

Well folks, here is another Bible 'corrector' who is happy 'chopping up' the Authorized Version Bible! Well I'm happy letting my big brother Alan O'Reilly CHOP HIM UP with the twoedged sword (Heb 4v12). As always, Bible 'correctors' don't stand a chance against a Bible Believer; I don't know why they bother wasting the time God has given them. To think that God gives us LIFE, & some 'Christians' are happy spending that time trying to find 'errors' in God's PERFECT word! Idiots!

So over to you Alan, go get him!!!

Written by Mr Bible 'corrector'...

Dear friend

Just visited your website and thought you may be interested on this article:

First, I want to affirm with all evangelical Christians that the Bible is the Word of God, inerrant, inspired, and our final authority for faith and life. However, nowhere in the Bible am I told that only one translation of it is the correct one. Nowhere am I told that the King James Bible is the best or only 'holy' Bible. There is no verse that tells me how God will preserve his word, so I can have no scriptural warrant for arguing that the King James has exclusive rights to the throne. The arguments must proceed on other bases.

Second, the Greek text which stands behind the King James Bible is demonstrably inferior in certain places. The man who edited the text was a Roman Catholic priest and humanist named Erasmus.¹ He was under pressure to get it to the press as soon as possible since (a) no edition of the Greek New Testament had yet been published, and (b) he had heard that Cardinal Ximenes and his associates were just about to publish an edition of the Greek New Testament and he was in a race to beat them. Consequently, his edition has been called the most poorly edited volume in all of literature! It is filled with hundreds of typographical errors which even Erasmus would acknowledge. Two places deserve special mention. In the last six verses of Revelation, Erasmus had no Greek manuscript (=MS) (he only used half a dozen, very late MSS for the whole New Testament any way). He was therefore forced to 'back-translate' the Latin into Greek and by so doing he created seventeen variants which have never been found in any other Greek MS of Revelation! He merely guessed at what the Greek might have been. Secondly, for 1 John 5:7-8, Erasmus followed the majority of MSS in reading "there are three witnesses in heaven, the Spirit and the water and the blood." However, there was an uproar in some Roman Catholic circles because his text did not read "there are three witnesses in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit." Erasmus said that he did not put that in the text because he found no Greek MSS which had that reading. This implicit challenge—viz., that if he found such a reading in any Greek MS, he would put it in his text—did not go unnoticed. In 1520, a scribe at Oxford named Roy made such a Greek MS (codex 61, now in Dublin). Erasmus' third edition had the second reading because such a Greek MS was 'made to order' to fill the challenge! To date, only a handful of Greek MSS have been discovered which have the Trinitarian formula in 1 John 5:7-8, though none of them is demonstrably earlier than the sixteenth century.

That is a very important point. It illustrates something quite significant with regard to the textual tradition which stands behind the King James. Probably most textual critics today fully embrace the doctrine of the Trinity (and, of course, all evangelical textual critics do). And most would like to see the Trinity explicitly taught in 1 John 5:7-8. But most reject this reading as an invention of some overly zealous scribe. The problem is that the King James Bible is filled with readings which have been created by overly zealous scribes! Very few of the distinctive King James readings are demonstrably ancient. And most textual critics just happen to embrace the reasonable proposition

that the most ancient MSS tend to be more reliable since they stand closer to the date of the autographs. I myself would love to see many of the King James readings retained. The story of the woman caught in adultery (John 7:53-8:11) has always been a favorite of mine about the grace of our savior, Jesus Christ. That Jesus is called God in 1 Timothy 3:16 affirms my view of him. Cf. also John 3:13; 1 John 5:7-8, etc. But when the textual evidence shows me both that scribes had a strong tendency to add, rather than subtract, and that most of these additions are found in the more recent MSS, rather than the more ancient, I find it difficult to accept intellectually the very passages which I have always embraced emotionally. In other words, those scholars who seem to be excising many of your favorite passages from the New Testament are not doing so out of spite, but because such passages are not found in the better and more ancient MSS. It must be emphatically stressed, however, that this does not mean that the doctrines contained in those verses have been jeopardized. My belief in the deity of Christ, for example, does not live or die with 1 Timothy 3:16. In fact, it has been repeatedly affirmed that no doctrine of Scripture has been affected by these textual differences. If that is true, then the 'King James only' advocates might be crying wolf where none exists, rather than occupying themselves with the more important aspects of advancing the gospel.²

Third, the King James Bible has undergone three revisions since its inception in 1611, incorporating more than 100,000 changes. Which King James Bible is inspired, therefore?

Fourth, 300 words found in the KJV no longer bear the same meaning—e.g., "Suffer little children...to come unto me" (Matt 19:14). "Study to shew thyself approved unto God" (2 Tim 2:15). Should we really embrace a Bible as the best translation when it uses language that not only is not clearly understood any more, but in fact has been at times perverted and twisted?³

Fifth, the KJV includes one very definite error in translation, which even KJV advocates would admit. In Matthew 23:24 the KJV has 'strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.' But the Greek has 'strain out a gnat and swallow a camel.' In the least, this illustrates not only that no translation is infallible but also that scribal corruptions can and do take place—even in a volume which has been worked over by so many different hands (for the KJV was the product of a very large committee of over 50 scholars).⁴

Sixth, when the KJV was first published, it was heavily resisted for being too easy to understand! Some people revere it today because it is difficult to understand. I fear that part of their response is due to pride: they feel as though they are able to discern something that other, less spiritual folks cannot. Often 1 Corinthians 2:13-16 is quoted with reference to the KJV (to the effect that 'you would understand it if you were spiritual'). Such a use of that text, however, is a gross distortion of the Scriptures. The words in the New Testament, the grammar, the style, etc.—in short, the language—comprised the common language of the first century. We do God a great disservice when we make the gospel more difficult to understand than he intended it. The reason unspiritual people do not understand the scriptures is because they have a volitional problem, not an intellectual problem (cf. 1 Cor. 2:14 where 'receive,' 'welcome' shows clearly that the thing which blocks understanding is the sinful will of man).

Seventh, those who advocate that the KJV has exclusive rights to being called the Holy Bible are always, curiously, English-speaking people (normally isolated Americans). Yet, Martin Luther's fine translation of the Bible into German predated the KJV by almost 100 years. Are we so arrogant to say that God has spoken only in English? And where there are substantial discrepancies between Luther's Bible and the KJV (such as in 1 John 5:7-8), are we going to say that God has inspired both? Is he the author of lies? Our faith does not rest in a singular tradition, nor is it provincial. Vibrant, biblical Christianity must never unite itself with provincialism. Otherwise, missionary endeavor, among other things, would die.

Eighth, again, let me repeat an earlier point: Most evangelicals—who embrace all the cardinal doctrines of the faith—prefer a different translation and textual basis than that found in the KJV. In fact, even the editors of the New Scofield Reference Bible (which is based on the KJV) prefer a different text/translation!

Finally, though it is true that the modern translations 'omit' certain words and verses (or conversely, the KJV adds to the Word of God, depending on how you look at it), the issue is not black-or-white. In fact, the most recent edition of a Greek New Testament which is based on the majority of MSS, rather than the most ancient ones (and thus stands firmly behind the King James tradition), when compared to the standard Greek New Testament used in most modern translations, excises over six hundred and fifty words or phrases! Thus, it is not proper to suggest that only modern translations omit; the Greek text behind the KJV omits, too! The question, then, is not whether modern translations have deleted portions of the Word of God, but rather whether either the KJV or modern translations have altered the Word of God. I contend that the KJV has far more drastically altered the scriptures than have modern translations. Nevertheless, I repeat: most textual critics for the past two hundred and fifty years would say that no doctrine is affected by these changes. One can get saved reading the KJV and one can get saved reading the NIV, NASB, etc.

I trust that this brief survey of reasons I have for thinking that the King James Bible is not the best available translation will not be discarded quickly. All of us have a tendency to make mountains out of molehills and then to set up fortresses in those 'mountains.' We often cling to things out of emotion, rather than out of true piety. And as such we do a great disservice to a dying world that is desperately in need of a clear, strong voice proclaiming the gospel of Jesus Christ. Soli Deo gloria!

Addendum

One further point is necessary. With the recent publication of several different books vilifying modern translations, asserting that they were borne out of conspiratorial motives, a word should be mentioned about this concocted theory. First, many of these books are written by people who have little or no knowledge of Greek or Hebrew, and are, further, a great distortion of the facts. I have read books on textual criticism for more than a quarter of a century, but never have I seen such illogic, out-of-context quotations, and downright deceptions about the situation as in these recent books. Second, although it is often asserted that heretics produced some of the New Testament MSS we now have in our possession, there is only one group of MSS known to be produced by heretics: certain Byzantine MSS of the book of Revelation. This is significant because the Byzantine text stands behind the KJV! These MSS formed part of a mystery cult textbook used by various early cults. But KJV advocates constantly make the charge that the earliest MSS (the Alexandrian MSS) were produced by heretics. The sole basis they have for this charge is that certain readings in these MSS are disagreeable to them! Third, when one examines the variations between the Greek text behind the KJV (the Textus Receptus) and the Greek text behind modern translations, it is discovered that the vast majority of variations are so trivial as to not even be translatable (the most common is the moveable nu, which is akin to the difference between 'who' and 'whom!'). Fourth, when one compares the number of variations that are found in the various MSS with the actual variations between the Textus Receptus and the best Greek witnesses, it is found that these two are remarkably similar. There are over 400,000 textual variants among NT MSS. But the differences between the Textus Receptus and texts based on the best Greek witnesses number about 5000—and most of these are untranslatable differences! In other words, over 98% of the time, the Textus Receptus and the standard critical editions agree. Those who vilify the modern translations and the Greek texts behind them have evidently never really investigated the data. Their appeals are based largely on emotion, not evidence. As such, they do an injustice to historic Christianity as well as to the men who stood behind the King James Bible. These scholars, who admitted that their work was provisional and not final (as can be seen by their preface and by their more than 8000 marginal notes indicating alternate renderings), would wholeheartedly welcome the great finds in MSS that have occurred in the past one hundred and fifty years.

1 Now a humanist in the sixteenth century is not the same as a humanist today. Erasmus was generally tolerant of other viewpoints, and was particularly interested in the humanities. Although he was a friend of Melancthon, Luther's right-hand man, Luther did not care for him.

2 It is significant that Erasmus himself was quite progressive in his thinking, and would hardly be in favor of how the KJV Only advocates have embraced him as their champion. For example, every one

of his editions of the Greek NT was a diglot—Latin on one side and Greek on the other. The Latin was his own translation, and was meant to improve upon Jerome's Latin Vulgate—a translation which the Catholic church had declared to be inspired. For this reason, Cambridge University immediately banned Erasmus' New Testament, and others followed suit. Elsewhere, Erasmus questioned whether the pericope adulterae (the story of the woman caught in adultery [John 7:53-8:11]), the longer ending of Mark (16:9-20), etc., were authentic.

3 "Suffer" in Matt 19:14 means "permit"; "study" in 2 Tim 2:15 means "be eager, be diligent." See the Oxford English Dictionary (the largest unabridged dictionary of the English language) for help here: it traces the uses of words through their history, pinpointing the year in which a new meaning came into vogue.

4 There are other mistakes in the KJV which persist to this day, even though this translation has gone through several editions. For example, the KJV in Heb 4:8 reads: "For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day." This sounds as though Jesus could not provide the eternal rest that we all long for! However, the Greek word for Jesus is the same as the word for Joshua. And in the context of Heb 4, Joshua is obviously meant. There is no textual problem here; it is rather simply a mistake on the part of the translators, perpetuated for the last 400 years in all editions of the KJV.

Dear Mr Bible 'corrector',

I am still awaiting your answers to my first email!

Now to correct all the mistakes you have made!!!

If you have cut & pasted this, then the person who you have taken it from is very shallow & poor in Scripture. I would be VERY careful in trusting a man like this in future! If it is your own work...OH DEAR!!! Sit down & get ready for a rough ride!!!

Re: the critic below (HIM OR YOU???), I think much of what he has come up with is the standard stuff you'll find addressed in "O Biblios" (A book written by Dr Alan O'Reilly - if you want a copy let me know!) and in the material on the website answering baby-Peter Amue (<http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1309647082.pdf> & <http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1309647107.pdf>), James White and Gordon Curley (Look & READ the articles under the AV ONLY tab <http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/>). These critics, as Dr Ruckman has said, are all programmed clones. They are infested by the same "perverse spirit" Isaiah 19:14 as God's judgement on their unbelief Proverbs 13:13a.

Now either YOU or your 'source' is lying about the preservation of God's word, as Psalm 12:6, 7 shows. He's also lying about God's special provision for the 1611 Holy Bible according to Ecclesiastes 8:4.

He's clearly a 'Greekiolator' and seems unaware that Koine Greek is a dead language, whereas "the word of God...liveth and abideth forever" 1 Peter 1:23. With reference to 'the Greek' etc., Either YOU or your 'source' is in fact just another Nicolaitan priest Revelation 2:15 in direct violation of the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9 and akin to a 33rd

Degree Royal Arch mason i.e. you can't know 'the truth' until you've been inducted into 'the mysteries' i.e. Hebrew and Greek.

That said, when it comes to 'the Greek,' regardless of how long YOU or your 'source' has looked at Greek texts, he/YOU? couldn't hold a candle to the King James translators who were past masters of the subject, as their biographies show, so YOUR 'corrections' to the 1611 Holy Bible are not to be taken seriously by anyone who has studied the subject.

He's lying about Erasmus as Gail Riplinger's detailed chapter in In Awe of Thy Word on Erasmus shows.

He's lying about 1 John 5:7-8 as Benjamin Wilkinson's work shows, on the Bibles of the Waldenses, <http://kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html>. Gail in Hazardous Materials on the Greek Orthodox Church shows why the verse is missing from most Greek mss.

He's lying about John 7:53-8:11, 1 Timothy 3:16, as the material in "O Biblios" shows, summarising the definitive work of Dean Burgon over a century ago.

He's lying about Matthew 23:24. The modern equivalent would be 'grasping AT a straw.'" See Dr Ruckman's Reference Bible.

He's lying about distinct KJB readings not having ancient testimony. See "O Biblios" and also J. A. Moorman's When the KJV Departs from The "Majority" Text and Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version – A Closer Look!

He's lying about major doctrine not affected by 'textual differences.' See recent note about Acts 8:37 and put it on the site as the Lord leads. See the tracts by Terry Watkins on the attacks on major doctrine by the NIV, NKJV (<http://www.av1611.org/niv.html> & <http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1311767813.pdf>). See the Appendix to The KJB Story 1611-2011, which summarises much of the material, with references. (<http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1311768035.pdf>) The Trinitarian Bible Society articles are very helpful here, as is New Age Versions by Sister Riplinger. The verse lists in "O Biblios" show many instances where the testimony of scripture to major doctrine is weakened by modern omissions, alterations etc. Note verses such as Luke 23:42, John 9:35, Acts 8:37, 9:5, 6, 16:31 where modern alterations/omissions distort the MAJOR DOCTRINE of INDIVIDUAL SALVATION. See the study on AV1611 Salvation vs. NIV Damnation.

He's lying about Erasmus and Revelation 22, as the material in "O Biblios" shows.

He's lying about Hebrews 4:8 (and Acts 7:45), as Joshua 5:13-15 show. See remarks in Dr Ruckman's commentaries and Reference Bible.

He's lying about the changes in different KJB editions, of which less than 200 are of any significance and, allowing for the need to correct printers' errors in some early editions, don't affect the text. See material in "O Biblios" and also the reply to Donald Waite, who also dredges up this non issue. Dr Grady's Final Authority discusses this issue and Dr Ruckman's

booklet on the KJB Editions is very informative. I also have Scrivener's list of the variations and, aside, from typos, they are truly minor.

Allowing for obvious typo corrections e.g. insertion of "not" in Exodus 20:14, the KJB given by inspiration of God is any one that you can get your hands on. Like the speaker on YouTube, either YOU or your 'source' won't allow God to edit His own work but the Lord has that privilege the same as any human author and as I understand it, laws on intellectual property rights confirm this. You'll recall that James White pulled this device about different KJB editions in his attempt to humiliate Will Kinney but in doing so, White referred to a new edition of his KJO Controversy Book, yet they are all his intellectual property.

He's lying about meanings of KJB words, which are defined by means of the KJB's built-in dictionary, e.g. see Mark 13:11 for "premeditate." See *The Language of the King James Bible* and *In Awe of Thy Word* both by Sister Riplinger on this subject. If YOU or your 'source' had read the context of Matthew 19:14 and Mark 10:14, he'd have seen why the Lord used the term "suffer." "Study" in 2 Timothy 2:15 does mean "study" as the rest of the verse shows, w.r.t. maintaining right divisions in the scripture, something YOU or 'him' clearly knows nothing about. John 5:39 and Acts 17:11 are parallel passages that help with the word "study." Where the King's men decided that "be diligent" was appropriate, they used it, Titus 3:12, 2 Peter 3:14. It was not appropriate in 2 Timothy 2:15 by comparison with the word "Study."

However much 'Greek' YOU or your 'source' may know, you don't know much Bible.

KJB words DON'T change meaning in the KJB, as the meanings via its built-in dictionary are fixed and not affected by changes in meaning as set out in a secular dictionary – you'll see that like all the critics, You/he resorts to multiple authorities to overthrow the authority of the 1611 Holy Bible. The constancy of meanings in the KJB is one reason why the Lord said Matthew 24:35, something that YOU/him wouldn't understand, of course. It should also be added that modern authors e.g. Dr Lawrence Vance, *Archaic Words* and the Authorized Version, have noted that many supposed archaic words in the KJB are used with those meanings in contemporary literature and that other, secular authors, e.g. Melvin Bragg, have noted many household expressions that are found in the KJB. Some of these are also noted in "O Biblios."

YOU/he is lying about 1 Corinthians 2:13-16, which essentially has to do with comparing scripture with scripture for understanding the scripture, John 6:63, which is a well-established principle of Bible study, though apparently unknown to YOU/him. "Receiveth" in 1 Corinthians 2:14 means "receiveth" as in John 1:12 and in 1 Corinthians 2:12, which YOU/he would have realised if he knew about comparing scripture with scripture.

He's lying about the notion of "exclusive rights" to calling the KJB the 'solely' Holy Bible. No serious KJB believer takes that stance as Sister Riplinger shows in *In Awe of Thy Word* in the chapter Acts 2 to You. She lists many foreign language Bibles that are faithful to the KJB text and work on those Bibles is her current project. Dr Ruckman and his co-workers laboured to get Luther's Bible cheaply available to German believers in the 1980s. However, note the remarks of some folk on the mission field about their preference for the KJB, in the

answers to Peter Amue (See AV ONLY tab on website). YOU/he clearly doesn't know much about the mission field.

He's lying about the so-called 'Majority' Greek Text, which it isn't, being Von Soden's 1913 collation of about 7-8% of available mss. that Von Soden tried to choose for their Alexandrian leanings – see J. A. Moorman's Early Mss. and the Authorized Version, also Gail Riplinger's Blind Guides. The resources used by the King's men encompassed a wide variety of witnesses to "the scripture of truth" Daniel 10:21 including but not limited to a comprehensive array of Greek witnesses. God has vindicated the result of their labours over the last 400 years with revival, reformation and missionary effectiveness. YOU/he can't bear witness to anything like it. His notions about going to "a dying world etc." are just so much cant.

He's lying about so-called additions to and alterations of the word of God (that YOU/he does not define between two covers) via the KJB, as the material in response to Gordon Curley shows (See AV ONLY tab on website), also in "O Biblios." The answer to James White also has similar material, along with answers to obfuscations about the KJB's marginal notes etc.. SW is saying that God can't preserve His word. He can, and He has, Psalm 12:6, 7. See remarks above about God's vindication of the KJB. See also the summary material in The KJB Story 1611-2011.

He's lying about the conspiratorial nature of the modern versions etc. Note that he does not mention even one author of those he purports to have refuted and neither can he reproduce even one quote that is supposedly out of context etc. i.e. he should really put up or shut up on this subject.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's work on this subject is extremely detailed and well-referenced. It is fully endorsed by Dr Ruckman, whose knowledge of the original languages dates from the 1950s – over twice as far back as YOU/him. Benjamin Wilkinson's work is very extensive on the Jesuit intrigue against the 1611 Holy Bible and was published 80 years ago, http://kjv.benabraham.com/html/our_authorized_bible_vindicate.html.

He's lying about agreement between text types, so-called. Dean Burgon showed the degenerate nature of the Westcott-Hort i.e. Alexandrian Text over 100 years ago in the Revision Revised. Burgon also explodes the notion of a 'recension' of the Byzantine i.e. Traditional Text that YOU/he is trying to imply.

He's lying about the perception of the King's men towards their work, which is clearly set out in The Translators to the Reader by Dr Miles Smith. See extracts in The KJB Story 1611-2011. See also In Awe of Thy Word pp 560ff.

*““Seven” times “they purge...and purify it...” (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. The KJV translators did **not** see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations. They wanted their Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, ‘It is good, **except** this word or **that** word...’ They planned:*

“...to make...out of many good ones [Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’], one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark.”

He ends up lying about Erasmus again, see “O Biblios” on Erasmus and about “mistakes” in the KJB. See the replies to Peter Amue, Gordon Curley, James White, the Appendix to The KJB Story 1611-2011 and the material in “O Biblios.” (ALL on the website - YOU NEED TO READ THESE!!!)

In short, YOU/he, is like the character in Chick’s tract Somebody Goofed? www.chick.com/reading/tracts/0003/0003_01.asp. Note that this individual and SW are in virtually complete agreement about the 1611 Holy Bible: “IT’S ONLY WRITTEN BY MEN!” The Lord Jesus Christ describes SW’s mentor in John 8:44.

Now I hope that this has not only been a lesson for you Steve, but also an eye-opener! Are you man enough to take this correction & get back on track???

We shall see!

Correcting the word of God is DEADLY & I would not be so idiotic to think there are 'errors' in the Bible! I would read it, believe it & LIVE it, & then go get some souls WITH IT!

If YOU correct the Bible what does that make YOU???

Now if it was YOUR work, I would repent of your sin to God & humbly submit to THAT BOOK!

If we can help further just give us a tinkle!!!

John E. Davis

Bible Believer

www.timefortruth.co.uk