent only 10,000 places in the New Testament (if the same word was misspelled in 3,000 manuscripts, that is counted as 3,000 variations.) Of these 10,000 places, all but 400 are questions of spelling in accord with accepted usage, grammatical construction, or order of words. Of the remaining variations, only 50 are of significance (such as two manuscripts leaving out Acts 2:37). But of these 50, not one alters even one article of faith which cannot be abundantly sustained by other undoubted passages. There are some manuscripts that date as early as 130 AD, very close to the completion of the New Testament. These manuscripts are nearly identical to those dating 900 years later, thus verifying the accuracy of the scribes."

Again, all they give us here are more outright lies and deception. We have nowhere near "14,000 manuscript copies of the New Testament" and the textual differences are often vast and highly significant. These Bible critics are just making up numbers out of thin air and expecting

us to think that all is well in \$cholar\$hip Land.

For some facts about what these so called “oldest and best manuscripts” the new "Catholic" versions like the NIV, NASB, ESV, etc. are based on and what they REALLY say, See -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/oldestandbestmss.htm>

As for their completely false statement that “we can be absolutely confident about the accuracy of the New Testament” see the opinions of several non-King James Bible onlyists in this article titled “The Bible is NOT the inspired and inerrant words of God”

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/thebiblenotinspired.htm>

They continue - 4. “These advocates reject all others Bible's that post-date the KJV.”

This statement of theirs is generally true. We DO reject all other English bibles that post date the King James Bible as being the complete, inspired and 100% true words of God. In fact, not even these Bible agnostics themselves believe that any of them are the infallible words of God either.

5. “They believe that the KJV is not only inspired in the original language, but also in the translation process.”

This statement is also generally true. We believe that God inspired not only the long lost originals that nobody alive today has ever seen, but also that He has preserved His inspired words and placed them into the English language of the King James Bible. It is not a case of “re-inspiration” at all, but one of preservation. The Bible itself tells us that “ALL SCRIPTURE IS given by inspiration of God.” (2 Timothy 3:16). IF something is Scripture, then it is inspired by God. Is it possible to have a Bible that is full of “uninspired” Scripture? Of course not!

6. “This claim of an inspired translation process is not made for any other Bible translation.”

We believe the COMPLETE and 100% historically true words of God are found in English ONLY in the King James Bible. To whatever extent THE SAME Hebrew texts and THE SAME Greek texts are followed resulting in THE SAME meaning as found in the English translation of the King James Bible, then to that extent another bible translation both in English or in a foreign language is inspired Scripture. The big problem is this - most modern versions like the NIVs, NASBs, ESVs etc. are based on an artificial Catholic-Evangelical “interconfessional” text that often rejects the clear Hebrew readings (and not even in the same places) and that omits literally THOUSANDS of God inspired words from the New Testament text alone. They are NOT the

complete and 100% historically true words of the living God and NOBODY defends them as such; Not even the KJB critics.

See “The NIV, NASB, ESV reject the Hebrew Texts - Part One”

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/nivnasbrejectthebrew.htm>

And Part Two

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/nivnasbrejectthebrew2.htm>

See also “Undeniable Proof the ESV, NIV, NASB are the new “Catholic” bibles parts One and Two here-

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/realcatholicbibles.htm>

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/esvcatholicpart2.htm>

7. “Only a very tiny fraction of people who use the KJV actually believe that the translation process was inspired by the Holy Spirit.”

Once again, this is a misleading statement. I think it would be far more accurate to say something like: “The vast majority of those who actually BELIEVE the King James Bible is the complete and infallible words of God (not just “use” it) believe that the sovereign hand of God in history worked through the KJB translators to preserve for us and to translate His inspired words into what would become the universal language of the end times - English.

The King James Bible believers are the ONLY ones who still stand for the doctrine of an inspired and 100% true Bible in any language. All others are “part time” bible agnostics who maintain that ONLY the originals WERE inspired and as a result have no inspired Bible NOW, and they know they don’t.

8. “We feel that the KJV is to be classed as one of several major standards of Bible translations including, NASB, RSV, NKJV, ASV, NIV. All these translations are equal in quality and all should be used for Bible study.”

Well, once again we see the twisted thinking of the typical bible agnostic. Even though these “bible” versions continue to change their underlying Hebrew and Greek texts, as well as their English translations of these texts from one edition to the next, and they disagree even among

themselves by literally thousands of words, yet in the mind of the “part time believer” they are all “equal in quality”. This just reveals how low and unbiblical their view of God’s Scripture really is. The true Bible believer takes these and other verses of Scripture very seriously and would never dream of calling several conflicting, contradictory and doctrinally unsound multi-versions "equal in quality" when compared with the King James Holy Bible.

“Every word of God is pure...Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.” (Proverbs 30:5-6)

“but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word.” (Isaiah 66:2)

“If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.” Revelation 22:19.

9. “The TR itself was based on a very few, late scripts, not one of which contained the entire Greek New Testament and none earlier than the 12th century. In the matter of the book of Revelation, a missing page was translated from the Latin Vulgate BACK to the Greek. Acts 9:6 although found in the Latin Vulgate, and thus the TR is found in no Greek manuscript at all. In light of its obvious shortcomings, a greater number of older and more complete manuscripts were used in the translation of subsequent versions (post-1881)} (The KJV Debate: A Plea for Realism, D.A. Carson) “

Again, lots of lies and misinformation. What is commonly called the Textus Receptus represents the Traditional Text used throughout the history of the Christian church. All major Reformation bibles in all languages were based on this text. These include Luther's German Bible 1545, the Spanish Reina Valera 1569, 1602, the Italian Diodati 1649, the Portuguese Almeida 1681, and the French Martin 1744. It is the Greek text used by the Orthodox Greek Churches today. The KJB translators did not even primarily use the Greek text of Erasmus, though it was quite good and representative of the vast majority of all Greek textual readings discovered since that time, but they used the Greek texts of Stephanus and that of Beza. They also had up to 25 other copies of Greek manuscripts at their disposal and were familiar with the errant and divergent readings found in the Vatican manuscript used for most modern versions. They were not unfamiliar with any reading the modern versionists can come up with.

As for Acts 9:5-6, Carson’s quote (who, by the way, is just another bible agnostic himself and does not believe that ANY Bible in any language IS the infallible words of God) that it “is found in no Greek manuscript at all.” is another bald faced lie. See

Acts 9:5-6 - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/acts957hear720excee.htm>

We now get into the section this anti- King James Bible site calls:

### **Indisputable, universally recognized errors in the KJV**

So, let's see what they've got in the way of "indisputable errors" in this Bible they earlier referred to as being "an EXCELLENT translation", OK? I will first post their own words where they claim the King James Bible has an "indisputable, universally recognized error" and then give you the link to articles where I show that the KJB is not at all in error and that these "part time bible agnostics" are completely wrong.

"Errors where the KJV translation disagrees with the Textus Receptus: KJV translates... Textus Receptus actually says..."

"robbers of churches." Acts 19:37 Every known Greek manuscript has HIEROSULOUS,  
"robbers of temples"

No, the KJB is right - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/act19robberdianaartemis.htm>

"Lucifer" Is 14:12 - "O Day Star" (Lucifer is a human origin nickname for the Devil in the 1600's refers not to the devil but the king of Babylon)

No, the KJB is right - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/luciferormorningstar.htm>

"Easter" Acts 12:4 "Passover"(Easter very poor choice as it confuses the pagan origin Roman Catholic "Easter" holy day with what the TR clearly says is the Jewish Passover!)

No, the KJB is right - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/easterreplenish.htm>

"Baptism" (entire New Testament) Acts 2:38; 22:16 - "immersion, because sprinkling was the mode of baptism in 1611AD, they jelly-fished out and transliterated the Greek "baptizo" but refused to translate it."

No, the KJB is right. In fact, this "indisputable, universally recognized error" is just plain ridiculous. Not only does the KJB have the word "baptism" in the entire New Testament but so too do the RV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NASB, NIV, NKJV, Holman Standard and every major

Bible translation in both English and foreign languages. This just shows how wacko and blinded the minds of these self appointed Bible critics really are.

"Tithes of all I possess" Lk 18:12 - "all I acquire" (Not only variant with the TR, but quite wrong. Tithes were never paid on capital, only increase)

No, the KJB is right - See Luke 18:12 "all that I possess" in the second part - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/luke1791812.htm>

"Schoolmaster" Gal 3:24 "attendant" (the law was the one who brought us to Christ, not taught us about Christ)"

No, the KJB is right - 2nd half of this article - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/godheaddeityschoolmast.htm>

"God save the King": 1Sam 10:24, 2Sam 16:16, 1Kings 1:25

"May the king live" ("God" not in TR, but reflects the British culture of the 1600's. Proof that the translators used dynamic equivalents.)

Uh...these Bible correctors might want to take note of the fact that these Old Testament verses are NOT found in the TR as they say. The TR refers to the New Testament, not the Old Testament. Duh!

And once again the KJB is right - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/godsavetheking.htm>

"God Forbid." Rom. 3:4,6,31; 6:2,15; 7:7,13; 9:14; 11:1,11; 1 Co. 6:15; Ga. 2:17; 3:21; 6:14 "may it not be" or "let it not be." KJV adds the word God where it is absent in the TR because it was a common expression in 1600's. Proof that the translators used dynamic equivalents."

More ignorance on the part of these "part time" bible believers. The KJB is right, as always - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/godforbid.htm>

"sweet savour" Lev 6:21; 8:28; 17:6; 23:18- "soothing aroma" KJV appeals to wrong senses-



taste instead of smell in the TR”

Again, more amazing ignorance of our own English language, and of the obvious fact that these verses are, once again, NOT found “in the TR”. The KJB is right again -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/smelledasweetsavor.htm>

"ashes upon his face" 1 Kings 20:38 - "bandage over his eyes" KJV varies from TR by using ashes”

Once again, it should be pointed out to these buffoons that 1 Kings 20:38 is NOT part of the TR, and the KJB is right again -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/1kings2038ashesonface.htm>

"flagon" 2 Sam 6:19; 1 Chron 16:3; SoS 2:5; Hosea 3:1 - These verses contain the word "flagon" which is a fluted cup from which liquid is drunk. However, the Hebrew word is "ashishah" which has always meant raisins or raisin cakes. This is especially true in Hosea 3:1 because raisin cakes were often offered to idols. This is an obvious error in translation.”

Once again, their “obvious error” is shown to be a mere phantom of their imagination. The KJB is right, as always -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/hosea3flagonsofwine.htm>

So much for this list of “Indisputable, universally recognized errors” in the King James Bible.

## **The Marginal Notes**

The next point of attack these bible agnostics use is the issue of the marginal notes.

They tell us the King James Bible translators “were not inspired” in their translation work and then post: “No one questions the Greek and Hebrew is inspired. But if the translators were also inspired by the Holy Spirit, in their work of translating the inspired Hebrew into English, THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN GUIDED BY DIVINE INSPIRATION THE CORRECT RENDERING, hence no need for any alternate readings in the margin.”

First of all it should be noted that we do not believe the KJB translators were inspired. They were not writing new Scripture in the same way the original writers were moved by the Holy Ghost (2

Peter 1:21) They were merely the chosen vessels God used to preserve His already inspired words and to gather them and translate them into the English language.

Secondly, these Bible agnostics reveal the emptiness of their present position when they piously tell us that “No one questions the Greek and Hebrew IS inspired.” Well, just ask them where we can get a copy of this “the” Greek and “the” Hebrew that IS inspired. They won’t tell you! They will NEVER tell you where to get a copy simply because they do not have one and they don’t believe such a thing exists anywhere on the face of this earth. They are professing faith in something that they KNOW does not exist.

As far as the marginal notes go, they are all easily explained. The group of translators gathered together to give us the King James Bible numbered about 54 learned men, every one of whom was highly trained in biblical languages. There quite naturally would arise individual differences of opinion regarding how to translate certain words or passages, but we believe that the invisible hand of God was guiding these men to put INTO THE TEXT the readings and translation into English that He knew to be the correct ones.

Aside from the issue of the correction of minor printing errors and changes in the spelling of certain English words, the text of the King James Bible has not changed in 400 years. This is in sharp contrast to such modern versions as the NIV, ESV, NASB, NKJV that continually and deliberately keep changing both their underlying Hebrew and Greek as well as their English translations from one edition to the next.

### **Marginal Notes Continued**

This particular anti-King James Bible site makes this lame statement: “The fact that the translators placed into the margin alternate manuscript readings **PROVES BEYOND ANY DOUBT** that they **WERE NOT GUIDED** by the Holy Spirit as to which one of the two readings were correct.” (Caps are theirs)

The first example these Bible critics present as their “proof” is Judges 19:2

Here we read: “And his concubine played the whore against him, and went away from him unto her father’s house to Beth-lehem-judah, and was there **FOUR** whole months.”

They then point out that the marginal note reads: ‘four whole months: or, a year and four months: Heb. days, four months.’

All the KJB translators were doing is to point out the truth of the Hebrew language in this passage. The word for “day” is # 3117 yohm, and in ALL versions it is translated either as ‘day’ or ‘year’ depending on the context.

For example, the NASB has translated this same Hebrew word as “day” or “days” or “daily” 681 times and as “years” 28 times, while the NIV 1984 edition has translated it as “day” 950 times and as “year” or “years” 25 times while not translating it at all some 65 times according to the NIV Complete Concordance, which I have right here in my study.

As far as I know there is not a single Bible translation that translates this passage any differently than “four months”. This includes Wycliffe, Coverdale, Bishops’ Bible, the Geneva Bible, the RV, ASV, NASB, NIV, NKJV, RSV, NRSV, ESV and Holman Standard. The Jewish translations like the JPS 1917 and the 2004 Complete Tanach likewise translate this phrase as “four months” and not as “a year and four months”, though the Hebrew text itself could be translated in this manner. God guided the translators to put INTO THE TEXT what the correct reading should be.

I will deal with one more example which they present. Basically all the examples they give us of these marginal notes are of the same nature. They also mention the marginal note found in Luke 17:36. Here we read: “Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left.” Then there is a marginal note in the KJB that says: “this 36th verse is wanting in most of the Greek copies.”

The first thing to note about this verse is that it DISPROVES the commonly made assertion that the KJB translators were limited in their knowledge of Greek texts to that of Erasmus and his alleged “six manuscripts” to make up his Textus Receptus. The KJB translators were well aware of the textual variations found among numerous Greek manuscripts. It is our belief that God had them put into the English text the whole verses, phrases and individual words He wants to be there.

Please notice that the marginal note does NOT say that the verse shouldn’t be there, or even question whether it is authentic or not. It just states that it is not found in most Greek copies.

To see much more about this verse and why it is inspired Scripture that belongs in our Bible see - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/luke1736scripture.htm>

The Bible agnostics close this section with this question: “Unanswerable question: "If the translators died not knowing they were inspired, HOW DID YOU FIND THIS OUT???"

Well, first of all we point out again that KJB translators themselves were not “inspired”. We Bible believers do maintain that they were guided by God to give us His already inspired words and to place them into the English Bible.

Secondly, these bible critics who do not believe that any bible in any language is or ever was the inspired, complete and infallible words of God are setting up another straw man argument that is not in the least bit Biblical. We might just as well as state that neither Matthew, nor Mark, nor Luke, nor John nor James, Jude nor Peter nor numerous human writers of many Old Testament books were “inspired” because *they never say that they were*. None of these men just named ever say anything like “I am under the inspiration of God and what I am writing are the inspired words of God.” Find the verse if you can where Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, James, Peter or Jude ever said something like this. There is no such verse. Yet we can see from history and how God has used His inspired words, that they were indeed guided by the sovereign hand of God to give us His pure and precious words of truth and grace. The same can be said for the King James Bible.

See many of the “coincidences” of history and how the King James Bible has become The Standard of Absolute Written Truth

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/absolutestandard.htm>

This particular anti-King James Bible site basically closes out with three more sections - one giving us 70 questions for “KJV Only Advocates”, another having to do with the “archaic” language of the King James Bible and the third one dealing with the translators thoughts as found in the Preface to the King James Bible.

### **“Archaic” Language**

As for the issue of the “archaic” language of the King James Bible, one of the main objections people often raise is the use of all those “thee”s and “ye”s. Actually, these words had dropped out of common speech quite awhile before 1611. Most people are unaware of the difference between “thee” and “ye” and why they are far more accurate to the Greek and Hebrew than is the generic “you”. Rather than being a hindrance to understanding the Bible, once the difference is understood, the Bible’s own language will become much clearer and more precise.

See “Why those “thee”s and “ye”s are more accurate” here

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/theeandye.htm>

And see “The Old Fashioned Language of the King James Bible” here - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/archaicjbskip.htm>

## **Preface to the Reader**

As for the Preface to the Reader found in the King James Bible, many anti-KJB folks like to use certain quotes from the KJB translators (usually taken out of context) in an effort to prove that the translators themselves would approve of the multiple, conflicting and contradictory Bible Babble Buffet versions seen on the bible market today. It should first be pointed out that **we do not hold the King James Bible translators as our final authority**. Neither their Prefatory remarks, nor their individual or collective theology (though I personally agree with much of it) nor their personal lives nor opinions form any part of our Final Written Authority. They were not always right in what they said or did, just as king David, Solomon, Peter, Paul or John were not always right in what they did or thought. They were sinful and imperfect men, but they were all God fearing, blood bought children of God who believed they were handling the very words of the living God. It is **the TEXT of the Authorized King James Holy Bible that we believe and defend as the complete and 100% true words of God. If God cannot use fallen, sinful man as His chosen vessels in the process of preserving His inspired words, then we never would have had the inspired originals to begin with!** Think about it.

They ask: “Were the KJV translators "liars" for saying that "the very meanest [poorest] translation" is still "the word of God"?”

This quote is always taken out of context by the KJB critics. Throughout the Preface there are repeated references to the contrast between between the Bible translation work of Christians of the Reformation faith and those of the Catholic church.

The whole quote in context is this. “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.”

It should be clear that Miles Smith (the man who wrote the Preface) is referring to the Douay-Rheims ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT here, which was published by the Roman Catholics in 1582, the Old Testament not appearing until some five or six years AFTER the King James Bible translators began their own work of translation. Thus the reason for Smith's notation that they had "SEEN NONE OF THEIRS OF THE WHOLE BIBLE AS YET."

“Men of our profession” refers to the Protestant, Reformation Christians and the “theirs” refers to the Catholics. In the previous paragraph to this quote we read them say regarding “the translations of the Bible maturely considered of and examined” that “all is sound for substance in one or other of OUR editions, AND THE WORST OF OURS FAR BETTER THAN THEIR AUTHENTICK VULGAR” (which refers to the various Latin Vulgate versions)

The context of the Preface by Miles Smith shows the contrast between early English Protestant translations and the "Bible" of the Roman Catholic Church. Translations like Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Matthew's, the Great Bible, Geneva's, Bishops' and such were translations "set forth by men of our profession" and thus, "containeth the Word of God, nay is the Word of God."

Throughout the Preface there is a constant contrast between "our" and "their" translations, and between Protestant thought and Catholic thought. They also state in their Preface - "also on the other side we have shunned the obscurity of the Papists, in their asimes, tunike, rational, holocausts, praepuce, pasche, and a number of such like, whereof THEIR LATE TRANSLATION, and that of purpose to darken the sense, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof, it may be kept from being understood.”

In another part they stated: "“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”.

The translators of the AV saw their task as the perfecting of the earlier English translations that followed the Traditional Greek texts as found in the Reformation bible translations of Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, the Great Bible 1540, Matthew’s Bible 1549, the Bishops’ Bible 1568 and the Geneva Bible.

The supreme irony today is that these same modern versions most anti-King James Bible folks are promoting are in fact the new “Catholic” bible versions. See "Undeniable Proof the NIV, NASB, ESV are the new 'Catholic' versions" here- Please read both parts

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/realcatholicbibles.htm>

### **“Variety of Translations is Profitable”**

This is another line from the Preface to the King James Bible that is taken completely out of context and quoted by bible agnostics like James White to try to make us think the KJB

translators would approve of today's multiple choice bible versions that differ textually from the King James Bible by literally thousands of words and hundreds of different meanings, and often reject the Hebrew readings.

In his book, *The King James Only Controversy*, James White writes, "When the very preface to the KJV says, 'variety of Translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures,' it is obvious that the KJV Only position is proven utterly ahistorical thereby. The position requires the translator to be something its own authors never intended it to be." (*The King James Only Controversy*, pp. 76-77).

James White and others like him **SAY** they believe The Bible is the infallible words of God but when asked to tell us where we can get a copy of this infallible Bible they profess to believe in, they refuse to give us an answer. They will **never** tell you.

The Bible critics have taken this quote completely out of context and try to apply it to the ridiculously Absurd idea that it is profitable to have multiple, conflicting "bible" versions which differ from one another by thousands of words; the omission of anywhere from 17 to 45 entire verses in the N.T.; numerous different readings than the Hebrew texts and hundreds of totally different meanings of individual verses. We can see how "profitable" this has **really** been by the fact that the recent polls show that fewer than 50% of average Christians today and well over 90% of seminarians do NOT believe in the inerrancy of The Bible.

The CONTEXT of this statement - "Variety of Translations is Profitable" - was the use of marginal notes to explain the meaning of a very few specific Hebrew and Greek words which either carry several meanings or for rare animals, stones and birds. Please note the full context of the phrase in question:

"There be many words in the Scriptures which be never found there but once, (having neither brother nor neighbour, as the Hebrews speak) so that we cannot be holpen by conference of places. Again, there be many rare names of certain birds, beasts, and precious stones, &c., concerning which the Hebrews themselves are so divided among themselves for judgement . . . **Now in such a case**, doth not a margin do well to admonish the reader to seek further, and not to conclude or dogmatize upon this or that peremptorily? For as it is a fault of incredulity, to doubt of those things that are evident, so to determine of such things as the Spirit of God hath left (even in the judgement of the judicious) questionable, can be no less than presumption. Therefore as S. Augustine saith, that **variety of translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures:** so diversity of signification and sense in the margin where the text is not so clear, must needs do good, yea, is necessary, as we are persuaded."

Obviously the KJB translators were referring to the variety of translations regarding specific names of certain birds, beasts and stones, NOT to the wholesale omission or addition of thousands of phrases, verses and words to the God inspired texts.

What the KJB translators **DID** say was this: “Truly, good Christian reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make a bad one a good one... **but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principle good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavour, that our mark.**”

If you wish to see much more about the contrast between the Protestant bibles and the Catholic versions as revealed in the KJB Preface, see Scott Jones' article “Commentary on the King James Bible Translators’ Preface” here -

[http://www.lamblion.net/Articles/ScottJones/commentary\\_on\\_kjv\\_translators\\_preface.htm](http://www.lamblion.net/Articles/ScottJones/commentary_on_kjv_translators_preface.htm)

### **The Final Part of this Study - The “Questions for KJV Only Advocates”**

Many of the 70 questions are just plain silly and have already been addressed in my article about the “Printing Error Ploy” -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/printingerrors.htm>

But some of their questions are worth taking a moment to answer.

They ask: “Which KJV is inspired, since it was revised four times, the last being in 1769.”

The King James Bible has NEVER been “revised”. Not even Scriviner who wrote about the printing changes in the KJB called them “revisions” but he referred to the font change from Gothic to Roman, the spelling updates and the correction of minor printing errors as different “editions” of the King James Bible. The underlying Hebrew and Greek texts have never changed in 400 years. This is in sharp contrast to versions like the NASB, NIV, ESV, and NKJVs that continue to change both their underlying texts and their English translations.

Even the American Bible Society, no friend to the King James Bible, had this to say about the "revisions" of the King James Bible. The American Bible Society wrote, "The English Bible, as left by the translators (of 1611), has come down to us unaltered in respect to its text..." They



further stated, "With the exception of typographical errors and changes required by the progress of orthography in the English language, the text of our present Bibles remains unchanged, and without variation from the original copy as left by the translators" (Committee on Versions to the Board of Managers, American Bible Society, 1852).

For more detail and specific examples see "The Printing Error Ploy" in the link above.

Question: "What Bible would these KJV worshipers recommend since before 1611 there was no Bible."

Question: "Was Tyndale's [1525], or Coverdale's [1535], or Matthew's [1537], or the Great [1539], or the Geneva [1560] . . . English Bible absolutely infallible?"

The English Bibles before the King James Bible came out were far better textually than are the new "Catholic" versions so popular today. No, they were not the perfect words of God nor infallible, but they were part of the "many good ones" that preceded the KJB. Keep in mind that these Bible critics do not believe that there EVER WAS an infallible Bible, let alone one now.

Since this question comes up a lot, I have written an article called "Does the King James Bible Only Position "blow up"? See it here

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/kjbonlyblowup.htm>

Question: "Is the Holy Spirit an "it" according to John 1:32; Romans 8:16, 26; and 1 Peter 1:11 in the KJV? "

This alleged error is often brought up and bible agnostic Doug Kutilek thinks this is "the worst defect" in the King James Bible. All it reveals is his own ignorance of the English language and of the Bible itself.

See - "The Spirit Itself" - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/thespirititself.htm>

Question: "Why do KJV only advocates reject the apocrypha, since the original 1611 version contained the apocrypha?"

Again, this shows utter ignorance of the facts and what is going on even in today's modern versions - See Why Was the Apocrypha in the Early King James Bibles? -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/apocryphakjb.htm>

Question: "Why would the Holy Spirit mis-guide the translators to employ the use of mythical creatures like "unicorn" for wild ox, "satyr" for "wild goat", "cockatrice" for common viper, when today we know what the real name of these creatures is?"

See the article "Satyrs, Dragons, Unicorns and Cockatrices"-  
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/satdragunicorns.htm>

And particularly the one titled "Unicorns" -  
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/unicorns.htm>

Question: "Did Jesus teach a way for men to be "worshiped" according to Luke 14:10 in the KJV, contradicting the first commandment and what He said in Luke 4: 8? "

No, the KJB is right again. See - Luke 14:10 "then shalt thou have worship"

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/luke1410worship213t.htm>

Question: "Where does the Bible teach that God will perfectly preserve His Word in the form of one seventeenth-century English translation?"

This is one of the most hypocritical objections the bible agnostics come up with in an effort to overthrow our faith in a complete and 100% true Holy Bible. Obviously the Bible does not mention the King James Bible itself. However, neither does it mention the NASB, NIV, ESV, Spanish, French, German, Russian, Chinese or Daffy Duck bible either. In fact, the Bible never even mentions "the originals". There is no bible on this earth that even hints at what these Bible Agnostics themselves believe. Where in any Bible does it say things like "only in the originals", "only in the Hebrew and the Greek", "a better translation would be", "Some manuscripts read" or "we are called to investigate which reading is the right one"? None. It is the height of hypocrisy to demand something from the Bible believer that the bible agnostic himself cannot provide.

What the Bible DOES mention is that God has promised to preserve His words, heaven and earth shall pass away but not his words, the Scripture cannot be broken, and that God Himself CANNOT lie. Either God has kept His word to give us "the book of the LORD" somewhere on this earth, or He has lied to us.

See "The Bible is NOT the inspired, inerrant and 100% historically true words of God" to see what most Christians today believe and, in contrast to that, what the Bible says about itself. -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/thebiblenotinspired.htm>

In closing, I have only one fundamental question for all those King James Bible Only critics. If you do not believe that the King James Holy Bible is the complete, inspired and 100% historically true, preserved words of God, then do you believe that ANY Bible in ANY language IS? Yes, No, I dunno or Who cares? If Yes, then where can we get a copy of it so we can read it for ourselves and compare it to whatever version we are using to see the differences and similarities?

If you do not have such a Book, then you are just another Bible agnostic who is a “part time” bible believer who has made his own mind and understanding his final written authority, subject to change at a moments’ notice, and you deny and disbelieve the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Bible. It is as simple as that. You are on one side or the other. You are either a King James Bible believer or you are a Bible agnostic.

“He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.” Matthew 11:15

“Seek ye out of the book of the LORD, and read” Isaiah 34:16

Will Kinney