

## Is King James onlyism Scriptural?

We who believe God has preserved His inspired words only in the Authorized King James Holy Bible are accused of being unscriptural.

What does the Book say? God told the prophet Isaiah in chapter 59:21 "This is my covenant with them; My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the LORD, from henceforth and for ever."

The Lord Jesus Christ said in Matthew 24:35: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

Isaiah 40:8: "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever."

Psalms 12:6-7: "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."

Psalms 19:7: "The law of the LORD is PERFECT, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is SURE, making wise the simple." The "law and testimony of the LORD" = His words.

Psalms 100:5: "For the LORD is good; his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations."

Psalms 119:152, 160: "Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that Thou hast founded them for ever. ... thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever."

John 10:35: "... the Scripture cannot be broken."

God has promised to preserve His words IN A BOOK here on this earth till heaven and earth pass away. He either did this and we can know where they are found today, or He lied and He lost some of them, and we can never be sure if what we are reading are the true words of God or not.

God's words are in a BOOK. Consider the following verses: "Now go, write it before them in a table, and NOTE IT IN A BOOK, that it may be for the time to come FOR EVER AND EVER."

Isaiah 30:8

"Seek ye out of THE BOOK of the LORD, and READ: no one of these shall fail...for my mouth it hath commanded..." Isaiah 34:16

"And 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

God has promised to preserve His words, here on earth, in a form that will be known and spoken among His seed, till the end of this world. How has He done this? Modern scholars tell us: "No translation is inspired; only the originals were inspired." The originals no longer exist. Is it

biblical to say no translation is inspired? Again, what does the Book say? Moses spoke to Pharaoh in Egyptian, yet it was translated into Hebrew. Paul and Jesus both spoke in the Hebrew tongue, yet their words were translated into a different language of inspired words. Jesus spoke in Hebrew and possibly Aramaic too, yet His words were translated into Greek as were the O.T. quotes. To say "no translation is inspired" is not biblical. Please see my article "Can a Translation be Inspired" for further development of this topic, here -

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

God can and does refer to the Book of the Lord as being a real object even though it is still in the process of being written and perfected. Yet He sees the end from the beginning and refers to a future event (from our point of view) as a present reality.

Daniel 10:21 - 11:2 - "the Scripture of Truth"

Another clear example of God's Book being progressively revealed to us is found in one of the heavenly visions revealed to the prophet Daniel. In chapter 10 a heavenly messenger is sent to Daniel who tells him: "But I will shew thee THAT WHICH IS NOTED IN THE SCRIPTURE OF TRUTH". The angel then says - "And now will I shew thee THE TRUTH. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings of Persia: and the fourth shall be far richer than they all..."

Here the angel refers to a Book of Scripture that is ALREADY WRITTEN IN HEAVEN, and that is progressively revealed to man. This "Scripture of truth" has already recorded coming events BEFORE they happen in time. Nothing takes God by surprise; He sees the end from the beginning, and there is a completed Book in heaven that God progressively reveals to His people in time and history.

Scholars tell us God has preserved His words somewhere in a few thousand conflicting manuscripts which only they can read. Yet they cannot agree among themselves as to which texts to put into their "bibles", nor how to translate the meaning once they agree on the text.

Get 10 scholars into a room and you will come up with 12 different opinions. They try to piece together the original words from the remaining, conflicting manuscripts. Yet God can work through this "scholarly process" Himself much better than they, and place His true words in one volume, because He knows which words are His and which ones are not.

I often hear objections raised by "scholars" who themselves do not believe that any Bible in any language, including "the" Hebrew and "the" Greek, is now the complete and inerrant words of God. They ask such things as: "Well, how do you know the King James translators got it right?" or "What was their textual source for deciding which readings were inspired and which ones were scribal additions or omissions?" Implied in their very questions is the idea that there is no such thing as an inerrant Bible now, nor ever was one.

Don't the "scholars" who put together the constant barrage of "new and improved, based on the latest findings" type of bible versions that keep coming down the pike go through a similar

process, at least in their own minds and on their best of days? Don't the modern scholars get together and pray asking God to guide their efforts, hoping that perhaps theirs will be the best bible version to ever appear in print and be "the closest to the originals" of any of them? (This scenario is, of course, giving them the best of all possible motives for their work).

Is it impossible for God to work through a group of dedicated men, though fallen, sinful and imperfect, to bring about the truth of His preserved and perfect words and place them in a real Book between two covers printed on paper with ink, that the children of God can actually hold in their hands and believe every word? Why do the Bible critics mock at the idea that God may have actually already guided through this "scholarly process" and done what they themselves think they are trying to do today? I don't get it.

Try this with the bible agnostics. Since they do not believe that ANY Bible in ANY language is now or ever was the complete, inspired and infallible words of God, then ask them if they think the scholars will ever be able to work through all the manuscript evidence and eventually be able to give us a complete and perfect Bible. If they say No, then they are perpetual Bible agnostics and never will believe in the Infallibility of Scripture. If they say Yes, at some time in the future we will be able to put together a perfect Bible, then ALL the objections they presently raise against the King James Bible only position will turn right around and come back to pester them. Such things as "Where was the perfect word of God before 20??" or "How do you know they got it right?" or "What is your Scriptural basis for this hypothetical future perfect Bible being the infallible words of God? yada, yada, yada.

The indebtedness of the King James Bible translators to their predecessors is recognized most clearly in the Preface to the reader where they state in no uncertain terms: "Truly, good Christian reader, we never thought, from the beginning, that we 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."

The King James Translators also wrote: "Nothing is begun and perfected at the same time, and the later thoughts are the thoughts to be the wiser: so if we build upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labors, do endeavor to make better which they left so good...if they were alive would thank us...the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished."

Another KJB believer came up with this answer to those who say the KJB translators never claimed perfection for their work - "I've had this come up several times and the thinking here, I suppose, is that since the King James translators didn't claim their translator was perfect then it couldn't be so. Several problems with this line of thinking, had they even given it a thought that they had (or were) going to achieve perfection, God could not use them. It's as simple as that. There is NO WAY God would have told them they would be "it" as "THE" translators for the FINAL edition of his words in English without their PRIDE becoming an issue in the matter.

A man (or men) that God uses always do so with an element of humbleness and thus they would claim that it's not perfect, that is the mark of men that God uses. Good thing we have what they didn't **Hindsight**, we can now see that the King James is indeed THE english Bible that God breathed on making those words alive. Something he has NOT done with ANY version of ANY english translation since." (end of comments by fellow Bible believer)

God is under no obligation to give equal light or gifts to all people. Psalm 147:19,20: "He sheweth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation; and as for his judgments, they have not known them. Praise ye the LORD."

He has not promised to give every individual a perfect Bible. Even modern scholars will admit there are inferior translations. Yet using the Jehovah Witness version, or just a gospel tract, someone can come to know the Lord. We are only responsible for the light we have received.

I believe in the sovereignty of God in history. "For the kingdom is the LORD'S; and He is the governor among the nations." Psalm 22:28. God has set His mark upon many things in this world that reveal His Divine hand at work in history. Why do we use the 7 day week instead of the 10 day week? Why are dates either B.C. (Before Christ) or A.D. (Anno Domini - year of our Lord)? (although the secular world is now trying in vain to change this too to BCE and CE.) England, the country that gave us the King James Holy Bible, just "happens to be" the one nation from which we measure the true Time (Greenwich time, zero hour) and from which we measure true Position on this earth, zero longitude. Just a "coincidence", huh?

In 1611 the English language was spoken by a mere 3% of the world's population, but today English has become the closest thing to a universal language in history. He used the King James Bible to carry His words to the far ends of the earth, where it was translated into hundreds of languages by English and American missionaries for over 300 years. The sun never set on the British empire. It was even taken to space by American astronauts and read from there. God knew He would use England, its language and the King James Bible to accomplish all these things long before they happened. Oh, and by the way, the King James Bible is the all time Number One Best Selling Book EVER, and that BY FAR! No other book in print has even come close. It is the only Bible God has providentially used in this way. It is the only Bible believed by thousands upon thousands of believers to be the inspired, infallible and 100% true words of God.

We are falsely accused of trusting in a 17th century Anglican translation. No, we do not defend the KJB translators, their doctrines, prefatory remarks or their marginal notes. We trust in the living God Who used imperfect, sinful men both to write the originals and to preserve His words. We defend only THE TEXT AND THE MEANING of the King James Holy Bible. Modern scholars admit their bibles are not inspired and contain errors. Ask your pastor where you can get a copy of the inspired writings of the prophets and apostles. If he doesn't believe in the inerrancy of the King James Bible, you are in for a real treat when you hear his answer.

Check out my article called "There is No Inerrant Bible", and you will see factual statements

from many leading Evangelicals showing that most seminarians and future pastors no longer believe in the inerrancy of Scripture.

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

The NKJV, NIV, ESV, Holman Standard, and the NASB all contain provable false doctrines and disagree among themselves. The NIV and NAS reject in many places the Hebrew to follow the LXX, Syriac, Targum something else or just "make up" a text (See 1 Samuel 13:1 for example) and the NIV and Holman tell you this in their footnotes.

(For examples of where versions like the NASB, NIV, ESV etc. reject the Hebrew texts, and not always in the same places, please see the first two links here. And to see some concrete examples of false doctrine found in the modern versions, take a look at the third link provided here.)

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

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

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

The "all scripture is given by inspiration of God" in 2 Timothy 3:15-16 applies to what Timothy and his mother had in their home hundreds of years after the originals had turned to dust.

To say, "only the originals were inspired" is unbiblical. Which view is more scriptural, that of the King James Bible believer, or that of the modern "Bible Of The Month Club" promoter?

The "Thus saith the Lord" of old, has been replaced by "How does this version render it?"

I can hold the pure, perfect, inerrant words of the living God in my hands and read them in the King James Bible. What do you have in your hands?

The following is part of a discussion I had with a Christian who does not believe any Bible is the inerrant word of God.

"Why did you call it 'baloney'?"

Hi brother \_\_\_\_\_, I understand your concern about the way I answered your stance on the question of the inerrancy of the Bible. Let me explain a little bit. I am deliberately somewhat confrontational and "in your face" when I see the typical clichés you posted about where you think God's inerrant words are today. I have heard and read the same platitudes hundreds of times.

Your stated position is not at all well thought out. It superficially sounds very religious, but in reality says nothing. I want to get your attention and hopefully you will think it through a bit more.

Here is what you said: "Just remember, if you want the inerrant Word, as it is in its raw self,

without any question as to its validity - then you need to become a student in its original languages. NO translation, including the KJV, is 100% accurate...they all have their strengths in translation and they all have their weaknesses."

Now brother, instead of taking offense by my basically calling this a bunch of baloney (which it is), think about what you are really saying here.

If we need to learn the original languages like Hebrew and Greek, then the average Joe and Jane out there can't really know what God has said. All he or she is left with are inferior, error prone, and imperfect translations, and we need the "expert scholars" to clear things up for us. All of these things are implied by your statement. In other words, the average working guy and Christian Mom or student has to settle for something less than the pure word of God. You are stealing the inspired Bible right out from under them and placing some kind of special class of modern day priestcraft as interpreters.

Secondly, you should know by now that there is no "The Hebrew text", and much less any "The Greek Text" for anyone out there to compare all versions with to see if they are right or not.

Thirdly, even if we all knew Hebrew and Greek, there still would not be any inerrant Bible as the Final Standard, simply because all these guys who write today's "bibles" come up with entirely different meanings in hundreds of verses, even when they are looking at the same text.

Fourthly, none of the bible versions out there like the NASB, NIV, ESV, NKJV, Holman follows the exact same underlying Old Testament or New Testament texts as do the others. They are all different from each other and they often contradict one another in both text and meaning.

And fifthly, when you make a statement like this: "NO translation, including the KJV, is 100% accurate...they all have their strengths in translation and they all have their weaknesses." - what do you think this implies?

It means that even though all the other translators have taken your initial advice on how to find the inerrant word of God by becoming students of the original languages, yet they have failed to give us an inerrant Bible (in your humble opinion, of course).

It also means that Your expertise is above and beyond everybody else's, because You have examined all the Bible versions in detail (which I highly doubt) and have found them all to be wanting. So, this begs the question: Why then haven't YOU, with all your advanced learning, published for the needy Christian world an inerrant Bible that only has strengths and no weaknesses in it?

Brother, I just want you and all others who express similar views (and there are many today who hold the same views you do) to realize how utterly vacant of any real meaning, and pretentious your statement of faith about the Bible really is.

Sometimes a mild rebuke is called for, and if someone tells me there is no inerrant, complete, inspired Holy Bible on this earth, I get a bit indignant about it.

"This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith." Titus 1:13

I do not reject you personally as a brother in Christ; it is your position of unbelief in an inspired, inerrant Holy Bible that I attack. I hope you can see the difference. If I didn't love God's word or care about where the church is clearly headed with today's mindset regarding the inspired Scriptures, then I would say nothing.

"Therefore I esteem all thy precepts concerning all things to be right; and I hate every false way."  
Psalm 119:128

Here is another typical letter I receive from time to time and my response to their arguments:

"I have read many articles of yours, and I have seen falsehood. Your only real argument is the one by most KJV onlyist, which is GOD promised to preserve his words, so it must be the KJV. The perfection is in the originals. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE to have a perfect word for word from Greek or Hebrew into English."

Hi Ryan. Then by your own implied admission, there IS no perfect Bible since the originals do not exist and everybody knows this. Why don't you more accurately say "the perfection WAS in the originals" instead of "is". And how would you know that perfection was (or is) in the originals when you have never seen them? Isn't this a position of faith in something you know doesn't exist?

It is your position that leaves you with no inspired and inerrant Bible. All you have is a "once upon a time, and far, far away, there might have been a perfect bible if the original writings had been all gathered together into one book", but such is not the case and today we don't know for sure what God really said.

You can't even point to a single Hebrew text or single Greek text and tell anyone with a straight face that this is the true words of God, can you?

Sorry, Ryan, but I believe your present position leaves you with no true "book of the LORD" at all. All of grace, Will K

Here is another typical response I get from the Bible Agnostics. They demand that we provide them with just one Bible verse that teaches that the King James Bible is the complete and inerrant words of God. This is from a man who calls himself freesundayschoollessons.

[QUOTE=freesundayschoollessons] Will you ever give us at least ONE Bible verse on why God's preservation is limited to an English translation which appeared 1600s years after its final original composition? [/QUOTE]

Hi Free. You are demanding something of us Bible believers that you Bible agnostics cannot yourselves provide. Can you say 'Hypocrisy'? Since you do not believe that any bible in any language is the complete and inerrant words of God, "Will you ever give us at least ONE Bible verse on why" there is no complete and inerrant Bible in any language?

"Will you ever give us at least ONE Bible verse" that teaches that 5 or 6 textually very different "reliable" bible versions (KJV, NIV, NASB, ESV, NET, etc.) are all the inerrant words of God?

"Will you ever give us at least ONE Bible verse" that teaches that God will preserve His inspired and inerrant words "only in the originals"?

"Will you ever give us at least ONE Bible verse" that teaches that God will preserve His words in thousands upon thousands of very different and contradictory scraps of remaining "original language" manuscripts?

"Will you ever give us at least ONE Bible verse" that even mentions "the original languages"?

"Will you ever give us at least ONE Bible verse" that even remotely teaches what it is that you believe about the Bible not being the inerrant and 100% true words of God?

Go for it, Free. Let's see what good all your seminary training has done for you. Can you provide a Biblical answer to the very question you demand we answer for you before you will be satisfied? I trow not.

Happy hunting for that ONE Bible verse,

Will K

I've noticed lately another tactic in the attack against the inerrancy of the King James Bible. Here is the question now being posed: "By the way, what was the final authority of the KJV translators in 1604 when they began their work? Using your paradigm, what was their "inerrant" Bible from which they did their work?"

This is a good question in a way. However I believe if you think about it for a minute, the real reason people ask this question is simply because their position is that there never was, much less is now, any written Final Authority.

I don't think there was an infallible or inerrant Bible in the English language in 1604. Generally speaking the English Bibles like Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, the Great Bible (Cranmer) of 1540, Matthew's Bible (John Rogers) of 1549, the Bishops' Bible of 1568 and the Geneva Bible 1587 were quite good. At least they were based on the right Hebrew and Greek texts 99.9% of the time. This is in sharp contrast to today's modern versions like the NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV and Holman Standard.

I can't tell you for sure where the infallible N.T. was. I think it may have been among the Waldensian believers but was being corrupted by variant readings, much like the situation is today. There are maybe 200 different English versions out there now, and the King James Bible is one of them. I believe the KJB is the perfect and infallible words of God, and other English versions are some closer and others further away from this pure standard. So, can we say the true words of God are found in the English language? Well, Yes, but with some very serious qualifications.

Unfortunately the whole argument now is that there never was an infallible Bible and there certainly is not one now. Do you believe in the infallibility of Scripture or the Bible? If so, then where can we get a copy of it so we can compare it to whatever translation we are using now to see the differences and similarities? Or is it really that people like the philosophical concept of infallibility but they don't believe in the reality of it?

Another commonly raised question by the "no Bible is the only inspired words of God" group is

this little gem. "Where is your Scriptural support for your view that the King James Bible is the only 100% true and inerrant Bible?"

In spite of the fact that I and many others repeatedly post a long list of Bible verses showing that God will preserve His words on this earth till heaven and earth pass away, they come back with: "Well, no where do the Scriptures mention the King James Bible." This is admittedly true. But let's turn the tables around, shall we? They are demanding something from us which they themselves cannot provide. Where in any Bible version does it ever support what they believe? Does any Bible version tell us that God would preserve His words "only in the originals" or even in the Hebrew or the Greek? Does any Bible version tell us that God would preserve His words "out there somewhere" among 400,000 variant readings and that it is up to the scholars, who never agree with each other and keep changing their minds every few years, to tell us where the true words of God might be found? Neither does any Bible version mention the NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV, NET, Holman Standard, NKJV nor the Daffy Duck Version.

And the Bible certainly does not mention this really looney toons view that I have heard some like Robycop, Brian Tegart, Ed 1611 and a few others who try to tell us that God's inerrant words are found in [quote] "any reliable (whatever THAT means) version like the NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV, NKJV, KJV, Holman Standard, etc. that follows its SOURCES (no matter how different nor contradictory). They are all the inerrant words of God (in spite of literally thousands of textual differences and hundreds of different meanings, and scores of different names and numbers), but the KJV, though "inerrant" still has several goofs, boo boos, wrong texts and wrong translations." [/quote] Where is the Scriptural support for anything the anti-King James Bible only people tell us? Short answer: NOWHERE.

Let them rant and rave away and continue to promote the idea that No Bible and no single text in any language, including "the" Hebrew and "the" Greek is now the 100% true and infallible words of God. We King James Bible believers are quite content to maintain our position affirming that God has given us the true Book of the LORD in the English language. We'll leave the results with Him.

Will Kinney

Return to Articles - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm>

Majestic Legacy (of the King James Bible) by Dr. Phil Stringer

<http://www.preservedwords.com/legacy.htm>

Fox New, 8 minute video about The Book that changed the world, the King James Bible 400th year celebration

<http://video.foxnews.com/v/4427126/king-james-bible-celebrates-400-years/>