

## **Twist and Curl – Your Fiendly\* Neighbourhood Bible Correctors, \*NOT a Misspelling!**

### **Each a “crooked serpent” Isaiah 27:1**

#### **Introduction by Alan O’Reilly**

Bro. John Davis’s web site [www.timefortruth.co.uk/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/) receives hundreds of hits per day. Occasionally a saved troll pops up who thinks he has found errors in the 1611 Holy Bible. Mr G. Curley, see below, is one such individual who forwarded an extensive list of so-called errors in the AV1611 to Bro. Davis in early 2011.

Bro. Davis replied incisively to Mr Curley’s objections to the 1611 Holy Bible, with some input from this writer and Bro. Davis uploaded our combined response onto his site. This write-up is a full compilation of that response with some added material.

See [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-7434.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-7434.php).

Another individual, who identified himself as kiwistef in the first part of his email address forwarded the same list to Bro. Davis in early 2012 that Mr Curley had a few months earlier. His objections to the 1611 Holy Bible have therefore been answered simultaneously with Mr Curley’s. Together, therefore, they have furnished the title of this write-up as shown above:

## **Twist and Curl – Your Fiendly\* Neighbourhood Bible Correctors, \*NOT a Misspelling!**

As will become apparent, these supposed fundamentalists, Twist and Curl, took their objections to the 1611 Holy Bible from the heretical cult of the Seventh Day Adventists.

Bro. Davis’s original introduction to our combined response to Mr Curley now follows. His remarks and further introductory remarks apply equally to Twister.

It should be especially noted that in all their objections to **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21, neither Curley nor Twister lay claim to any single document between two covers that they can unequivocally declare is **“all scripture”** that **“is given by inspiration of God”** 2 Timothy 3:16. The Lord Jesus Christ said of such:

**“...for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered”** Luke 11:52.

The Lord also referred to the archetypal Twisters and Curleys as crooked serpents.

**“O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh”** Matthew 12:34.

#### **Introduction by Bro. John Davis, [www.timefortruth.co.uk/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/) - Twist and Curl Part 1**

This is a list of *so-called errors* in the Authorized Version Bible sent in by a Bible corrector named Mr G. Curley. I have named him, as Paul NAMED someone in 2 Tim 4v14 (**Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord reward him according to his works**). The reason I name Bible correctors is because you need to be warned about these so-called ‘Christians’ who are going around trying to get you to distrust & disbelieve the Bible: I mean, would a servant of God really try to get you to distrust your Bible? Not one of them has a Final Authority that they can point to which exists between two covers (i.e. FRONT & BACK with the Scriptures in between!!!)

(Note – these Bible correctors love running back to ‘THE GREEK’, but know this, there is NO SUCH THING as ‘THE’ GREEK!! Don’t be fooled by these charlatans!)

**My Big brother Alan O’Reilly has answered this Bible corrector.**

**His comments are in RED!!!**

*‘Clever Curly’ the Bible corrector writes (his words are in black regular bold)...*

Not one mistake in the AV – which AV? - The King James Bible has undergone three revisions since its inception in 1611, incorporating many, many changes. Which edition of the King James Bible is inspired, therefore?

It underwent many more than 3 revisions, two in 1611 alone, then 1613, 1629, 1638, 1701, 1762, 1769 to name some of the more notable ones. Check the nature of the changes and state how significant they were, supposedly. This objection is a straw man. Scrivener found less than 200 worthy of mention\* and these are all listed in the appendices of his book *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611), Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*. Taking into account typos, easily fixed and even deliberate printers' errors\*\*, none of the 200 amount to any serious changes in the AV1611 Text.

\*As stated by Dr William P. Grady in his book *Final Authority* pp 168-170

\*\*The printer who left "not" out of the 7<sup>th</sup> Commandment in Exodus 20:14 got severely fined. See [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wicked\\_Bible](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wicked_Bible).

Any of them are "all scripture...given by inspiration of God" 2 Timothy 3:16 because they all had the same Author, Who like any human author is free to edit his own work. Check Jeremiah 36:32.

"Then took Jeremiah another roll, and gave it to Baruch the scribe, the son of Neriah; who wrote therein from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the book which Jehoiakim king of Judah had burned in the fire: and there were added besides unto them many like words."

Not one mistake – better not read the following. (Doesn't Curley think he's clever! Here we go, hold on folks...)

No problem. KJB believers have seen it all before. Note the corrections. Note also the unwillingness of the 'better translation' advocates to disclose where *their perfect, inspired, finally authoritative 'better translation' exists between 2 covers.*

#### King James Version Bible (KJV) Translation Errors [Old Testament – according to Twist and Curl]

Below is a partial listing of King James Version (KJV) Bible translation errors. The verse(s) in question are given first and then what is the correct or better translation.

##### Genesis 1:2

**KJV Bible:** "And the earth **was** without form, and void;..."

**Better Translation:** "And the earth **became** without form, and void;..."

**Comments:** The word translated "was" is *hayah* (Hebrew: היה, *Strong's Concordance* Number #H1961) and denotes a condition different than a former condition, as in Genesis 19:26.

**Correction:** The KJB Translators were past masters at the original languages. The critics e.g. James Strong, can be ignored for that reason. See *Which Bible Is God's Word?* pp 72-93 and *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 7 "Strong Delusion" by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger for "a partial listing" of errors in Strong's definitions of Biblical words.

The KJB rendering of Genesis 1:2 shows the then reality. The 'better translation' is a stupid reading because it implies that "darkness became on the face of the deep." Never mind the Hebrew if you can't address the obvious implications of the English.

##### Genesis 10:9

**KJV Bible:** "...Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter **before** the LORD."

**Better Translation:** "...Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter **in place of** the LORD."

**Comments:** The word "before" is incorrect and gives the connotation that Nimrod was a good guy, which is false. Nimrod placed himself in OPPOSITION to God.

The 'better translation' (BT, aka botched translation) is way west. "In place of" does not necessarily mean in opposition to, which is a stupid supposition. Check the references to the term "instead of" in the scripture.

"And he shall be thy spokesman unto the people: and he shall be, even he shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God" Exodus 4:16.

The BT also implies that the Lord is Himself a hunter, which He is not (Job 10:16 notwithstanding). He is a SHEPHERD, Psalm 23, which the BT overlooks.

The word "before" implies nothing of the kind with respect to Nimrod being good. Check Genesis 13:13.

"But the men of Sodom *were* wicked and sinners before the LORD exceedingly."

Leviticus 16:8, 10, 26

**KJV Bible:** "And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the LORD, and the other lot for the **scapegoat**...But the goat, on which the lot fell to be the **scapegoat**, shall be presented alive before the LORD, to make an atonement with him, *and* to let him go for a **scapegoat** into the wilderness...And he that let go the goat for the **scapegoat** shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward come into the camp."

**Better Translation:** "And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the LORD, and the other lot for **Azazel**...But the goat on which the lot fell for **Azazel** shall be presented alive before the LORD, to make an atonement upon it and sent away into the wilderness for **Azazel**...And he that let go the goat for **Azazel** shall wash his clothes and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward come into the camp." (Holy Bible in its Original Order Translation)

**Comments:** The meaning of the word **scapegoat** is different today than it was during the time of the King James translators. The *Online Etymology Dictionary* states concerning the word **scapegoat** and its original meaning that it is:

"...a mistranslation in Vulgate of Hebrew 'azazel (Leviticus 16:8, 10, 26), which was read as 'ez ozel or the "goat that departs," but is actually the proper name of a devil or demon in Jewish mythology..."

Today the word **scapegoat** has the connotation of someone who is UNJUSTLY blamed for the sins of others. The Azazel goat represents Satan, who is no scapegoat. He is guilty of his part in our sins.

**The BT is both stupid and blasphemous. The term "Azazel" is meaningless to a modern reader and Paul says to AVOID Jewish fables, Titus 1:14. "Scapegoat" is correct because the Lord Jesus Christ WAS unjustly blamed for the sins of others, 2 Corinthians 5:21, 1 Peter 2:22. The scapegoat has the sins of the people said over him, Leviticus 16:20-26, again typifying the Lord Jesus Christ in His humiliation, Isaiah 53:6, 12, Hebrews 9:28, 1 Peter 2:24. Note Exodus 12:5.**

**"Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year: ye shall take it out from the sheep, or from the goats:"**

**The BT appears also to BI – Biblically Ignorant.**

Deuteronomy 24:1

**KJV Bible:** "When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: **then let him write** her a bill of divorcement, and give *it* in her hand, and send her out of his house."

**Better Translation:** "When a man takes a wife and marries her, and it happens that she finds no favor in his eyes because he has found some uncleanness in her, **and he writes** her a certificate of divorce, puts it in her hand, and sends her out of his house..."

**Comments:** As the Savior explained in Matthew 19, Moses did not command divorce. This statute is regulating the permission of divorce because of the HARDNESS of the people's hearts.

The 'BT' (Bad Translation) does not even consist of a complete sentence here, which is why the ellipsis has had to be added. The translation is therefore poorly expressed and inferior to the 1611 Holy Bible for that reason alone. The comment is also poorly expressed. Matthew 19:7 states "They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?" By inspection, Matthew 19:7 is not 'commanding' divorce at all. It is simply stating what the Law requires in the case of divorce. In that respect, the comment is correct, in spite of its clumsy wording. The expression "then let him write" in Deuteronomy 24:1 is setting out the procedure of divorce according to the Mosaic Law.

Paul states in 1 Corinthians 7:36 "let him do what he will...let them marry." This wording is similar to that in Deuteronomy 24:1. Paul is not 'commanding' marriage, see the context, especially 1 Corinthians 7:25. He is simply setting out what to do if "need so require."

The BT only muddies the issue and is incorrect for that reason.

## 2 Kings 2:23

**KJV Bible:** "And he went up from thence unto Bethel: and as he was going up by the way, there came forth little children out of the city, and mocked him, and said unto him, Go up, thou bald head; go up, thou bald head."

**Better Translation:** "And he went up from thence unto Bethel: and as he was going up by the way, there came forth young men out of the city, and mocked him, and said unto him, Go up, thou bald head; go up, thou bald head."

Once again, the 1611 Holy Bible is right and the BT is wrong. Elisha had "a double portion" of Elijah's spirit, 2 Kings 2:9-11. If he had been mocked by young men, he'd have sent "fire down from heaven" on them 2 Kings 1:14.

## Isaiah 65:17

**KJV Bible:** "For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind."

**Better Translation:** "For, behold, I am creating [am about to create] new heavens and new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind."

The BT is clearly a sop to Theistic Evolution and abominable for that reason. The comment in brackets is also incorrect with respect to the expression "I am creating," which implies that the creation is already underway, not that it is about to start.

The word "Behold" shows that God is letting Isaiah see His creation of "new heavens and a new earth," according to Isaiah 46:9-10, which is yet future. See under-linings.

"Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure:"

The BT, to be 'consistent' with its mauling of Isaiah 65:17, requires an equally stupid translation in Isaiah 65:18.

"I am creating Jerusalem a rejoicing etc."

Jerusalem has not been, or been becoming "a rejoicing" since Isaiah's time with the possible exception of one day during the First Advent, Palm Sunday John 12:13 and it is not "a rejoicing" now. Revelation 11:8 describes its future condition as "spiritually... called Sodom and Egypt." (The only 'rejoicing' in that context, Revelation 11:10, is a Satanic Saturnalia.)

Again, Isaiah 65:18 describes the scene at the Second Advent, just as Isaiah 65:17 describes the new creation at the end of the Millennium.

Once again, the BT is a mess.

#### Ezekiel 20:25

**KJV Bible:** "Wherefore I gave them also statutes *that were not good*, and judgments whereby they should not live;"

**Better Translation:** "Wherefore I permitted them, or gave them over to, *false statutes that are not good*, and judgments whereby they should not live."

**Comments:** God's laws are good, perfect and right. This verse shows that since Israel rejected God's laws, He allowed them to hurt themselves by following false man made customs and laws.

Once again, observe the clumsy, jerky nature of the BT. None of the supposed improvements read well after the manner of Jeremiah 15:16, "Thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart."

The BT is a tautology, insofar as to permit is to give over to\* and "false statutes" are by definition "not good" so the translation is inferior in that respect as well.

\*The additional phrase "or gave them over to" in the BT appears to have been tacked on as an after-thought. The 1611 Holy Bible does define word meanings, often with the definition in the same verse as the word requiring a definition occurs, but the King's men knew what they were doing, unlike whoever concocted the BT offerings. Where the AV1611 gives a word and its meaning in the same verse, it invariably does so in a way that reads well, makes sense and informs the reader, not as a redundant phrase as the above BT does. Note Mark 13:11.

"But when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost."

See *The Language of the King James Bible* and *In Awe of Thy Word* Parts 1-3 both by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger.

Ezekiel 20:25 in the AV1611 is not denying that "the law is...holy, and just, and good" Romans 7:12, which matches Ezekiel 20:24. It is simply saying that God can punish a sinful people by means of "statutes that were not good." This is the whole essence of Romans 1:24-32, "...God also gave them up...God gave them up...God gave them over..."

Ezekiel 20:25 is also a match mate to Ezekiel 14:9, with respect to false prophets, which the BT overlooks:

"And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the LORD have deceived that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel."

Note also Psalm 18:26:

"With the pure thou wilt shew thyself pure; and with the froward thou wilt shew thyself froward."

Note further Isaiah 45:7:

"I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the LORD do all these things."

The "evil" includes evil statutes, as in Ezekiel 20:25.

#### Daniel 8:14

**KJV Bible:** "And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred **days**; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

**Better Translation:** "And he said unto me, Unto two thousand, three hundred **evenings and mornings**; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

**The BT appears to be a ham-fisted attempt to match Daniel 8:26.**

**"And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days."**

**The vision would refer to the taking away of "the daily sacrifice" Daniel 8:11, 12. This sacrifice was carried out according to Numbers 28:8.**

**"And the other lamb shalt thou offer at even: as the meat offering of the morning, and as the drink offering thereof, thou shalt offer it, a sacrifice made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD."**

**The Antichrist will mostly likely substitute a cannibalistic Catholic 'mass' in the forenoon hour, 1 Kings 18:26, as it is today but with real flesh and real blood, Psalm 14:4, 16:4, Isaiah 6:13.**

**The 1611 Holy Bible simply gives the time period before the sanctuary is cleansed and the BT is wholly unnecessary. The day-year system in Daniel, e.g. Daniel 9:24-27, 12:11, 12, together with the accompanying system in Revelation, Revelation 11:3, 12:6, is daunting enough without complicating the simple word "days."**

#### Malachi 4:6

**KJV Bible:** "And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, **lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.**"

**Better Translation:** "And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, **lest I come and smite the earth with utter destruction.**"

**Comments:** The word **curse** doesn't give the proper sense here. The phrase should be translated as utter destruction as it is in Zechariah 14:11.

**The 1611 Holy Bible does give the correct sense. The BT advocate is clueless.**

**"Utter destruction" in Zechariah 14:11 refers to events surrounding Jerusalem at the battle of Armageddon at the climax of the Second Advent. See Zechariah 14:1-5, 12-15. The term does not refer to the earth as a whole. Indeed it cannot, as Zechariah 14:9 shows. Note that the BT (Bad Translation) of Malachi 4:6 is in direct contradiction with Zechariah 14:9. The BT advocate is not very good at reading the context of the verses he quotes to support his translation aberrations.**

**"And the LORD shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one LORD, and his name one."**

**"Curse" is the correct sense because as Dr Ruckman states in his *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1230 "The Old Testament ends with "a curse" (see Gal. 3:10). The New Testament ends with an "Amen" to "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rev. 22:21), because "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law" (Gal. 3:13)."**

**The correct translation will always harmonize with the principle of "comparing spiritual things with spiritual" 1 Corinthians 2:13 in order to understand the scripture, as above. The 1611 Holy Bible is always correct according to that principle.**

**Bible critics, however, are always loath to apply it.**

Final note on these Old Testament 'errors'...

As you can see from the corrections Alan has made to Curley's ridiculous *suggested-'corrections'*, The Authorized Version is yet again 'vindicated!'

### **There is not one single proven error in the Authorized Version Bible!**

(Please watch this space for Curley's next attack, i.e. on the New Testament, & see Alan's rebuttal!!!)

#### **Introduction by Bro. John Davis - Twist and Curl Part 2**

Here is another list of so called *errors* in the Authorized Version Bible from Curley the Bible 'corrector', & here are the answers to **all of them** from Bible Believer Alan O'Reilly! (Author of "O BIBLIOS" THE BOOK\* – if you would like to purchase a copy of Alan's book (*I can't recommend it highly enough*) please contact me [john.e.davis@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:john.e.davis@hotmail.co.uk)). \*The 2012 text is on [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) - AJO'R.

All Curley has done is 'cut & paste' from a *Seventh Day Adventist* website (*How about that for 'hatred' towards the AV Bible, I mean stooping that low to try to prove that there are errors in the Bible, he has gone to a CULT!!!*)

(The sites are here. See:

The home site is:

[www.biblestudy.org/](http://www.biblestudy.org/).

Note what they say about the Sabbath:

[www.biblestudy.org/godsrest/catholics-challenge-protestants-on-sunday-worship-1.html](http://www.biblestudy.org/godsrest/catholics-challenge-protestants-on-sunday-worship-1.html).

The supposed 'errors' in the AV1611 are given in:

[www.biblestudy.org/basicart/what-are-the-errors-in-king-james-version-bible.html](http://www.biblestudy.org/basicart/what-are-the-errors-in-king-james-version-bible.html).)

This is one of the marks that the AV **IS** the word of God, i.e. by the amount of enemies it has, even *among the ranks!!!*

It would do EVERY Christian good to go through each point that Alan has covered both OT & NT.

Again Alan's comments are in **RED**!

**If you want a copy of the PERFECT word of God, get yourself an Authorized Version Bible!**

**King James Version Bible (KJV) Translation Errors [New Testament – according to Twist and Curl]**

#### **Matthew 5:48**

**KJV Bible:** "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

**Better Translation:** "Become ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

**Comments:** "Perfect" here means "spiritually mature." Sanctification is a process of overcoming with the aid of the Holy Spirit.

**The context of the passage describes what it is to be "perfect." Note the four commands in the following verse. As usual, the BT comment is no more than pious waffle.**

**"But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;" Matthew 5:44.**

**The Lord therefore said "Be ye therefore perfect" because He required the disciples to obey Matthew 5:44 from the moment of speaking, not at some future date, which is implied by the word "become."**

## Matthew 24:22

**KJV Bible:** “And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect’s sake those days shall be shortened.”

**Better Translation:** “And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved **alive**: but for the elect’s sake those days shall be shortened.

**Comments:** This verse needs an additional word to clarify its meaning.

In this case – and possibly in others in this list, the BT is not a translation. It is an insertion without any underlying word for “alive” in either Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> or Ricker Berry’s Edition of Stephanus’s Received Text that mostly matches the AV1611 New Testament. The so-called ‘Majority’ Text of Farstad and Hodges is a third variety of New Testament Greek Text and it doesn’t contain any equivalent word for “alive” either.

See [www.avpublications.com/avnew/content/Critiqued/james5.html](http://www.avpublications.com/avnew/content/Critiqued/james5.html) *The James White Controversy Part 5 and Blind Guides* p 50 both by Dr Mrs Riplinger for an accurate evaluation of the so-called ‘Majority Text.’ However, it is a sufficient witness, 2 Corinthians 13:1, to show that the BT reading “alive” has no textual support from ‘the Greek.’ It is a made-up, pretend reading.

The insertion is also wholly unnecessary. Only living flesh could benefit from a shortening of the days of “great tribulation” Matthew 24:21. The commentator forgot to look at the preceding verse. He is gnawing, Matthew 23:24.

## Matthew 27:49

**KJV Bible:** “The rest said, Let be, let us see whether Elias will come to save him.”

**Better Translation:** “The rest said, Let be, let us see whether Elias will come to save him. **And another took a spear and pierced His side, and out came water and blood.**”

**Comments:** Matthew 27:49 omits text which was in the original. The Moffatt translation correctly adds it, while the RSV puts it in a footnote: “**And another took a spear and pierced His side, and out came water and blood.**”

Again, the addition is not a translation. It is an insertion. The insertion is ridiculous. It makes Jesus dead before crying out for the last time. The commentator forgot to read the next verse.

“Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost” Matthew 27:50.

The correct sequence of events, including the piercing of the Lord’s side, is given in John 19:32-36, by John, who was there, not by Moffat, who wasn’t.

Matthew 28:1, which follows, is an insertion from Twister. Curley omitted it probably because the comments contradict those under Mark 16:9. See **King James Version Bible Punctuation Errors**. Curley appears to have realised the contradiction. Twister didn’t:

Matthew 28:1, “In the end of the sabbath as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week...” should be translated literally, “Now late on Sabbath, as it was getting dusk toward the first day of the week...” The Sabbath does not end at dawn but at dusk.

Ricker Berry’s Edition of Stephanus’s Received Text reads “dusk” instead of “dawn” in line with the BT but Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> and the Farstad-Hodges ‘Majority’ Text each have “dawn,” so the BT has some minority interlinear support.

However, the BT, by inspection, is wrong because it violates Matthew 12:40 in that it does not allow for a full three days and three nights between the crucifixion and the resurrection.

“For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.”



The “three days and three nights” were 6 p.m. Wednesday to 6 p.m. Thursday, 6 p.m. Thursday to 6 p.m. Friday, 6 p.m. Friday to 6 p.m. Saturday. The Lord was *already risen* when “came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre” Matthew 28:1.

“And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay” Matthew 28:5-6.

The BT clearly does not allow for a full “three days and three nights in the heart of the earth” and is wrong for that reason.

The expression “In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week” simply refers to passing from the seventh day of the week in which the Lord was crucified to the first day of the following week, as Mark 16:1-2 show.

“And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun.”

See Dr Ruckman’s commentary *The Book of Matthew* for a detailed study of Matthew 12:40.

#### Luke 2:14

**KJV Bible:** “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.”

**Better Translation:** “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men of God’s good pleasure or choosing.”

**Comments:** There will be peace on earth among men who have God’s good will in their hearts.

The BT is yet another aberration of English expression and the comment is yet more pious waffle that contradicts John 14:27 and 16:33. Peace on earth is separate from peace given by the Lord Jesus Christ to His followers and will not be achieved until the Return of “The Prince of Peace” Isaiah 9:6.

The BT corruption came from Origen and was adopted by the Catholic Church which inserted it into all Catholic bibles, such as the DR, Douai-Rheims and the JB, NJB, Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles. The NWT, New World Translation of the Watchtower cult and the NIV, TNIV, NKJV footnote have similar readings. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 1333 and “*O Biblios*” – *the Book*, by this author, p 68. See p 49 of the uploaded file [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/).

Dean Burgon showed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century that the supporting evidence in favour of the AV1611 reading is overwhelming.

The following item should also be noted with respect to Luke 2:14. It may be that the extract below identifies some of the commentator’s bedfellows.

The item is from the book *The Edge of the Sword* by General Sir Anthony Farrar-Hockley, 1924-2006, pp 259-260.

In April 1951, the late General Sir Anthony Farrar-Hockley was a captain and adjutant in the Gloucestershire Regiment, when it was surrounded by the Communist Chinese and sustained heavy casualties at the battle of the Imjin River during the Korean War. The survivors were then taken prisoner.

General Farrar-Hockley spent two and a half years as a prisoner-of-war and made these observations about a special ‘Christmas’ message delivered to the Allied POWs by a representative of Camp Commandant Ding named Chang on Christmas Day, 1952.

“He began to read from a page of typescript in his hand...It was in the worst possible taste; for after starting mildly, Ding had been unable to restrain his fanaticism for the Communist cause. He quoted – or rather, misquoted – the Scriptures, particularly the teachings of Christ. We heard the beloved Christmas

*words, for instance, rendered as follows: "Peace on earth to men of good will"; and the only men of good will, it seemed, were those who followed the policies of the Cominform group of governments. As Chang read on, the silence seemed to intensify. When he had finished, no one spoke; but I have neither felt nor seen before such profound disgust expressed silently by a body of men."*

The Communist reading is also that of Nestle's 21<sup>st</sup> Edition of the Greek New Testament, found with variation in the modern sources listed above. Nestle's 21<sup>st</sup> Edition reads "on earth peace among men of goodwill" in Luke 2:14. Note in passing that extant Greek sources e.g. Nestle, Ricker Berry, Farstad-Hodges along with their interlinear readings are not trustworthy, even if occasionally they may identify an aberrant reading with no Greek support, see Matthew 24:22 above. Greek sources, however, should never be used to change or, supposedly, to correct or clarify the English Text of the 1611 Holy Bible. See *Hazardous Materials* by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger.

Dr Mrs Riplinger also has this incisive observation from *In Awe of Thy Word* p 544, words emphasised, in agreement with the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. "The Bible appears in many forms – such as Hebrew, Hungarian, English and Polish. The "form" of the Word seemed different at various times, yet it was still Jesus (e.g. the "fiery furnace" (Dan. 3:35), the "babe wrapped in swaddling clothes" (Luke 2:12), when "She supposing him to be the gardener" (John 20:15), and when "his eyes were as a flame of fire" (Rev. 1:14)). When the Word "appeared in another form," as Jesus did, "neither believed they them" (Mark 16:12, 13). Likewise, some still dig for words in haunted Greek graveyards."

Like Twist and Curl.

#### Luke 14:26

**KJV Bible:** "If any man come to me, and **hate** not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."

**Better Translation:** "If any man come to me, and **love less by comparison** his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."

**Comments:** This verse has the unfortunate translation of the Greek word *miseo*, Strong's Concordance Number #3404, as "hate", when it should be rendered "love less by comparison." We are not to hate our parents and family!

The BT is a further clumsy expression that would sound ludicrous as speech.

Inspection of the comment shows that the commentator will use anything to overthrow the AV1611 Text. Thus far he has cited Strong's Concordance, the 'original' (unspecified), the Original Order Translation, The Online Etymology Dictionary and Moffat's (defunct) Translation, 5 different 'authorities' so far.

The commentator can't rightly divide "the word of truth" 2 Timothy 2:15. The Lord spoke in a pre-Calvary, Old Testament setting and the word "hate" is explained in Deuteronomy 33:9, with respect to Levi, Exodus 32:26-28.

"Who said unto his father and to his mother, I have not seen him; neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor knew his own children: for they have observed thy word, and kept thy covenant."

Note how Paul applies the principle of "hate" as an example for the Christian to follow in Philippians 3:8, with respect to anything, even close relationships, that might hold the individual believer back from following the Lord Jesus Christ.

"Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ"

### John 1:17

**KJV Bible:** “For the law was given **by** Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.

**Better Translation:** “For the law was given **through** Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.”

**Comments:** This is another instance of a poor preposition. Moses did not proclaim his OWN law, but the law that GOD gave him to proclaim.

**The commentator is gnat-straining again. The expression “by Moses” does not imply that he was giving his own laws and it is explained in Exodus 24:12.**

**“And the LORD said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and be there: and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written; that thou mayest teach them.”**

**The people of Israel were taught the law by Moses, not through Moses, as Nehemiah 9:13-14 confirm.**

**“Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments: And madest known unto them thy holy sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant:”**

**The correction and the comment are wrong – again.**

### John 1:31, 33

**KJV Bible:** “And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing **with water**...And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize **with water**, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.”

**Better Translation:** “And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing **in water**...And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize **in water**, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.”

**Comments:** Pouring or sprinkling with water is not the scriptural method of baptism, but only thorough immersion in water.

**The method of baptism is not the issue in John 1:31, 33. The issue is the element or medium of baptism. The passage contains two such elements that John is comparing and contrasting. Note the last part on John 1:33, which reads “he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost” that the commentator forgot to read.**

**To be ‘consistent,’ the BT would have to read “he which baptizeth in the Holy Ghost,” which is clearly a nonsense reading.**

**The commentator also forgot to read Matthew 3:17.**

**“I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire:”**

**A ‘consistent’ BT would read “he shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost, and in fire” which again is a stupid reading.**

### John 13:2

**KJV Bible:** “...**And supper being ended**, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon’s son, to betray him;”

**Better Translation:** “...**And during supper**, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon’s son, to betray him;”

**Comments:** This verse is correctly translated in the New Revised Standard Version Bible Translation.

The commentator now has 6 authorities: Strong's Concordance, the 'original' (unspecified), the Original Order Translation, The Online Etymology Dictionary, Moffat's (defunct) Translation and the soon-to-be-defunct NRSV.

The BT is another stupid translation. Apart from finishing up the left-overs (for the purpose of identifying the traitor) John 13:26, 27, the supper was finished according to John 13:4.

"He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself."

The Lord did not interrupt the supper. He followed 1 Corinthians 14:40, which He later had Paul write down.

"Let all things be done decently and in order."

**Acts 12:4**

**KJV Bible:** "And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quarters of soldiers to keep him; intending after **Easter** to bring him forth to the people."

**Better Translation:** "And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after **Passover** to bring him forth to the people."

**Comments:** The Greek word pascha (Greek: πάσχα, Strong's Concordance Number #G3957) in this verse has been inaccurately translated as **Easter**. This word should be translated as **Passover**, which agrees with the translation of pascha as **Passover** as found in Matthew 26:2 and other verses.

**None of the critics can resist taking a swipe at "Easter" in Acts 12:4. The BT commentator/critic of the Holy Bible is as ill-informed as the rest.**

One conspicuously anti-1611 Holy Bible critic is James White, author of *The King James Only Controversy*. Homing in on Acts 12:4, he insists, pp 233-234, 241, by reference to the supposed popular perception of Easter, the writings of the secular historian Josephus with respect to Herod and the term the "feast of the Jews" in John 2:13; 2:23; 6:4, 11:55 that the term "Passover" includes "the days of unleavened bread" so that the term "Easter" cannot be justified on the basis that the Passover for that year was already past.

Drs Gipp<sup>1</sup>, Holland<sup>2</sup> and Moorman<sup>3</sup> have shown that all the critics, including James White, are wrong<sup>4</sup>.

Dr Gipp states, his emphases, "*The days of unleavened bread are NEVER referred to as the Passover. (It must be remembered that the angel of the Lord passed over Egypt on one night, not seven nights in a row...)*"

"Verse 3 shows that Peter was arrested during the days of unleavened bread (April 15-21). The Bible says: "Then were the days of unleavened bread." The Passover (April 14<sup>th</sup>) had already come and gone. Herod could not possibly have been referring to the Passover in his statement concerning Easter. The next Passover was a year away!"

Note that Dr Gipp's books *The Answer Book*, *Gipp's Understandable History of the Bible*, one of the most extensive histories of the KJB in print and his booklet entitled *Answers to the Ravings of a Mad Plunger* that refutes a variety of basic objections to the KJB are all extremely helpful. They are available from Daystar Publishing, [www.daystarpublishing.org/king-james-defense/](http://www.daystarpublishing.org/king-james-defense/).

Dr Holland states, in response to White, "*None of this deals with the fact that in Scripture Passover came before the Days of Unleavened Bread. In Mark 14:1 we read, "After two days was the feast of the passover, and of unleavened bread." Passover precedes the Days of Unleavened Bread even in the New Testament. None of the verses cited by White change this. In fact, three of them simply state that Passover was near (John 2:13; 6:4 and 11:55). John 2:23 speaks of many making a surface pretense of believing in Christ at the feast of the Passover. None of these verses show the two events as being called "Passover" as White states. As for Herod observing the Jewish feasts, this means little because as a politician he*"

*obeyed whatever was [convenient] for him while in political power, including both Jewish and Roman holidays. And, it should be remembered, that this “conspicuous observer of the Jewish customs and rituals” had just put James to death and was himself about to die by the hand of God for setting himself up as a god (Acts 12:21-23; Exodus 20:2-6).”*

*Pastor Moorman states “the word “passover” did not even exist before William Tyndale coined it for his Version of 1526-31. His was also the first English Bible to use “Easter.””*

*The critics do not mention that Tyndale’s New Testament has the word “Easter” in Acts 12:4, even though Tyndale invented the word “Passover.” Pastor Moorman continues, his under-linings.*

*“To begin with, the Passover occurred before the feast of unleavened bread [the actual feast begins on Nisan 15<sup>th</sup>], not after! “And in the fourteenth day of the first month is the passover of the LORD. And in the fifteenth day of this month is the feast: seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten. (Num. 28:16, 17)…”*

*“Herod put Peter in Prison during the days of unleavened bread, and therefore after the Passover. The argument that the translation “Passover” should have been used as it is intended to refer to the entire period is ruled out by the inclusion of “these were the days of unleavened bread.” Scripture does not use the word “Passover” to refer to the entire period [according to the first mention of the word “passover” in Exodus 12:11].”*

*Note also Numbers 33:3.*

*“And they departed from Rameses in the first month, on the fifteenth day of the first month; on the morrow after the passover the children of Israel went out with an high hand in the sight of all the Egyptians.”*

*See also Answers to Your Bible Version Questions by David W. Daniels, Chick Publications, 2003, The Book of Acts by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, pp 355-357 and the Ruckman Reference Bible, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 2009, p 1452. White is wrong with respect to Acts 12:4 and “Easter” and so are all the critics of the 1611 Holy Bible, ‘the Greek’ notwithstanding.*

### **1 Corinthians 1:18**

**KJV Bible:** “For the preaching of the cross is to them that **perish** foolishness; but unto us **which are saved** it is the power of God.”

**Better Translation:** “For the preaching of the cross is to them that **are perishing** foolishness; but unto us **which are being saved** it is the power of God.”

**Comments:** [Salvation](#) is not a destination completely reached in this life. Believers must endure and remain faithful to God to the end of their lives before being fully saved. (See Matthew 24:13, Mark 13:13, 2 Timothy 2:10, etc.)

*The commentator can’t rightly divide “the word of truth” 2 Timothy 2:15. He has confused Church Age salvation with Tribulation salvation, Matthew 24:13, Mark 13:13. In 2 Timothy 2:10, the commentator/critic overlooked the words “with eternal glory.”*

*Paul is not referring in 2 Timothy 2:10 to the Christian’s salvation as such, which is a present and permanent possession for the Christian according to 1 John 5:10-13, after voluntarily receiving the Lord Jesus Christ by faith, John 1:12. Paul describes Christians as adopted sons (generically) of God in Galatians 4:5 and they cannot therefore get ‘unadopted.’*

*The critic also overlooked the word “elect” in 2 Timothy 2:10, which refers to saved individuals within the Body of Christ, who can never get ‘out’ of Christ according to Romans 8:33-39.*

*Note also that as part of his salvation, the Christian is also spiritually circumcised, Colossians 2:10-13 and is “in Christ” as “a new creature” 2 Corinthians 5:17. All these changes are irreversible, by definition.*

The expression “with eternal glory” shows that Paul was constrained to prove that the Lord was faithful to him and sustained him through all his sufferings, 2 Timothy 4:18 so that his Christian readers could take comfort that the Lord would do the same for them and they would be able to endure suffering as he did. They would therefore fulfil the good part of 2 Timothy 2:12 and thereby reap eternal glory.

“If we suffer, we shall also reign with him.”

2 Timothy 2:10 is therefore not in any way speaking of progressive salvation.

The BT reading “are being saved” is, however, part of the false teaching of progressive, works-based salvation. This writer’s book *“O Biblios” – The Book* summarises the heretical nature of the reading “are being saved” as found in 1 Corinthians 1:18, 2 Corinthians 2:15 and similar readings in several other verses in the new versions, pp 171ff, citing Dr Mrs Riplinger’s book *New Age Versions* pp 242ff and Dean Burgon’s work *The Revision Revised* pp 154ff.

See pp 131ff of the uploaded file [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/).

*““The new versions [say]...“have been saved” (Eph 2:8) and “are being saved” (1 Cor. 1:18 et al.). In both of these verses the KJV says “are saved”, which clearly describes the once-for-all-event that occurs when Jesus Christ is received as Saviour. One can only ask, are the new versions Catholic or Christian? Notice how the new versions present the process theology of the New Age and apostate Christianity where initiation commences an incessant course conveying one to salvation...”“*

A table follows in *“O Biblios”*, including 1 Corinthians 1:18 and 2 Corinthians 2:15.

Dr Mrs Riplinger continues, citing Burgon, with respect to the rendering “are being saved.”

*““Dean Burgon, noted Greek scholar, comments on the “are being saved” and “have been saved” rendition of the Greek verbs.*

*“““The schoolboy method of translation is therein exhibited in constant operation throughout. We are never permitted to believe that we are in the company of scholars...the idiomatic rendering of a Greek author into English is a higher achievement by far...”““*

The 1611 Holy Bible realised that achievement. The BT did not.

### 1 Corinthians 15:29

**KJV Bible:** “Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?”

**Better Translation:** “Else what shall they do which are baptized for the **hope of the** dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the **hope of the** dead?”

Again, the BT is ludicrous and misses the entire point of 1 Corinthians 15:29, as even the verse itself testifies, with the words “if the dead rise not all? Baptism pictures the death, burial and resurrection of both the Lord Jesus Christ and the saved sinner who is in Christ according to Romans 6:3-5 and Ephesians 4:5. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* pp 1528-1529, 1556-1557.

Paul is saying that the dead to whom he refers have no hope, if no resurrection is possible and he concludes therefore that both baptism and his ministry, which incurs great trial and hardship, would then be to no purpose, 1 Corinthians 15:30-32.

He makes these sombre statements in order to emphasise the importance of the resurrection, the bodily aspect of which he goes on to describe in 1 Corinthians 15:50-54. He has earlier stated his own position clearly with respect to the resurrection, in 1 Corinthians 15:20.

**“But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept.”**

Once again, the BT has only muddled “the scripture of truth” Daniel 10:21.

## 2 Corinthians 6:2

**KJV Bible:** "(For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in **the** day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now *is* the accepted time; behold, now *is* the day of salvation.)"

**Better Translation:** "(For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in **a** day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now *is* the accepted time; behold, now *is* the day of salvation.)"

**Comments:** This verse in the New Testament is a quote from Isaiah 49:8 which writes about **a day**, NOT **the day**, of salvation. The day of salvation is not the same for each individual. The firstfruits have their day of salvation during this life. The rest of humanity will have their full chance at salvation in the second resurrection.

**Again, the commentator has lapsed into false teaching. The first fruits to which he refers are those who ascended with the Lord Jesus Christ at His Ascension, Ephesians 4:8, not anyone experiencing this life now.**

**The commentator doesn't understand that an author is free to edit his own work and to make free quotations from it, the Author in this case being God. See remarks under the comments on the AV1611 Editions. See also the *Ruckman Reference Bible* pp 1238, 1499-1500. Paul therefore, under the "inspiration of God" 2 Timothy 3:16, makes free quotes in Romans 9:25 and again in 2 Corinthians 6:2.**

**2 Corinthians 6:2 does not refer primarily to the particular day that any individual got saved, as is evident in the verse itself. God does not succour the individual on the day of his conversion alone. God's succour for his "new creature" 2 Corinthians 5:17 is steadfast from then on, Hebrews 13:5.**

**"The day of salvation" is the time interval since Pentecost in Acts 2, when God offers the gift of salvation by grace through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ to everyone willing to receive it, John 1:12, Ephesians 2:8, 9, extending until the Lord's Return.**

**The offer closes forever on the day of the Rapture, 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17. See Dr Ruckman's commentary on *The Books of First and Second Corinthians* pp 469-470.**

**The false teacher with his BT (Botched Translation) appears totally unaware of these facts.**

## 2 Thessalonians 2:10

**KJV Bible:** "And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that **perish**; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."

**Better Translation:** "And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that **are perishing**; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."

**The BT supporter didn't read the verse. It said "they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." "Received not" is past tense. The word "perish" refers to unsaved sinners who've died and gone to hell and to unsaved sinners who are as good as dead and in hell even now, like the unsaved woman in 1 Timothy 5:6.**

**"But she that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth."**

**Note also Ephesians 2:1.**

**"And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins;"**

**The individual is either "quickened...together with Christ" Ephesians 2:5 or "dead in trespasses and sins." Where salvation is concerned he is either among them who "are saved" 1 Corinthians 1:18, 2 Corinthians 2:5 or who "perish."**

**No intermediate state of either salvation or damnation exists, which is why Paul wrote 2 Thessalonians 2:11-12 that the BT supporter forgot to read.**

**“And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.”**

The statement “might be damned” does not imply ‘might be or might not be’ – see how the word “might” is used in Hebrews 10:36. 2 Thessalonians 2:12 simply says that to disbelieve is to “be damned” or to “perish” as in John 3:36.

**“He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.”**

John 3:36 clearly allows for no intermediate state of ‘are being damned’ or ‘are perishing.’ Neither does the correct wording of 2 Thessalonians 2:10 as found in the 1611 Holy Bible.

#### **1 Timothy 4:8**

**KJV Bible:** “For bodily exercise profiteth **little**: but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.”

**Better Translation:** “For bodily exercise profiteth **for a little time**: but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.”

The BT is wrong because it limits revelation. It is true that “bodily exercise profiteth” for the period of one’s natural lifespan that James 4:14 states “is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away” but the sense of the verse is that bodily exercise is profitable mainly for the flesh, which one day will be corrupt, regardless of how well it is exercised bodily, Galatians 6:8.

By contrast, “godliness is profitable unto all things” because, for example, it brings intimacy with God in this life, Isaiah 66:1, 2 and great reward in the life “that which is to come.” See 1 Corinthians 3:10-14 and the potential rewards of crowns at “the judgment seat of Christ” Romans 14:10, 1 Corinthians 9:25, 1 Thessalonians 2:19, 2 Timothy 4:8, James 1:12, 1 Peter 5:4.

The 1611 Holy Bible covers all these applications. The BT does not.

#### **1 Timothy 6:10**

**KJV Bible:** “For the love of money is **the** root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”

**Better Translation:** “For the love of money is **a** root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”

The BT (Bad Translation) opts for the wrong reading for reasons that will be apparent from this extract from this author’s earlier work “*O Biblios*” – *The Book*, pp 196-197.

See p 150 of the uploaded file [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/).

More details are available in the work *Whitewashed: A Critique of James White*, by the same author, available from A. V. Publications.

The following extract refers to another Bible critic of the same mindset as the current one.

*“Our critic’s next “wrong inclusion” is in 1 Timothy 6:10, where “the root of all evil”, AV1611, should be “a root of all kinds of evil” as in the NIV, NWT, Ne [Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> Edition] and the renderings of the other Greek texts [Ricker Berry is also wrong here]. The JB has “the root of all evils”.*

*“The modern alteration is not surprising because like all modern versions, the NIV is bound by Copyright. Gail Riplinger states in New Age Bible Versions pp 171-172 “At the root of all the rhetoric about the need for new versions lies the true cause - covetousness...The KJV is the only version not bound by a copyright. No author or publisher receives a royalty because God is the author. However, “God is not the author of confusion” (1 Corinthians 14:33) or of “commercial ventures.” The latter term was used to describe the*



ASV (NASB, Living Bible), RV (RSV) and 'New' Greek Text by Philip Schaff the chairman of their American Committee...

““The autobiography of J.B. Phillips (NASB Interlinear Greek-English New Testament Forward, J.B. Phillips Translation, Living Letters et al) likewise lays bare his beliefs (about his billfold). He not only expects to receive royalties from the sale of these versions but those who use “extended quotes”...must expect to pay a proper copyright fee.”

““Is it any wonder new version editors twist or water down verses which warn of seeking wealth?” 1 Timothy 6:10 is just such a verse.

“Pastor Rockwood of Halifax, N.S., Canada cited The Wall Street Journal, Nov. 16<sup>th</sup>, 1978 in his review of the NIV: “Zondervan Corp. believes it has struck a new vein of gold in an ancient and well-mined lode: the Bible. Accordingly, it told analysts here, it raised its already-gleaming sales and earnings forecasts...Zondervan raised its earnings prediction 10 cents a share, to \$1.85, and its sales prediction \$3 million to \$41 million, for the year.”

“Our critic was rather put out in his letter that I had attributed “the lowest possible motives to textual critics and translators.” In view of the above, how could their motives be any lower?”

The current critic shares the same base motives.

#### Hebrews 4:8-9

**KJV Bible:** “For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day. There remaineth therefore a **rest** to the people of God.”

**Better Translation:** “For if Joshua had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day. There remaineth therefore a **keeping of a sabbath** to the people of God.”

The BT substitutes the incorrect reading “Joshua” in the passage, ignoring the pre-incarnate appearance of the Lord Jesus Christ in Joshua 5:13-15 and therefore subverting the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. See Dr Ruckman’s commentaries on the books of *Hebrews*, pp 77-78 and *Acts* pp 254ff, for Acts 7:45, with respect to the correct reading “Jesus.” See also the *Ruckman Reference Bible*, pp 347-348, 1441 and note the cross reference to Exodus 23:20-23.

The expression “keeping of a sabbath” is totally incorrect for Hebrews 4:9, which describes the spiritual rest that the Christian experiences through the finished work of the Lord Jesus Christ at Calvary, as Hebrews 4:10 shows (the Bible botcher forgot to read this verse as well, it seems).

“For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his.”

No Christian ‘works’ to get saved or to stay saved. He has “rest” from works in that sense. He works because he is saved. See Romans 3:24-28, Ephesians 2:8-10, Titus 3:5, 6, 8.

The reading “keeping of a sabbath” in Hebrews 4:9 obscures all the above essentials of Christian salvation and is therefore about as grotesque an error as it gets.

#### Revelation 14:4

**KJV Bible:** “These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, *being the firstfruits* unto God and to the Lamb.”

**Better Translation:** “These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, *being a firstfruits* unto God and to the Lamb.”

**Comments:** This verse should be translated with “a firstfruits” because the 144,000 are not all the firstfruits of God.

**'Botcher' didn't read the verse (typical). Revelation 14:4 said "the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb" not "the firstfruits of God." The individuals in Revelation 14:4 are a special group. They are "the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb" because "they...follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth" and because in Revelation 14:5 "they are without fault before the throne of God."**

**Which is much more than can be said for 'Botcher' and his BT efforts thus far.**

#### **Revelation 20:4-5**

**KJV Bible:** "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received *his* mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This *is* the first resurrection."

**Better Translation:** "And I saw thrones, and they sat on them, and judgment was committed to them. Then I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded for their witness to Jesus and for the word of God, who had not worshiped the beast or his image, and had not received his mark on their foreheads or on their hands. And they lived and reigned with Christ for a thousand years. But the rest of the dead did not live again until the thousand years were finished. **This is the first resurrection.**" (New King James Version Bible Translation)

**Comments:** The last part of verse five, which states "**This is the first resurrection.**" can seem a bit confusing. This verse refers back to "**they lived and reigned with Christ for a thousand years.**" found in verse 4.

**Note first that the commentator now has 7 authorities: Strong's Concordance, the 'original' (unspecified), the Original Order Translation, The Online Etymology Dictionary, Moffat's (defunct) Translation, the soon-to-be-defunct NRSV and the sterile NKJV.**

**The only apparent difference in the readings under consideration is that the word "is" is in italics in the 1611 Holy Bible but is displayed in regular type in the NKJV reading.**

**However, both hard and online copies of the NKJV show that the word "is" is actually in italic type in Revelation 20:5 of the NKJV, so its reading is no different from that of the 1611 Holy Bible. (The NKJV's insertion of "for" into the expression "they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years" adds nothing of substance to the expression.)**

#### **Revelation 20:10**

**KJV Bible:** "And the devil that deceived them **was** cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet *are*, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever."

**Better Translation:** "And the devil that deceived them **were** cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet *are*, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever."

**Comments:** Verse 10 of Revelation 20 should state "**were cast**" into the lake of fire because the beast and false prophet were mortal human beings who were burned up in the lake of fire 1,000 years previous to this time (Revelation 19:20). The point is that Satan will be cast into the **same** lake of fire into which the beast and false prophet were cast a thousand years previously.

**The BT is, once again, a stupid reading because it is grammatically incorrect, using the plural verb "were" with a singular subject "the devil." Expressions like "he was," singular and "they were," plural, are grammatically correct but the expression "he were" is grammatically incorrect when used as part of a sentence like Revelation 20:10.**

#### **Revelation 22:2**

**KJV Bible:** “In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, *was there* the tree of life, which bare twelve *manner of* fruits, *and* yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree *were* for the **healing** of the nations.”

**Better Translation:** “In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, *was there* the tree of life, which bare twelve *manner of* fruits, *and* yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree *were* for the **health** of the nations.”

“Health” is another stupid reading because it ignores Revelation 21:24, which shows that these nations are made up of saved Gentiles, who by definition will be ‘healthy.’ See the *Ruckman Reference Bible pp 1668-1669.*

“And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it.”

“Healing of the nations” is what will be needed at the time of Revelation 22:2 because these saved Gentiles will have endured the apostasy and devastation of the final Satanic rebellion of Revelation 20:7-9, followed by the judgement of the Great White Throne, Revelation 20:11, where they will be among those being judged, Revelation 20:13 and where they will see souls “cast into the lake of fire” Revelation 20:15 who fail the judgement.

After those harrowing experiences, many of “them which are saved” will no doubt need some kind of healing for their “whole spirit and soul and body” 1 Thessalonians 5:23 for a time and “the leaves of the tree” will provide it. (NHS prescriptions will no longer be needed or indeed in effect.)

Curley continues as follows:

**Which italicized words in the King James Bible are INCORRECT?**

No language can be translated word for word into another language. Hebrew and Greek idioms often do not come through clearly into literal English. Thus, beginning in 1560 with the Geneva Bible, translators initiated the practice of ADDING italicized words they felt clarified and made it easier to understand what the original language was stating for a particular verse. The fifty-four King James translators did the same. Many times their added italicized words DO help make the meaning of a particular passage clearer. At other times, however, they erroneously added words based on their biases and misunderstandings of Biblical doctrine.

The commentator is lying with respect to this last sentence, as the examples below will show. The first so-called error in italicized words is supplied by Twister, not Curley, who left it out.

In Psalms (sic) 81:4, “*was*” is totally uncalled for and not in the original Hebrew. **New Moons are still a statute of God.**

Psalms 81:4 states “For this was a statute for Israel, and a law of the God of Jacob.”

It is the critic’s omission of the verb “*was*” that is totally uncalled for and totally stupid as well. The omission results in a sentence without a principal clause and a reading divorced from its context that doesn’t make sense. Twister has also overlooked the SDA heresy in the comment to the effect that “**New Moons are still a statute of God.**” They are not. See remarks under Colossians 2:16, 17 below where the SDA heresy of observing days etc. emerges again. Twister and Curley both missed it.

Note Paul’s lament over the Galatian Church for falling into this exact same heresy.

“But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain” Galatians 4:9-11.

Twister and Curley missed Galatians 4:9-11 as well.

**“But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.”**

#### **Matthew 24:24**

**KJV Bible:** “For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if *it were* possible, they shall deceive the very elect.”

**Comments:** This verse should NOT have the italicized words “*it were*.” It IS possible for the elect to be deceived. We need to be on guard!

**The commentator doesn’t realise that removal of the italics does not change the sense of the statement. The italics have clearly been inserted so that the sentence reads more smoothly.**

#### **Luke 3:23-38**

**KJV Bible:** “And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was *the son* of Heli, Which was *the son* of Matthat, which was *the son* of Levi, which was *the son* of Melchi, which was *the son* of Janna, which was *the son* of Joseph...”

**Comments:** The italicized words “*the son*” are not in the original Greek. Actually, Luke gives the fleshly descent of the Savior through Mary, while Matthew gives the legal descent through Joseph.

**Insertion of the words “the son” is necessary for good English. It should be noted that, typically for Bible critics, the commentator has not disclosed where he has accessed “the original Greek” i.e. he has never seen “the original Greek” and is therefore lying.**

**Note however that the commentator now has 8 authorities; Strong’s Concordance, the ‘original’ (unspecified), the Original Order Translation, The Online Etymology Dictionary, Moffat’s (defunct) Translation, the soon-to-be-defunct NRSV, the sterile NKJV and “the original Greek.”**

#### **John 8:28**

**KJV Bible:** “Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am *he*, and *that* I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.”

**Comments:** The “*he*” in italics was NOT spoken by Jesus. This added word completely obscures the fact that Jesus was claiming to be the great “**I AM**” of the Old Testament (Exodus 3:14, John 8:58).

**Removal of the word “he” results in ungrammatical English. Far from being a confirmation of “the great “I AM” of the Old Testament,” the removal is actually an attack on the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ because close inspection of the sentence shows that it then reads “...then shall ye know that I am..., and that I do nothing of myself...”**

**The meaning in English would then be that the Lord is saying “...I am...nothing of myself...”**

**The commentator’s stance is therefore not only wrong but blasphemous, especially in the light of John 10:36.**

**“Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?”**

**The Lord in John 8:28 is simply reiterating what He said in John 8:19, 24, 25, namely His testimony with respect to God as “my Father.” Note John 8:24.**

**“I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.”**

## Romans 1:7

**KJV Bible:** "To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called *to be* saints: Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ."

**Comments:** The italicized words "*to be*" were added in error. True Christians are NOW saints.

**That is exactly what the expression "to be" means. It means a present continuous state of being. If the expression is removed, it is possible that the "beloved of God" in Rome are NOT saints but only 'called' saints. Note in Acts 24:14 that what is called "heresy" is NOT "heresy."**

**"But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets:"**

## 1 Corinthians 7:19

**KJV Bible:** "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God."

**Comments:** This verse actually NEEDS some italicized words to make the meaning clear, such as: "*For* circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, *rather the important thing is* the keeping of the commandments of God."

**The commentator is here imposing his own "private interpretation" 2 Peter 1:20 on the reading, which he does not have the authority to do.**

**Moreover, his private interpretation is wrong.**

**Paul is simply saying that circumcision, or uncircumcision is a matter of whether or not God commands either of them. He does not in the New Testament. The state of circumcision (or not) is therefore not an issue.**

**That is why Paul wrote 1 Corinthians 7:18, 20, which the commentator overlooked.**

**"Is any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised."**

**"Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called."**

## Colossians 2:16-17

**KJV Bible:** "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath *days*: Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body *is* of Christ."

**Comments:** These verses can only be properly understood if the italicized word "*is*" in verse 17 is left out. The message of these verses is to NOT let men judge you as doing wrong when you observe God's holy days, new moons and sabbaths; let the body of Christ (the Church) do the judging.

**The comment is both stupid and heretical, in keeping with the SDA source for this list of supposed errors in the AV1611. See Introduction by Bro. John Davis - Twist and Curl Part 2. The passage says nothing about the church judging anything and Colossians 2:17 is nonsensical if the word "is" is removed.**

**Paul is saying that the body of believers now is of Christ, Colossians 2:6, 7, not of any of the ceremonies listed, which actually point to a future time, AFTER the body leaves, 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17. See Dr Ruckman's commentary, *The Books of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians* pp 558ff.**

**The "is" in italics must remain. It is the commentator and his unbiblical comments that should be deleted.**

## 1 Timothy 3:11

**KJV Bible:** “Even so *must* **their** wives *be* grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things.”

**Comments:** The “**their**” is unwarranted and not implied in the original language.

The “**their**” is entirely warranted. It refers to “deacons” in 1 Timothy 3:8 and “them” in 1 Timothy 3:10. 1 Timothy 3:11 becomes detached from the context of the passage if the “**their**” is omitted.

Moreover, Paul has set out the principles of godly behaviour for all women in the church in 1 Timothy 2:9-15, including wives. That is another reason why Paul is referring explicitly to the wives of deacons in 1 Timothy 3:11.

## 2 Peter 2:5

**KJV Bible:** “And spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth **person**, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly;”

**Comments:** This verse should not have “**person, a**” in it. Noah was the eighth preacher of righteousness.

**Chapter and verse?** The commentator gives no chapter and verse for Noah as the eighth preacher of righteousness. He is lying.

He also forgot 1 Peter 3:20, which shows why Noah is called “the eighth person.”

“Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.”

## 1 John 2:23

**KJV Bible:** “Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: *(but) he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also.*”

**Comments:** The phrase in italics was added based upon the Latin text and is not in the original Greek language for the verse.

The commentator gives no chapter and verse to show that “the original Greek language” or any Greek source for that matter should be finally authoritative, so his implication to this effect can be ignored.

Dr Ruckman states in the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1635 with respect to 1 John 2:23 that “*Since the AV translators added ten words to the text in 1611, all ten have been found in Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and fifteen other sources.*”

The TBS, Quarterly Record, October-December 1975, No. 453 identifies the following sources for the second part of 1 John 2:23 in the 1611 Holy Bible, besides the Latin Vulgate. The list, according to the TBS, is not exhaustive.

“*Codices Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Ephraemi, the Palestinian and Harkelian Syriac, Memphitic and Armenian versions, Origen, Eusebius, Cyprian, Hilary*” i.e. 12 in all.

Dr Hills states in *The King James Version Defended* p 221, [wilderness-cry.net/bible\\_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html](http://wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html).

“*[A]t 1 John 2:23 the King James translators followed the Great Bible and the Bishops’ Bible in adding the clause, he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also, and in placing the clause in italics, thus indicating that it was not found in the majority of the Greek manuscripts or in the earlier editions of the Textus Receptus. Beza included it, however, in his later editions, and it is found in the Latin Vulgate and in Aleph [Sinaiticus] and B [Vaticanus]. Hence modern versions have removed the italics and given the clause full status. The Bishops’ Bible and the King James Version join this clause to the preceding by the word but, taken from Wyclif. With customary scrupulosity the King James translators enclosed this but*

*in brackets, thus indicating that it was not properly speaking part of the text but merely a help in translation.”*

It is up to the critic to show how and why this clause found its way into so many diverse and ancient sources if it is spurious (which it is not), especially when the well-known tendency of some of those sources e.g. Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, is to OMIT genuine passages of scripture, such as Mark 16:9-20 and John 8:1-11 in the case of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

The critic does not do so. His attempt to cut out the clause “[but] he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also” is spurious, not the clause itself, which is a genuine statement of scripture that God has honoured in the 1611 Holy Bible for 400 years.

Additional material on 1 John 2:23 is as follows. Unlike Twister and Curley, Bro. Shue is a genuine Biblical researcher.

See [[groups.yahoo.com/group/KingJamesBible/message/13342](https://groups.yahoo.com/group/KingJamesBible/message/13342)].

*“IS FIRST JOHN 2:23 GENUINE SCRIPTURE?*

*“By Martin A. Shue*

*“Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: (but) [he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also].*

*“First John 2:23 proves the superiority of our AV / KJV.*

*“The phrase in question, “...(but) he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also.”, stands in italics (brackets) in our AV. The KJV translators placed these words in italics to show the reader that these words were not found in the Greek text from which they translated the NT. This in no way meant that they were not aware of some of the Greek support for the phrase. They were well aware of the Greek support extant at that time, as well as the support of the early versions.*

*“The phrase is found in the Old Latin (150 AD), the Syriac, the Coptic, the Arabic and the Vulgate. This alone is some strong evidence for the reading. Some of the Early English versions also contained the reading.*

*“The first English translation by John Wycliffe (1380) contained the phrase. Likewise, the Great Bible (Cranmer), the Bishop’s Bible and the Rheims Bible all contained the phrase in question.*

*“Tyndale and the Geneva Bible did not contain the phrase which is even further proof as to why God guided the translation of our KJV in 1611.*

*“Though the Greek support was scarce in 1611 it DID exist.*

*“What is so amazing is that since 1611 many Greek MSS have been unearthed that testify to the reading of our AV. Just a few of these MSS would be Aleph and B (imagine that!), Psi, C, 33, 614, 630, 1505, 1739 and others. Clarke notes the following, “It is found in A, B, C, and in between twenty and thirty others of the best authority.” It is also found in the Greek texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth, Scholz, W-H and N-A.*

*“The phrase is not without strong attestation from the ECF’s [Early Church Fathers] either. It is quoted without question by Athanasius, Cyril, Cyprian, Augustine, and many others.*

*“The phrase is certainly genuine and by the great providence of God our translators were guided by the Holy Ghost to place the phrase in the Biblical text.”*

Curley’s (and Twister’s) next set of supposed errors in the AV1611 are as follows.

## King James Version Bible Punctuation Errors

### Mark 16:9

**KJV Bible:** “Now when *Jesus* was risen early the first *day* of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.”

**Better Translation:** “Now after Jesus had risen, early the first day of the weeks, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.”

**Comments:** There is a missing implied comma between “risen” and “early.” Jesus was NOT resurrected on a Sunday morning. Jesus died on a Wednesday and was resurrected Saturday evening, a FULL three days as was prophecied.

Again, the critic didn't read the verse. Mark 16:9 is simply saying that early on the first day of the week, the Lord was risen, i.e. already risen, not that He came out of the tomb on Sunday morning. He arose 6 p.m. Saturday evening. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* pp 1257-1258.

Note remarks under Matthew 28:1 under King James Version Bible (KJV) Translation Errors [New Testament – according to Twist and Curl]. The critic has contradicted himself in his comments under Matthew 28:1 versus those under Mark 16:9. As indicated, Curley seems to have realised the contradiction and so omitted Matthew 28:1. Curley therefore appears to have been a little more observant than Twister, though that is not saying a great deal.

### Luke 23:43

**KJV Bible:** “And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To day shalt thou be with me in paradise.”

**Better Translation:** “And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee To day, shalt thou be with me in paradise.”

**Comments:** This verse has been used by some to claim that Jesus went straight to heaven at His death. The original Greek did not have punctuation marks as we do today. The clarifying comma after “thee” should be moved to after the words “To day.” The believing malefactor would be with Christ in the paradise of the redeemed when he was resurrected not right after his death but FAR INTO THE FUTURE as part of the second resurrection of the dead.

The comment is a lie. The Lord's soul went to paradise or Abraham's bosom Luke 16:22 in the heart of the earth and the soul of the thief accompanied Him, Matthew 12:40 as the Lord promised in Luke 23:42. The thief went to heaven with the Lord when He ascended in Ephesians 4:8 and is there now. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 1557.

Leave the 1611 Holy Bible punctuation as is.



### Introduction by Bro. John Davis – Twist and Curl Part 3

This is part three of Curley's attack on the Authorized Version Bible & this is the third lesson he gets from Alan O'Reilly. You would have thought that poor old Curley would have learnt his lesson by now, but these Bible 'correctors' never do! **For if a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself.** Gal. 6v3 - This is an apt verse for Curley! (*Why is it that Bible 'correctors' are so arrogant?*) **For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.** Rom. 12v3

Go get him Alan! (Alan's comments are again in red!)

#### **Erroneous Additions to the King James Version Bible – according to Curley!**

The following additions should be DELETED from the King James Version Bible. These additions were derived from the Latin Vulgate, a Roman Catholic Bible translation created by Jerome in 338 A.D. His translation was based on **CORRUPTED Greek texts.**

**The above statement is a lie, as will be shown. The sources in support of the AV1611 readings are numerous and varied. It is up to the critic to prove that they are corrupt in the readings that match the text of the 1611 Holy Bible. He has not and will not.**

**It should also be noted that none other than Charles Taze Russell, founder of the so-called Jehovah's Witnesses aka Watchtower, stated that "The basis for our Common Version [AV1611] is the Latin Vulgate" (Raleigh Herald, West Virginia, June 8, 1911). See *The Word: God Will Keep It* by Joey Faust, Fundamental Books, 2011, p 160, [www.KingdomBaptist.org](http://www.KingdomBaptist.org).**

**Twist and Curl are therefore caught up in not one but two heretical cults in their antagonism to the 1611 Holy Bible, Seventh Day Adventists and Watchtower.**

**Note that available versions of Wycliffe's Bible support some of the AV1611 readings that Twist and Curl want to cut out of Holy Scripture. Elsewhere, available versions of Wycliffe's Bible display the omission. See *Wycliffe Vs Cloud* [www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads/PDF/WycliffVSCloud.pdf](http://www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads/PDF/WycliffVSCloud.pdf) by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger for the explanation of the corruptions made to Wycliffe's Bible to conform it to Jerome's Vulgate. Virtually all available versions of Wycliffe's Bible exhibit these corruptions.**

**Concerning Jerome's Vulgate and the King James translators, Dr Mrs Riplinger, a genuine researcher unlike Twist and Curl, has this statement from her book *Hazardous Materials* pp 646-647.**

**"Scrivener is unscholarly in assuming something that opposes everything that the KJB translators ever said in print. On the title page of their New Testament the KJB translators said they used the "Originall Greek," not any Vulgate readings.**

**"Their detailed notes, taken by translator John Bois, never mention the Latin Vulgate Bible. They list many other sources for reference, including one reference to the "Italian" Bible, and two to the "Old Latin," but NEVER to the Latin Vulgate (Ward Allen, *Translating for King James: Notes Made by a Translator of King James's Bible*, Vanderbilt University Press, 1969, pp. 41, 47, 113). The Italian Diodati and the Old Latin are pure editions. Scrivener did not have access to these recently discovered notes of the translators. Therefore what he "assumed" has been proven wrong and Scrivener's text along with it...**

**"Again, the KJB translators expressly stated that they did not follow the Latin Vulgate. A very large percentage of the KJB [translators'] introductory "The Translators to the Reader" was taken up to express their utter contempt for the Catholic church and its Latin Vulgate."**

**Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly draws attention to the following criticisms of Jerome's Vulgate in *The Translators to the Reader*, with respect to the errors in the Jerome's Vulgate and the alterations between editions. See [www.kjvbibles.com/kjppreface.htm](http://www.kjvbibles.com/kjppreface.htm). Emphases as under-linings are those of Dr Mrs Riplinger and this writer.**

*“For by this meanes it commeth to passe, that whatsoever is sound alreadie (and all is sound for substance, in one or other of our editions, and the worst of ours farre better then their autentike vulgar)...For what varieties have they, and what alterations have they made, not onely of their Service bookes, Portesses and Breviaries, but also of their Latine Translation?...Nay, doth not Sixtus Quintus confesse, that certaine Catholikes (he meaneth certainte of his owne side) were in such an humor of translating the Scriptures into Latine, that Satan taking occasion by them, though they thought of no such matter, did strive what he could, out of so uncertaine and manifold a varietie of Translations, so to mingle all things, that nothing might seeme to be left certaine and firme in them, &c? Nay, further, did not the same Sixtus ordaine by an inviolable decree, and that with the counsell and consent of his Cardinals, that the Latine edition of the olde and new Testament, which the Council of Trent would have to be authentike, is the same without controversie which he then set forth, being diligently corrected and printed in the Printing-house of Vatican? Thus Sixtus in his Preface before his Bible. And yet Clement the eight his immediate successour, publisheth another edition of the Bible, containing in it infinite differences from that of Sixtus, (and many of them waightie and materiall) and yet this must be authentike by all meanes. What is to have the faith of our glorious Lord JESUS CHRIST with Yea and Nay, if this be not [2 Corinthians 1:18, 19]?”*

The critic is therefore lying, again.

### Matthew 27:35

**Text to Remove:** “that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.”

Dr J. A. Moorman reports in *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* p 38 that the clause is found in 3 uncial mss., Delta, Theta, Phi and in over 30 cursive mss., including the well-known Families 1, 13, the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation and in the Received Texts\* of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir.

\*Overall, these editions are the most trustworthy of the published Greek sources with respect to bearing witness to the *Greek text underlying* the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament, though none of them follow it precisely, exhibiting scores of departures from it. It should be remembered that these editions are *not* in authority over the AV1611 and their interlinear English readings, see remarks above on Matthew 28:1 and Ricker Berry’s incorrect reading, may *not* be trustworthy. See *Hazardous Materials* Chapters 17, 18, 19 for more details on the most prominent editions of the Received Text available today.

Moorman reports that the clause is also found in 10 Old Latin mss.. Wilkinson\* states that the text of the Old Latin version dates from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD. Though extant copies have suffered corruption, the Old Latin was the text of faithful Bible believers, not Romanists, who later introduced corruptions. See [kiv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html](http://kiv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html).

\*Wilkinson, it should be noted, was a Seventh Day Adventist. However, unlike Twister and Curley, he did not use Adventist sources to change the 1611 Holy Bible with error. His work *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* [kiv.benabraham.com/html/our\\_authorized\\_bible\\_vindicated.html](http://kiv.benabraham.com/html/our_authorized_bible_vindicated.html) remains, in this writer’s considered view, one of the most comprehensive studies on the true history of the Holy Bible available.

Dr Ruckman in *The Christian’s Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* p 98 shows that the corruptions in the Old Latin consist of departures from the text of the 1611 Holy Bible, not matches with it. Dr Ruckman explains that Jerome, Origen and Augustine were the main corrupters of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century Old Latin text.

The corrupt Critical Text, so-called, actually Minority Text, such as Nestle’s and the corrupt modern versions, RV 1881 Revised Version, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB Catholic Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles, NWT Watchtower’s New World Translation, HCSB Holman Christian Standard Bible omit the words.

It is up to the commentator to prove that the Vulgate should override all the witnesses to the AV1611 reading that are cited above as the actual source of the **Text to Remove**. He has not done so.

Note that the critic now has 11 authorities to which he must resort in order to overthrow the 1611 Holy Bible; Strong's Concordance, the 'original' (unspecified), the Original Order Translation, The Online Etymology Dictionary, Moffat's (defunct) Translation, the soon-to-be-defunct NRSV, the sterile NKJV, "the original Greek," the so-called 'Majority' Text, the corrupt Critical/Minority Text and the other corrupt modern versions translated from the corrupt Critical/Minority Text in addition to the NRSV.

#### John 8:9-10

**Text to Remove:** "being convicted by their own conscience...unto the last...alone...and saw none but the woman...those thine accusers."

**Comments:** The correct translation of the verse, based on the Greek text, is:

**"But when they heard it, they went away, one by one, beginning with the eldest, and Jesus was left with the woman being before him. Jesus lifted himself up and said to her, 'Woman, where are they? Has no one condemned you?'"**

The commentator does not state which Greek Text. However, Moorman reveals in *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text* pp 54-55 that the words "being convicted by their own conscience," "and saw none but the woman," "those thine accusers" are found in 300-600 cursive mss. and in Beza's Received Greek Text that, like that of Stephanus, largely but by no means completely, underlies the AV1611. All the disputed words are found in Ricker Berry's Edition of Stephanus's Greek New Testament that usually matches the AV1611, as Moorman confirms and in the Received Text of Elzevir that Moorman also cites.

Moorman shows that the first phrase is found in the Geneva and Bishops' bibles and the remaining phrases are found in the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops' bibles.

The corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's and the corrupt modern versions, NIV, TNIV, JB, NWT, HCSB omit "being convicted by their own conscience," "even unto the last," "and saw none but the woman," "those thine accusers," i.e. all the words except "alone."

The DR Douai-Rheims Bible, Challoner's 1749-1752 Revision omits "being convicted by their own conscience," "unto the last," "and saw none but the woman."

The RV omits "being convicted by their own conscience," "and saw none but the woman," "those thine accusers."

The NJB omits "being convicted by their own conscience," "and saw none but the woman," "those thine accusers."

It is up to the critic to refute the above witnesses to the words he disputes and to justify the corrupt sources that support his omissions from John 8:9-10. He has not done so.

#### Acts 9:5-6

**Text to Remove:** "it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him..."

Moorman, *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text* p 61, states that the words are found in 7 Old Latin mss., the 2<sup>nd</sup> century Peshitta Syriac version and in 4 4<sup>th</sup> century church writers as well as in several other versions and in the Greek mss. E and 431. The words are also found in the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir and in the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops' bibles.

The corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's and the corrupt modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words.

It is up to the critic to refute the above witnesses that testify to the words and to justify the corrupt sources that omit them. He does not do so.

### Acts 10:6

**Text to Remove:** “he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do”

**Moorman** *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* pp 61-62 notes that the words are found in the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir, in 9 cursives, though considerably expanded in 4 and in the margin of a 10<sup>th</sup> and in “others.” The words are also found in the Reformation bibles of Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’.

The corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the corrupt modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words.

It is up to the critic to refute the above witnesses that testify to the words and to justify the corrupt sources that omit them. He does not do so.

### Acts 10:21

**Text to Remove:** “which were sent unto him from Cornelius”

**Moorman** *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* p 62 notes that the AV1611 reading is found in the Reformation Bibles of Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ and in the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir. It is also found in uncial H, cursives 69, 2495 and an Old Latin source.

Again, it is up to the critic to refute the above witnesses that testify to the words. He does not do so. It should be noted that although the number of witnesses in favour of the AV1611 reading is small, they include an Old Latin source and *the uncorrupted text of the Old Latin Bible* pre-dates Jerome. See remarks under Matthew 27:35.

It should not be overlooked that the witnesses in favour of the AV1611 reading include the Bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation, by which God continues to bless the English-speaking nations.

### Acts 21:8

**Text to Remove:** “that were of Paul’s company”

Not according to the Bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation; Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’. The Received Text of Stephanus also contains the words.

The corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the corrupt modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words.

The critic will have to outdo the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation to prove his point.

He won’t.

### Romans 13:9

**Text to Remove:** “Thou shalt not bear false witness”

Origen cites the words in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, “*O Biblios*” p 81. **Moorman** in *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!* p 81, shows that about half of the available cursive mss. contain the words, along with 5 of the 10 available Old Latin sources. The Received Text of Stephanus contains the words. See p 58 of the uploaded file [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/).

The Bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation; Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ contain the words, as does Wycliffe’s Bible.

The corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the corrupt modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words.

It is up to the critic to refute these witnesses in favour of the AV1611 reading. He won’t.

By inspection, it is not surprising that the critic wants the words deleted.

#### **Romans 16:20**

**Text to Remove:** “Amen”

On this occasion, the Received Text of Stephanus omits the “Amen.” The later text of Elzevir, 1624, includes it. However, external witnesses in support of inclusion of the word “Amen” are lacking, including the usually faithful witnesses of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Bibles.

In such a case, it is prudent to “search the scriptures” John 5:39. The expression preceding the “Amen” in Romans 16:20 is “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.” Romans 16:20 is the first mention in the scripture of the combination of these expressions.

The combination occurs a total of 9 times in scripture, the remaining 8 times with only slight variation, at the conclusion of New Testament Books; Romans 16:24, 1 Corinthians 16:23, 24 with the “Amen,” Galatians 6:18, Philippians 4:23, 1 Thessalonians 5:28, 2 Thessalonians 3:18, Philemon 25, Revelation 22:21.

The repeated insertion of the combination “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen” at the conclusion of New Testament Books underlines the importance of its first mention in Romans 16:20, as does the rest of the verse “And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly.”

The “Amen” should not be tampered with, therefore.

The corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the corrupt modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the word “Amen.”

It should be noted that the 1611 AV1611 contains the word “Amen” in Romans 16:20. God has therefore honoured this reading for the last 400 years.

Note also that like the branches on His vine, where scriptural readings are missing from otherwise sound scriptural texts such as the Bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation, “God is able to graff them in again” Romans 11:23. God has done so with the word “Amen” in Romans 16:20.

#### **Colossians 1:14**

**Text to Remove:** “through his blood”

Omission of “through his blood” from Colossians 1:14 introduces doctrinal error in the text by equating redemption with forgiveness. See “*O Biblios*” p 84. Moorman in *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!* p 131 notes that 11 uncial mss. omit the clause and 5 retain it, while the cursives are about equally divided and Old Latin and Peshitta Syriac both omit the clause. See p 60 of the uploaded file [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/).

Stephanus’s Greek Received Text retains the clause.

The Bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> Century English Protestant Reformation; Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ all contain the words, so, again, the critic will have to improve on the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation in order to omit the clause. He won’t.

In short, the witnesses in favour of the clause are considerable and are made decisive by the doctrinal import of the words that necessitate their inclusion.

The corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the corrupt modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words. The critic continues, therefore, to side with the corrupters of scripture.

## Hebrews 2:7

**Text to Remove:** “and didst set him over the works of thy hands”

Moorman in *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!* p 139 cites 12 uncials as containing the reading. It is found in several cursives and 9 Old Latin witnesses, together with the Peshitta Syriac.

The words are also found, with only slight variation, in the Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles as well as in the Received Text of Stephanus.

The critic must therefore account for how the words came to be supposedly spuriously inserted in all the above divergent sources. He won’t.

The corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the corrupt modern versions, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, HCSB omit the words. The DR, RV, NWT retain them, which simply means that corruption isn’t uniform in the anti-Biblical sources. Regrettably, as Romans 16:20 above shows, it also occasionally contaminates usually sound Biblical witnesses.

## Hebrews 11:13

**Text to Remove:** “and were persuaded of them and embraced them”

Moorman states in *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* p 75 that the words are found in the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir and have cursive support.

They are also found in the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles, so once again, the critic is up against the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation in his efforts to cut the words out of “the holy scriptures” 2 Timothy 3:15.

The corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the corrupt modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words “and were persuaded of them” but retain, with variation, the words “and embraced them.” Again, partial corruption in the anti-Biblical sources is apparent.

## Hebrews 12:20

**Text to Remove:** “or with a dart shot through” actually “thrust through with a dart.”

Moorman p 75 states that the words are found with the support of several cursives in the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir and in the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles.

Again, the critic must overthrow the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation in his efforts to cut the words out of “the holy scriptures” 2 Timothy 3:15. He won’t.

The corrupt Critical/Minority text such as Nestle’s and the corrupt modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words. The critic continues, therefore, to side with the corrupters of scripture.

## 1 John 2:23

**Text to Remove:** “(but) he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also”

See remarks on 1 John 2:23 at the end of the section on italicized words in the 1611 Holy Bible, showing that the words must be retained.

## 1 John 5:7-8

**Text to Remove:** “in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth,”

**Comments:** Most modern translations agree that this was an uninspired addition to the Latin Vulgate to support the unscriptural doctrine of the trinity.

The comment is a blatant lie, both with respect to the inspiration of 1 John 5:7-8 and the doctrine of the Trinity. It is remarkable that the fundamentalist, who forwarded this list of errors to Bro. Davis should be prepared to condone false doctrine in his efforts to overthrow the 1611 Holy Bible.

It may be of course that he neglected to check his SDA/Watchtower sources carefully.

Wilkinson states that the Waldenses, whose pre-1611 Latin Bibles, the texts of which date from as early as 157 AD, furnished *“unequivocal testimony of a truly apostolical branch of the primitive church, that the celebrated text of the heavenly witnesses [1 John 5:7] was adopted in the version which prevailed in the Latin Church, previously to the introduction of the modern Vulgate.”*

See [kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html](http://kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html).

Dr Thomas Holland states in *Crowned With Glory*, pp 163ff *“Although not found in most Greek manuscripts, the Johannine Comma is found in several. It is contained in 629 (fourteenth century), 61 (sixteenth century), 918 (sixteenth century), 2473 (seventeenth century), and 2318 (eighteenth century). It is also in the margins of 221 (tenth century), 635 (eleventh century), 88 (twelfth century), 429 (fourteenth century), and 636 (fifteenth century)...*

*“While the Greek textual evidence is weak, the Latin textual evidence for the Comma is extremely strong. It is in the vast majority of the Old Latin manuscripts, which outnumber the Greek manuscripts...*

*“Although some have questioned if Cyprian (258 AD) knew of the Comma, his citation certainly suggests that he did. He writes: ‘The Lord says, ‘I and the Father are one’ and likewise it is written of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, ‘And these three are one’.” Also, there is no doubt that Priscillian (385 AD) cites the Comma:*

*““As John says “and there are three which give testimony on earth, the water, the flesh, the blood, and these three are in one, and there are three which give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one in Christ Jesus.”*

*“Likewise, the anti-Arian work compiled by an unknown writer, the Varimadum (380 AD) states: “And John the Evangelist says... ‘And there are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one’.” Additionally, Cassian (435 AD), Cassiodorus (580 AD), and a host of other African and Western bishops in subsequent centuries have cited the Comma. Therefore, we see that the reading has massive and ancient textual support apart from the Greek witnesses.”*

David Cloud states on his web site in answer to James White’s *King James Only Controversy*, Part 3 that *“powerful arguments...have led Bible believers to accept 1 John 5:7 as Scripture for centuries on end. 1 John 5:7 stood unchallenged in the English Bible for a full six hundred years. It was in the first\* English Bible by John Wycliffe in 1380, in Tyndale’s New Testament of 1525, the Coverdale Bible of 1535, the Matthew’s Bible of 1537, the Taverner Bible of 1539, the Great Bible of 1539, the Geneva New Testament of 1557, the Bishop’s Bible of 1568, and the Authorized Version of 1611. It did not disappear from a standard English Bible until the English Revised of 1881 omitted it...”* \*Wycliffe’s was not the first English Bible but it does contain 1 John 5:7, 8. See *In Awe of Thy Word* by Dr Mrs Riplinger.

See also Will Kinney’s comprehensive article on 1 John 5:7, [brandplucked.webs.com/1john57.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/1john57.htm) and note the following extracts.

*“It is sometimes erroneously asserted that this text originated close to the time of Erasmus. However, even the UBS Greek NT (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) notes that the “comma” is attested by the Latin church fathers (Cyprian) (d. 258), (Pseudo-Cyprian) (4<sup>th</sup> century), (Priscillian) (d. 385), the Speculum (5<sup>th</sup> century), Varimadum (UBS date “445/480”), Pseudo-Vigilius (4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> century), and Fulgentius (d. 533), as well as a few manuscripts. And these notes are found in the very Greek editions of those who oppose its inclusion in the New Testament!...*

*“Now the “Waldensian,” or “Vaudois” Bibles stretch from about 157 to the 1400s A.D. The fact is, according to John Calvin’s successor Theodore Beza, that the Vaudois received the Scriptures from missionaries of Antioch of Syria in the 120s A.D. and finished translating it into their Latin language by 157 AD. This Bible was passed down from generation, until the Reformation of the 1500s, when the Protestants translated the Vaudois Bible into French, Italian, etc. This Bible carries heavy weight when finding out what God really said. Theodore Beza, John Wesley and Johnathan Edwards believed, as most of the Reformers, that the Vaudois were the descendants of the true Christians, and that they preserved the Christian faith for the Bible-believing Christians today.”*

In *The Scholarship Only Controversy*, p 321, Dr Ruckman summarizes the evidence for 1 John 5:7. See also Dr Ruckman’s pamphlet on 1 John 5:7 available from the Bible Baptist Bookstore.

*“Watch God Almighty preserving His words. In spite of the negative, critical, destructive work of “godly Conservative and Evangelical “scholars.” AD 170: Old Syriac and Old Latin, AD 180: Tatian and Old Syriac, AD 200: Tertullian and Old Latin, AD 250: Cyprian and Old Latin, AD 350: Priscillian and Athanasius, AD 415: Council of Carthage, AD 450: Jerome’s Vulgate, AD 510: Fulgentius, AD 750: Wianburgensis, AD 1150: Miniscule manuscript 88, AD 1200-1500: Four Waldensian Bibles, AD 1519: Greek Manuscript 61, AD 1520-1611: Erasmus TR, AD 1611: King James Authorized Version of the Holy Bible.”*

The words have been preserved in Stephanus’s Received Text and in subsequent editions of the Received Text i.e. those of Beza and Elzevir.

Dr Hills in *The King James Version Defended* pp 209ff explains why the words of 1 John 5:7-8 were removed from the Greek manuscripts, through the influence of anti-Trinitarian heretics. See [wilderness-cry.net/bible\\_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html](http://wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html) and Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work *Hazardous Materials* pp 750ff, together with Chapter 6 of Dr Moorman’s book *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text*.

Caving in before heretics and cutting out parts of the Holy Bible to please them did not die out in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century when 1 John 5:7-8 began to be excised from scripture. It continues to this day, as the perfidy of the fundamentalists who forwarded the deletions to Bro. Davis vividly shows.

The corrupt Critical/Minority text such as Nestle’s and the corrupt modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words. The critic continues, therefore, to side with the corrupters of scripture.

## **Revelation 1:8**

**Text to Remove:** “the beginning and the ending”

It should first be noted that departures from the 1611 Holy Bible in the Book of Revelation are particularly well documented. Dr Moorman in Chapter 4 of *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* describes the work of Hoskier who identified two major streams of manuscripts for the Book of Revelation, collating 200 plus extant mss. of the Book of Revelation.

Over half of the mss. belong to what Hoskier termed the Andreas group, the text of which can be traced back to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, i.e. not long after the time of the Apostle John himself. The 1611 Holy Bible follows the Andreas text for the Book of Revelation. The remaining mss. belong to what Hoskier termed the 046 group. He concluded that it dates from the 7<sup>th</sup> century, when changes were made to extant mss. that now constitute the observed departures in modern versions from the text of the 1611 Holy Bible.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states in *Hazardous Materials* pp 754ff that the changes to the correct i.e. Andreas/1611 Holy Bible texts were made by Greek Orthodox monks who denied the literal 1000-year reign of the Lord Jesus Christ on earth as prophesied in Revelation 20:3-5.

Dr Moorman in *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!* p 149 confirms that the Andreas mss. contain the words “the beginning and the ending” along with 8 Old Latin witnesses.



The words are found in the Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Bishops', Geneva bibles and in Stephanus' Received Text.

It should therefore be noted again that the critic will have to overthrow the witness of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation in order to deny this and the subsequent readings from the Book of Revelation that he seeks to cut out of the 1611 Holy Bible.

It should be noted further that the critic is evidently taking his alterations to the 1611 Holy Bible from the so-called 'Majority' Text of Hodges and Farstad. This is not a majority text but is based on the incomplete 1913 collation of Herman von Soden, who collated only about 8% of available cursive mss. and leaned heavily towards those he could identify as having appreciable departures from the text of the 1611 Holy Bible. See Chapter 3 of *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text*.

The corrupt Critical/Minority text such as Nestle's and the corrupt modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words "the beginning and the ending." The critic continues to side with them.

#### **Revelation 1:11**

**Text to Remove:** "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and...which are in Asia"

Dr Moorman in *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text* p 80 specifies 29 cursive mss. that contain the first phrase "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last." He adds that of the Andreas mss. that contain Revelation 1, 57 i.e. most of the group, contain the words. The Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles all contain the words, along with the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir.

Dr Moorman specifies 3 cursives that contain the words "which are in Asia" and says that a total of 10 of Hoskier's cursives contain the words. The words are found in the Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles and the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir.

The corrupt Critical/Minority text such as Nestle's and the corrupt modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last and," "which are in Asia."

The DR omits the words "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last and." Again, Twist and Curl are siding with heretics, cultists and Bible corrupters.

#### **Revelation 1:20**

**Text to Remove:** "which thou sawest"

The expression "which thou sawest" occurs twice in Revelation 1:20. The critic aims to cut out the second occurrence.

The Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles contain the second occurrence of the expression "which thou sawest."

The DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the second occurrence of the words.

The Received Text of Stephanus contains the second occurrence of the expression "which thou sawest" and the corrupt Critical/Minority text such as Nestle's omits the words, typically.

Again, Twist and Curl are siding with heretics, cultists and Bible corrupters.

#### **Revelation 2:17**

**Text to Remove:** "to eat of"

The Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva and Bishops' bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation contain the words, as does Stephanus's Received Text.

The words clearly should NOT be omitted.

The corrupt Critical/Minority text such as Nestle's and the corrupt modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words.

Again, Twist and Curl are siding with heretics, cultists and Bible corrupters.

#### Revelation 5:4

**Text to Remove:** "and to read"

The Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva and Bishops' bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation contain the words, as does Stephanus's Received Text.

The corrupt Critical/Minority text such as Nestle's and the corrupt modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, NWT, HCSB omit the words. The NKJV footnote disputes the words, which it says are in neither the Critical/Minority Text (Nestle-United Bibles Societies Text) nor the so-called 'Majority' Text.

The JB, NJB contain the words "and read it" but omit the words "neither to look therein." Once again, the so-called "Text to Remove" clearly should NOT be removed.

#### Revelation 5:14

**Text to Remove:** "four and twenty...him that lives forever and ever"

Dr Moorman states in *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text* p 89 that both phrases are found in the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops' bibles, together with the Received texts of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir. Both Wycliffe and Coverdale contain the words.

Dr Moorman identifies up to 10 cursives that contain the first phrase and 3 that contain the second.

The corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's and the corrupt modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, NWT, JB, NJB, HCSB omit both phrases and the NKJV footnote disputes them, which it says are in neither the Critical/Minority Text (Nestle-United Bibles Societies Text) nor the so-called 'Majority' Text.

In spite of the lack of mss. support, the weight of testimony from the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation shows clearly why the words remain in the 1611 Holy Bible.

#### Revelation 11:1

**Text to Remove:** "and the angel stood"

The Geneva and Bishops' bibles contain the words together with Elzevir's Received Text.

The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale and Great bibles omit the words, together with Stephanus's Received Text.

The corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's and the corrupt modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words. The NKJV footnote disputes the words, which it says are in neither the Critical/Minority Text (Nestle-United Bibles Societies Text) nor the so-called 'Majority' Text.

On this occasion the testimony of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Reformation bibles is weaker than usual. However, the overwhelming objections to the phrase of the modern corrupt sources shows that the words should remain in the 1611 Holy Bible, where God has honoured them for 400 years. The words are found in the 1611 AV1611.

Note again that like the branches on His vine, where scriptural readings are missing from otherwise sound scriptural texts such as some of the Bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation, "God is able to graff them in again" Romans 11:23. God has done so with the words "And the angel stood" in Revelation 11:1. See remarks under Romans 16:20.

## Revelation 12:12

**Text to Remove:** “the inhabitants of”

Dr Moorman states in *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* p 98 that the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles contain the words. Coverdale’s Bible also contains the words. The Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir contain the words, which are in part of the Andreas mss. Moorman identifies 15 cursives that contain the words.

Naturally, they are missing from the corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s, the so-called ‘Majority’ Text and from the corrupt modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB.

The words are therefore rightly retained in the 1611 Holy Bible.

## Revelation 14:5

**Text to Remove:** “before the throne of God”

Dr Moorman states in *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* p 100 that the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles contain the words. Wycliffe’s and Coverdale’s Bibles contain the words. The Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir contain the words. Moorman identifies 3 cursives that contain the words and indicates that several Old Latin mss. contain the words.

The words are missing from the corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the so-called ‘Majority’ Text. Although the DR contains the words (which is usually the case when Wycliffe’s Bible contains the words, see remarks under **Introduction by Bro. John Davis – Twist and Curl Part 3**), the corrupt modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB, omit the words.

In opposition to the corrupt witnesses, the 1611 Holy Bible rightly retains the words.

## Revelation 15:2

**Text to Remove:** “over his mark”

Dr Moorman states in *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* p 101 that the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles contain the words. Coverdale’s Bible contains the words. The Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir contain the words. Moorman identifies no fewer than 73 cursives that contain the words.

The words are missing from the corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s, the so-called ‘Majority’ Text and from the corrupt modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB.

Yet again, therefore, the 1611 Holy Bible rightly retains the words.

## Revelation 16:7

**Text to Remove:** “another out of”

By inspection, the omission creates a nonsensical reading that makes the altar speak, instead of an angel speaking out of the altar. See Revelation 16:5. An angel can stand in the sun, so one that speaks out of the altar in Revelation 16:7 is easily credible.

The Tyndale, Coverdale, Geneva (with “sanctuary” instead of “altar”) and Bishops’ bibles have the words. The Wycliffe and Great bibles have the word “another” but omit “out of the altar.” That reading is incomplete but at least it is sensible.

The Received Text of Stephanus has the words.

The Critical/Minority Text of Nestle and the so-called ‘Majority’ Text omit the words, along with the corrupt modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT. On this occasion, the HCSB has an inferior but at least sensible reading “someone from the altar.”

It is clear from the context of the words and the nature of the witnesses for and against them that the words are part of “the holy scriptures” 2 Timothy 3:15, as found in the 1611 Holy Bible.

#### **Revelation 16:14**

**Text to Remove:** “of the earth and”

Dr Moorman states in *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* p 103 that the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles contain the words. The Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir contain the words. Moorman specifies 3 cursives that contain the words and states that about 22 of Hoskier’s cursives contain the words. Coverdale’s Bible contains the words.

The words are missing from the corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s, the so-called ‘Majority’ Text and from the corrupt modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, HCSB. The DR, NWT retain the word “earth” but omit the word “world” from the verse i.e. their readings are incomplete, in the light of the considerable witnesses in favour of the words.

Yet again, therefore, the 1611 Holy Bible rightly retains the words.

#### **Revelation 21:3**

**Text to Remove:** “and be their God”

Dr Moorman states in *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* p 109 that the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles contain the words. The Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza and Elzevir contain the words. Moorman specifies 3 uncials and 27 cursives that contain the words and states that about 44 of Hoskier’s cursives contain the words. Coverdale’s Bible also contains the words.

Moorman also cites early church writers such as Irenaeus 178 A.D., Tyconius 380 A.D., Ambrose 397 A.D. as quoting the words.

The words are so well attested that of the corrupt sources, only Nestle and two other Critical/Minority Text editors, Tischendorf and Tregelles omit the words, along with the NWT.

The critic is clutching at straws, as he has been throughout his futile assault on the 1611 Holy Bible.

It is up to the critic to show that the witnesses listed above in favour of the texts that he wishes to cut out of the Holy Bible are corrupt. He has not done so and will not do so.

The above witnesses show that it is actually corrupt Greek texts and corrupt versions of scripture that support the omissions that the critic favours.

Again, Twist and Curl are siding with heretics, cultists and papist Bible corrupters.

## Introduction by Bro. John Davis – Twist and Curl Part 4

On & on Curley goes! Now he thinks verses are ‘misplaced’ in the AV (KJV). This poor *deluded* man!

When & where will he stop?

Sort him out Alan! (His comments in **red** as usual).

### What verses are MISPLACED in the KJV Bible?

#### Matthew 23:13-14

**Proper Order:** “But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows’ houses, and for a pretense make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.”

**The Received Text of Stephanus has Matthew 23:13, 14 as the 1611 Holy Bible has them but Ricker Berry notes that Elzevir places Matthew 23:14 before Matthew 23:13. Moorman in *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!* p 71 notes that many of the numerous and varied witnesses that support Matthew 23:14 in the 1611 Holy Bible place it before Matthew 23:13 but he does not indicate that the change is authoritative in any way.**

**The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles contain Matthew 23:13, 14 as found in the 1611 Holy Bible, so once again the critic is in opposition to the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation.**

**The corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the corrupt modern versions, RV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT omit Matthew 23:14. The online NIV available from E Sword and the HCSB bracket the verse indicating that it is not scripture, though they insert it after Matthew 23:13. The Bible Gateway NIV omits Matthew 23:14 but does not reverse the order of Matthew 23:13, 14 i.e. the omission is after Matthew 23:13, not before it.**

**The significance of the above observation is that the critic has now abandoned those authorities that he used extensively in the previous section on texts he sought to cut out of “the scripture of truth” Daniel 10:21.**

**This critic will clearly clutch at any straw in order to attempt to overthrow the 1611 Holy Bible. His efforts are as futile this time as in all his previous attempts to do so.**

#### Romans 16:25-27

**Proper Order:** Romans 16:25-27 belongs AFTER Romans 14:23 and not at the end of the book.

**The following versions all locate Romans 16:25-27 where the 1611 Holy Bible locates them.**

**Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’**

**DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB**

**That is, not even the corrupt modern versions follow the transposition of Romans 16:25-27, although the so-called ‘Majority’ Text that is supposed to underlie the NKJV places Romans 16:25-27 after Romans 14:23.**

**However, even the corrupt Critical/Minority Text of Nestle has Romans 16:25-27 where the 1611 Holy Bible has the verses.**

**According to Ricker Berry’s Edition of Stephanus’s Received Text, the only other Greek text to reposition Romans 16:25-27 immediately after Romans 14:23 is the early Critical/Minority Text of J. J. Griesbach, of whom Dr Hills states in *The King James Version Defended* p 65:**

**See [wilderness-cry.net/bible\\_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter3.html](http://wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter3.html):**

*"J. J. Griesbach (1745-1812), pupil of Semler and professor at Jena, early declared himself a skeptic regarding the New Testament text. In 1771 he wrote, "The New Testament abounds in more glosses, additions, and interpolations purposely introduced than any other book." And during his long career there is no indication that he ever changed this view. He was noted for his critical editions of the New Testament and for the comprehensive way in which he worked out a classification of the New Testament manuscripts into three "rescensions" or ancestral groups. He also developed the thought implicit in Bengel's rule, "The hard reading is to be preferred to the easy reading." Like Bengel he interpreted this rule to mean that the orthodox Christians had corrupted their own New Testament text. According to Griesbach, whenever the New Testament manuscripts varied from each other, the orthodox readings were to be ruled out at once as spurious. "The most suspicious reading of all," Griesbach wrote, "is the one that yields a sense favorable to the nourishment of piety (especially monastic piety)." And to this he added another directive: "When there are many variant readings in one place, that reading which more than the others manifestly favors the dogmas of the orthodox is deservedly regarded as suspicious.""*

The editors of the so-called 'Majority' Text were clearly deceived by the likes of the heretic Griesbach. So was the critic, in his obsession with finding any means by which to try to overthrow the text of the 1611 Holy Bible.

Dr Moorman states in *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text* p 67 that P61 i.e. papyrus ms. 61, 5 uncial mss., over 16 cursive mss., 9 Old Latin sources, the Peshitta Syriac and other early versions and early church writers, Clement 215 A.D., Origen 254 A.D., Ambrosiaster 354 A.D. all place Romans 16:25-27 where it is found in the 1611 Holy Bible. That is, even heretics like Clement and Origen did not see fit to transpose Romans 16:25-27.

Moorman states that only Greek mss. exhibit the transposition. He says that the Latin sources are unequivocal in their support for the 1611 Holy Bible and reveals that Origen in his commentary on Romans identifies the influential heretic Marcion [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marcion\\_of\\_Sinope](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marcion_of_Sinope) as responsible for confusion arising in the Greek mss. over the location of Romans 16:25-27 because Marcion cut out Romans 15 and 16 from the scripture.

The critic therefore continues to side with heretics, Griesbach and Marcion in this case.

#### Hebrews 9:28

**Proper Order:** "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them without sin that look for him shall he appear the second time unto salvation."

The alteration is both stupid and heretical.

"For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin" Romans 7:14.

"Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me" Romans 7:20.

"But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members" Romans 7:23.

"I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin" Romans 7:25.

"But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe" Galatians 3:22.

"Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin" James 4:17.

"If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" 1 John 1:8.

The following versions all read as the 1611 Holy Bible with only slight variation.

Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops'

Ricker Berry's Edition of Stephanus's Received Text indicates that neither the Received Text nor the otherwise corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's follows the critic's rearrangement of Hebrews 9:28.

Not even the otherwise corrupt modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB adopt the critic's rearrangement of Hebrews 9:28, even though some of them have incorrect readings e.g. "apart from sin" NKJV, NWT, "not to bear sin" NIV, TNIV, JB with slight variation, "sin being no more" NJB.

The critic is making up his own 'bible' to overthrow the 1611 Holy Bible. His 'DIYV' Do-It-Yourself Version is his 12<sup>th</sup> authority.

A possible explanation for this 'DIYV' approach may be found in Ricker Berry's literal rendering of the Received Text.

"Thus the Christ, once having been offered for to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time to those that await him apart from sin for salvation."

Ricker Berry's rendering of Stephanus's text is inferior to the 1611 Holy Bible reading but the phrase "apart from sin" that should read "without sin" is rightly taken to refer to the Lord Jesus Christ.

However, "men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith" 2 Timothy 3:8 could in their obsession to overthrow the 1611 Holy Bible wrongly attach the phrase "without sin" to "those that await him" and thereby generate the distortion that the critic has tried to introduce.

It is interesting that the very next verse, 2 Timothy 3:9, applies directly to the critic.

"But they shall proceed no further: for their folly shall be manifest unto all men, as theirs also was."

## Introduction by Bro. John Davis – Twist and Curl Part 5

Well Curley has given his BEST SHOT to destroy your faith in the Authorized Version Bible (he even ran to the cults for help!), but unfortunately for him, this Bible ‘corrector’ lost the fight as soon as my big brother Alan (a Bible BELIEVER) entered the arena! In fact it was embarrassing to watch! Curley lost ‘everything’, his credibility, his reputation, EVERY SINGLE point he raised, in fact Curley was fortunate to come out with his ‘shirt!’

So what have we learnt from the ‘caning’ Curley received from Alan O’Reilly?

You should have learnt the following...

- 1) NEVER try to find errors in the AV Bible – it hasn’t any & you are just wasting the time God has given you! Go do something productive like distribute some tracts & win some souls! God is NOT happy by you trying to correct His word! In fact, you are on dangerous ground by trying to do so; GROW UP & get rid of your pride & surrender to THAT BOOK & live as a Christian should live in this sinful world!
- 2) The Holy Spirit has NEVER shown YOU an error in the Authorized Version Bible; you’re a LIAR if you say He has!
- 3) Don’t follow these idiots like Curley! They are so full of pride, thinking they can ‘correct’ God’s word – stay with the AV Bible & let IT correct THEM!
- 4) Curley’s opinions don’t amount to a ‘hill of beans’ therefore ignore him & people like him! Stick with those preachers & teachers that TREMBLE at His word (Isa 66v5) & preach the TRUTH week in week out! Egotistical Christians like Curley are a *dime a dozen* & they are only interested in themselves & promoting their ‘thoughts & opinions’ – DUMP THEM! Get back to that AV & STAY there until the Rapture!
- 5) Bible ‘corrector’ - Ask yourself these questions...‘What good am I doing by getting Christians to doubt their FINAL AUTHORITY?’ ‘Is God happy with what I am doing?’ ‘What rewards will the Lord give me by doing this work?’ (Now get on your hands & knees asking God to forgive you!!!)
- 6) By reading Alan’s notes, responses & answers to Curley’s questions, it should fire us all up to want to get DEEPER into this Book of all books! Read the Scriptures much more, asking God to help you understand them.
- 7) Ask God what He wants YOU to do with the life that He has given you!

I am very thankful to the Lord for Alan O’Reilly & all the work he puts in to combat the errors of these Bible ‘correctors!’ I cannot tell you how much time he has saved us here at Time for Truth! He puts hours & hours of study into his research & has been such a blessing to many Christians all around the world. I have said a number of times now that every Christian ought to purchase his book “O BIBLIOS” THE BOOK – If you would like to order a copy via us I would be happy to send you one.

If you are reading these articles as a Bible ‘corrector’ I would suggest you STOP exactly where you are & think about what you are doing with your time! God is NOT pleased & you will reap what you sow!

So here we go, Curley’s final stand! Good bye Curley; sorry you weren’t humble enough to stand with us Bible Believers but we have to move on & press on in the fight! You’ve been wounded & we have the ‘medicine’ to make you better but you would rather be left to the enemy!!! You’re a sad man Curley but there is nothing more we can do for you; you’ve gone over to the other side & we will NOT follow a deceiver!

Alan, it’s over to you again! Finish this Bible corrector off so that others won’t follow his pernicious ways (2 Peter 2:2)...

Alan’s words are in **RED** as usual...



## Words LEFT OUT or replaced in KJV Bible that should be added back

Below are some words and phrases that were MISTAKENLY left out or replaced in the King James Version Bible (KJV) that should be added back into God's word.

**Note first that neither Curley nor Twister has identified where "God's word" is as a single document between two covers. Neither of them do so throughout all their objections to the 1611 Holy Bible, which is typical of Bible critics or any persuasion whether or not they profess to 'prefer' the 1611 Holy Bible. See remarks under Introduction by Alan O'Reilly.**

### Luke 9:50

**Verse should read:** "And Jesus said to him, Forbid him not, for he is not against you. For whoever is not against you is for you."

**None of the following bibles or versions has the extra words "for he is not against you."**

**Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops'**

**DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB**

**Neither Stephanus's Received Text nor Nestle's Critical/Minority Text contains the extra words. Ricker Berry does not indicate any other Greek edition that contains the words, nor does Moorman indicate any ms. support for the extra words. The so-called 'Majority' Text of Farstad and Hodges does not contain the words.**

**The critic is resorting to his DIYV, or 12<sup>th</sup> authority again.**

### Luke 10:22

**Verse should read:** "And having turned to the disciples, he said:"

**The extra words make no sense in Luke 10:22 by inspection of Luke 10:23, which begins with "And he turned him unto his disciples."**

**The Greek texts are divided with respect to the added words in Luke 10:22.**

**The so-called 'Majority' Text includes them.**

**Ricker Berry's Edition of Stephanus's Received Text contains the words but notes that Elzevir's Received Text omits them.**

**Dr Mrs Riplinger in *Hazardous Materials* p 704 shows that Beza's 1589 and 1598 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Editions of the Received Text each omits the words.**

**The usually corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's omits the words. Ricker Berry indicates that of the 6 Critical/Minority Texts that he includes in his notes; Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth; Griesbach, Tregelles omit the words and Alford considers them doubtful.**

**The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles omit the words.**

**The modern versions DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words.**

**As indicated, the division in 'the Greek' notwithstanding, Luke 10:23 shows that the added words in Luke 10:22 are extraneous.**

**Again, therefore, it appears that the critic will use anything to contradict the 1611 Holy Bible, even when the result makes no sense, the AV1611's majority mss. support notwithstanding.**

## John 1:28

**Verse should read:** "These things were done in Bethany beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing."

Dr Moorman notes in *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text* p 51 that the Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles and the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir have "Bethabara" in agreement with the 1611 Holy Bible instead of "Bethany." Coverdale's Bible also has "Bethabara."

The corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's, the so-called 'Majority' Text and the corrupt modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB have "Bethany."

In spite of the support for "Bethany" in the majority of mss. (as determined by von Soden), that reading is clearly incorrect, because as any Bible map of the Holy Land in the First Century will show, Bethany is not "beyond Jordan," but west of the Jordan River.

Regrettably, even normally reliable Bible dictionaries like Unger's and *The New Compact Bible Dictionary* invent a second 'Bethany' to appease 'modern scholarship.' Nevertheless, the *New Compact* is forced to confess, "nothing is known of its location except that it is beyond the Jordan."

*The Oxford Bible Atlas* can't find Bethany #2 either. The reason is that Bethany #2 never existed.

"Bethabara" should therefore remain, as it is found in the 1611 Holy Bible.

## Acts 9:19

**Verse should read:** "Then was Saul certain days with the disciples which were **at the time** in Damascus."

Neither the Received Text of Stephanus nor the Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's contain the words "at the time." The so-called 'Majority' Text of Farstad and Hodges does not have the words.

The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles do not contain the words.

The modern versions DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB do not contain the words.

The critic has resorted to his DIYV again. The words are clearly an unnecessary insertion because if Paul was spending time with the disciples "which were in Damascus" where else would they have been "at that time"?

## Acts 20:28

**Verse should read:** "...the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to feed the church of the Lord and God, which He purchased with His own blood."

"The Lord and" is an unnecessary insertion that could be used by Bible critics to cast doubt upon the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, by implying that the Lord and God are two separate individuals. The expression "Lord and God" never occurs as such in the 1611 Holy Bible.

Dr Moorman notes in *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text* p 64 that the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir and the Tyndale, Geneva, Bishops' bibles read "of God" with the 1611 Holy Bible. The Wycliffe, Coverdale, Great bibles also have "of God."

Some editions of the Critical/Minority Text but not Nestle's on this occasion have "of the Lord and God" as does the so-called 'Majority' Text.

However, the modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NKJV, NWT, HCSB all have "of God."

Dr Moorman identifies 4 uncials, Aleph, B (both of which often depart from the 1611 Holy Bible), 056, 0142 and over 38 cursives and lectionaries, 2 Old Latin sources, the Peshitta Syriac and 7 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> century church writers, including Chrysostom that have "of God" in Acts 20:28.

Although the reading "of the Lord and God" has support from the so-called 'Majority' Text, it is clearly an incorrect reading according to its own implications of false doctrine against the Deity of Christ and the many and varied good witnesses against it, discounting the usually corrupt ones.

### Philippians 3:3

**Verse should read:** “serve in (the) Spirit of God” rather than “serve God in the spirit.”

The actual wording of the 1611 Holy Bible is “worship God in the spirit.”

Dr Moorman notes in *When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text* p 72 that the Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ bibles and the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir agree with the 1611 Holy Bible. Coverdale’s Bible agrees with the 1611 Holy Bible and Wycliffe’s reading is close to that of the 1611 Holy Bible.

Dr Moorman identifies 5 uncial mss., 9 cursives plus “many others,” 10 Old Latin sources, the Peshitta Syriac and the Gothic bibles and 8 early church writers from the 3<sup>rd</sup> to the 5<sup>th</sup> centuries including Origen and Chrysostom that agree with the 1611 Holy Bible.

The Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the so-called ‘Majority’ Text and the modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB have the incorrect reading “worship by the Spirit of God,” which not only fails to identify who is being worshipped but incorrectly capitalises “spirit” and breaks the cross reference to John 4:24.

“God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.”

The NKJV reads with the 1611 Holy Bible but incorrectly capitalises “spirit.”

The modern revisers and the current critic are rebuked according to John 4:22.

“Ye worship ye know not what.”

On the basis of the above, even in defiance of the so-called ‘Majority’ Text, the 1611 Holy Bible is again seen to be correct.

### Colossians 1:6

**Verse should read:** “Which is come unto you, as *it is* in all the world; and bringeth forth fruit, and is growing, as *it doth* also in you, since the day ye heard *of it*, and knew the grace of God in truth:”

Colossians 1:6 in the 1611 Holy Bible reads “Which is come unto you, as it is in all the world; and bringeth forth fruit, as it doth also in you, since the day ye heard of it, and knew the grace of God in truth:”

The extraneous words are “and is growing.” By inspection, this reading contradicts “bringeth forth fruit” with respect to fruit-bearing in the scriptures, where fruit-bearing is depicted as the final stage of the plant’s development.

“For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear” Mark 4:28.

“The gospel” Colossians 1:5 is never said to be “growing” in the scriptures. In any particular setting, it is there in its entirety to be *preached*. See Matthew 4:23, 9:35, Mark 1:14, 16:15, Luke 4:18, 9:6, 20:1, Acts 8:25, 14:7, 21, 16:10, Romans 1:15, 10:15, 15:19, 20, 1 Corinthians 1:17, 9:14, 16, 18, 2 Corinthians 10:14, 16, Galatians 4:13, 1 Peter 1:12, giving 23 occurrences in all with respect to the preaching of the gospel.

The extra words are found in the corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the so-called ‘Majority’ Text, though the NKJV does not have the words.

The Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ bibles do not have the words.

The JB does not have the words.

The DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, NJB, NWT, HCSB have the words.

On the basis of the above, it is clearly the corrupt versions, i.e. most of them that contain the words and the God-honouring bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation that do not contain them.

The extra words are rightly not contained in the 1611 Holy Bible, therefore.

### Colossians 2:13

**Verse should read:** "And you - being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh - you hath He quickened together with him, having forgiven us all the trespasses..."

Colossians 2:13 in the 1611 Holy Bible reads "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;"

The extra words are an unnecessary "you" in front of "hath he quickened" and an unwarranted "the" in front of "trespasses." The second "you" has been changed to "us."

The inserted "you" is unnecessary because Paul has already addressed his readers in the opening words of the verse and the "the" is unwarranted because "all trespasses" is an all-encompassing term like "all sin" in 1 John 1:7. "You" should not be changed to "us" because it breaks the thought flow, which is directed towards Paul's readers.

The Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's inserts the unnecessary "you" and along with Stephanus alters "you" to "us." Elzevir retains "you" in front of "all trespasses."

Ricker Berry and Nestle each translate the "the" in front of "trespasses" but the King James translators rightly did not, very likely for the reason given above with respect to 1 John 1:7.

The modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB follow the altered reading, with minor variation, mainly consisting of altering the "the" in front of "trespasses" to "our." The DR inserts the unnecessary "you."

Of the pre-1611 bibles, the Geneva and Bishops' follow the 1611 Holy Bible with minor variation. On this basis, the 1611 Holy Bible clearly represents the final purified stage of what is in effect an older, less refined reading that the critic would rather regress to, in order to persist in his efforts to overthrow "the scripture of truth" Daniel 10:21.

Again, therefore, the 1611 Holy Bible has the correct reading.

### 1 Thessalonians 5:21

**Verse should read:** "Despise not prophesyings, **but** prove all things..."

No, it should not. 1 Thessalonians 5:20, 21 read as follows in the 1611 Holy Bible.

"Despise not prophesyings."

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

The sentences should not be joined by either "and" or "but" because they are expressing separate thoughts. The first statement is certifying the ministry of prophecy, as in 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17. See also 1 Corinthians 12:10, 14:1, 31, 39.

The second statement is an application of Acts 17:11. It could be applied, for example, to proving the bogus nature of modern tongues' speaking, 1 Corinthians 1:22, 14:22, two scriptures that are repeatedly violated by modern tongues speakers.

Joining the sentences implies that prophecies have to be proved. They don't. They simply await fulfilment, as in 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17. Paul is not referring to "false prophets" 1 John 4:1. He is referring to prophecies where "the spirits of the prophets" 1 Corinthians 14:32 have already been successfully tried.

Joining the sentences wrongly assumes that the above procedure has not been carried out.

The Received Text of Stephanus agrees with the 1611 Holy Bible in not joining 1 Thessalonians 5:20, 21 with "but."

The Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles agree with the 1611 Holy Bible.

The Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's has the altered incorrect reading, although Nestle's has "and" instead of "but." The texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth have "but," a reading adopted by the RSV, NRSV, it should be noted.

The Farstad-Hodges 'Majority' Text begins 1 Thessalonians 1:21 with "But," effectively following the critic's corruption, although the NKJV does not. See below.

The DR, TNIV, HCSB have the altered, incorrect reading. The other modern versions, NIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT follow the 1611 Holy Bible reading.

The critic has followed an erroneous minority reading that does not have unanimous support even among the modern versions that usually follow the Critical/Minority Text.

Once again, the critic has shown that he will snatch at any straw in the wind in his efforts to downgrade the 1611 Holy Bible.

## 2 Timothy 2:19

**Verse should read:** "Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name **of (the) Lord** depart from iniquity."

"The Lord" has been incorrectly substituted for "Christ" as found in the 1611 Holy Bible.

Dr Moorman in *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text* p 74 states that the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir have "Christ" and that the Critical/Minority and so-called 'Majority' Texts have "the Lord." Nestle's text reads "the Lord."

Dr Moorman also states that the Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles have "Christ" in agreement with the 1611 Holy Bible and adds that the reading "Christ" has cursive support. He notes in particular that the term "Christ" is linked to that of "God" in the first part of 2 Timothy 2:19 and therefore confirms the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. Altering "Christ" to "the Lord" weakens the identification of the Lord Jesus Christ as God. Coverdale's Bible has "Christ."

The DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT (with "Jehovah"), HCSB all have the incorrect altered reading of the Critical/Minority Text.

Once again, the critic is against the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation and has lined up with the apostasy of "the last days" 2 Timothy 3:1 in his antagonism towards the 1611 Holy Bible.

## Hebrews 8:8

**Verse should read:** "For finding fault **to** them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah:"

The alteration of "with them" to "to them" results in an expression that is both ungrammatical and obscure, although this time, Stephanus's Received Text has "to" and editions of the Critical/Minority Text, including Nestle's, have "with."

The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles alter the text to reading "rebuking them" and so avoid using either "with" or "to."

The DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NKJV, NWT all have "with."

On this occasion, therefore, the 1611 Holy Bible effectively stands alone with its reading, apart from the dubious support of some editions of the Critical/Minority Text and the modern versions.

However, the alteration is, as indicated, ungrammatical and obscure so that the reading of the 1611 Holy Bible is undoubtedly correct because it is both grammatically correct and couched in "words easy to be understood" 1 Corinthians 14:9.

## Hebrews 13:9

**Verse should read:** “Be not carried **away** with divers and strange doctrines. For *it is* a good thing that the heart be established with grace; not with meats, which have not profited them that have been occupied therein.”

Alteration of “carried about” in the 1611 Holy Bible to “carried away” is incorrect because it breaks the cross reference to Ephesians 4:14. By inspection, Ephesians 4:14 ironically conveys the critic’s attitude exactly.

“That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive;”

The Received Text of Stephanus has “about” in agreement with the 1611 Holy Bible and the Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the so-called ‘Majority’ Text have “away.”

The Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ bibles have “about” in agreement with the 1611 Holy Bible.

The DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, NWT have “away.”

The JB, NJB, HCSB have “astray” instead of either “about” or “away.”

On balance, therefore, the critic has forsaken the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation yet again and sided with the apostasy of “the last days” 2 Timothy 3:1 in his efforts to contradict the 1611 Holy Bible.

## 1 Peter 2:2

**Verse should read:** “As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation:”

The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva bibles agree with the 1611 Holy Bible in not adding the words “unto salvation.”

The Received Text of Stephanus does not add the words “unto salvation.” Neither does the Farstad-Hodges ‘Majority’ Text.

The Bishops’ Bible has “unto salvation” in brackets.

The Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB have “unto salvation” or “in your salvation” or similar in their texts.

Dr Moorman in *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!* p 142 states that the majority of the cursives do not add “unto salvation” and that the addition is found in P72, 7 old uncials, a few cursives, most of the Old Latin and the Peshitta Syriac.

Dr Moorman states that although the addition has support from the uncials and the versions such as the Old Latin and the Peshitta Syriac that normally support the 1611 Holy Bible, the addition cannot be correct because it supports the unscriptural doctrine of works-based salvation in the Church Age. The addition is therefore spurious, as most of the pre-1611 bibles show, these usually being the strongest witnesses in support of the 1611 Holy Bible, with God having clearly blessed these early bibles by means of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation.

The critic has, however, already shown himself to be a heretic, or supporter of heretics by means of his false teaching against the Godhead in 1 John 5:7. See remarks above.

It is not surprising therefore that he should support the unbiblical doctrine of works-based salvation in the Church Age – another SDA heresy. The unscriptural addition to 1 Peter 2:2 that he proposes clearly does not belong in the 1611 Holy Bible.

## Revelation 2:21

**Verse should read:** “And I gave her space to repent of her fornication; and she **wills not.**”

It is noteworthy that of the 30 verses that the critic lists in this section, he has taken 17 or over half from the Book of Revelation alone. These verses are in addition to the 17 from the Book of Revelation that he has sought to corrupt in earlier sections of his list. The total of 34 is over one-fourth of the 126 verses\* in the critic’s entire list where he attempts to charge the 1611 Holy Bible with error.

\*See [Conclusion](#).

As a false teacher, see remarks on 1 Peter 2:2 and 1 John 5:7 above, the critic will not be kindly disposed towards the Book of Revelation. That Book shows the fulfilment of Matthew 13:41-42.

“The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; And shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.”

The critic and his supporters stand to discover the fearful truth of Revelation 22:18-19, Revelation 22:19 itself being one of the very verses that the critic tries to corrupt.

“For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: 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.”

Concerning the unbiblical addition of the words “wills not” in Revelation 2:21, Dr Moorman notes in *When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text* p 83 that the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir and the Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ bibles do not have the words. Coverdale’s Bible does not have the words.

Dr Moorman notes further that about 17 of Hoskier’s cursives and 8 of von Soden’s do not have the addition. These mss. are from the Andreas group the text of which can be traced back to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, which strongly suggests that the addition is a later, manmade insertion. See remarks under Revelation 1:8 above.

The addition is found in the corrupt Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s, the so-called ‘Majority’ Text and with variation in the corrupt modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB.

The critic has once again gone against the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation and lined up with known Bible corrupters in order to contradict the 1611 Holy Bible.

## Revelation 6:12

**Verse should read:** “And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and, lo, there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the **whole** moon became as blood;”

The Received Text of Stephanus agrees with the 1611 Holy Bible in omitting the word “whole.”

The Geneva Bible agrees with the 1611 Holy Bible.

Wycliffe’s Bible does not contain the word “whole.”

The Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Bishops’ bibles have the expression “waxed all even as blood” or similar, which is like the addition of “whole.”

The Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s, the so-called ‘Majority’ Text and the corrupt modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB have the addition “whole” with variation.

Support for the 1611 Holy Bible on this occasion is less than usual. That the notably corrupt sources are unanimous in their support for the departure from the 1611 Holy Bible is in itself enough for this writer

to dismiss the addition as spurious. However, the expression “the whole moon” is never found in scripture, nor even the more familiar expression “the full moon.” The reason is plain.

The scripture only qualifies the expression “the moon” when referring to the moon in part. For example, the expressions “new moon” or “new moons” occur 21 times in scripture, 1 Samuel 20:5, 18, 24, 2 Kings 4:23, 1 Chronicles 23:31, 2 Chronicles 2:4, 8:13, 31:3, Ezra 3:5, 10:33, Psalm 81:3, Isaiah 1:13, 14, 66:23, Ezekiel 45:17, 46:1, 3, 6, Hosea 2:11, Amos 8:5, Colossians 2:16.

In addition, Revelation 8:12 refers to “the third part of the moon” and note the equivalent expression “the third part of the sun.” The expression “the moon” therefore refers in scripture to the whole moon, as would the expression “the sun” for the sun in its entirety and qualification of “the moon” by means of the term “whole” is superfluous and wrong, as it would be if used in an expression such as the ‘whole’ sun. Song of Solomon 6:10 underlines this conclusion.

“Who is she that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners?”

The word “whole” is not needed in Song of Solomon 6:10 for any of the underlined expressions. Nor is it needed in Revelation 6:12.

The critic is wrong – again.

#### Revelation 8:7

**Verse should read:** “The first angel sounded, and there followed hail and fire mingled with blood, and they were cast upon the earth: **and the third part of the land was burnt up**, and the third part of trees was burnt up, and all green grass was burnt up.”

Inspection of the verse shows that the addition is both superfluous and stupid. As Dr Moorman points out in *When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text* pp 91-92, the insertion by inspection conflicts with the remainder of the verse “the third part of trees was burnt up, and all green grass was burnt up.”

Dr Moorman states that the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir and the Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ bibles agree with the 1611 Holy Bible in ignoring the addition. Coverdale’s Bible does not have the addition, although Wycliffe’s Bible does.

It should be noted again that although, as is often the case when the Critical/Minority Text and the modern versions depart from the 1611 Holy Bible, Wycliffe’s Bible also has the departure, Wycliffe’s editors, Purvey and Hereford, under duress, altered Wycliffe’s text to conform more closely to the Latin Vulgate after Wycliffe’s death in 1384. See “*O Biblios*” – *The Book* by this writer, p 21, p14 of the uploaded file [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) and *In Awe of Thy Word by Dr Mrs Riplinger*, pp 873-874.

See also See *Wycliffe Vs Cloud* [www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads/PDF/WycliffVSCloud.pdf](http://www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads/PDF/WycliffVSCloud.pdf) by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger and remarks under **Erroneous Additions to the King James Version Bible** – *according to Curley!*

Wycliffe’s true text, therefore, may agree much more closely with the bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Reformation that in turn repeatedly agree with the 1611 Holy Bible against the Catholic and modern departures from it.

Dr Moorman identifies 3 cursives that agree with the 1611 Holy Bible, along with 21 of Hoskier’s cursives i.e. a substantial witness from the Andreas mss.

The Critical/Minority Text, as Dr Moorman also notes, such as Nestle’s and the so-called ‘Majority’ Text have the addition, although as is usually the case with agreement between these texts, the NKJV does not have the addition.



The modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB have the addition. The sense of the verse and the witness of the bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation show however that the addition should be ignored.

### Revelation 8:13

**Verse should read:** “And I beheld, and heard an **eagle** flying through the midst of heaven, saying with a loud voice,...”

“Eagle” is a nonsense reading. It cannot be justified by means of Revelation 5:13, 2 Peter 2:16, Luke 19:40 where God gives speech to non-human or even inanimate sources because, as Dr Ruckman notes in the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1653, the reading contradicts Revelation 14:6.

“And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people,”

The expression “another angel” occurs 8 times in the Book of Revelation, Revelation 7:2, 8:3, 14:6, 8, 15, 17, 18, 18:1. Each time it denotes a second or subsequent angel from the context.

By inspection, the reading “eagle” in Revelation 8:13 contradicts Revelation 19:17-18, 21.

“And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God; That ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great...And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.”

The above passage shows that “all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven” are not concerned with expressing woe or sympathy for “the inhabitants of the earth.”

Dr Moorman in *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!* p 150 states that of the mss. that contain Revelation 8:13, the Andreas group has “angel” and the 046 group has “eagle.”

The Received Text of Stephanus and the Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ bibles have “angel.”

The Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB have “eagle.” The Farstad-Hodges ‘Majority’ Text has “eagle” although the NKJV has “angel.”

The above witnesses show that the 1611 Holy Bible is, as always, correct and the critic is wrong, again.

### Revelation 11:18

**Verse should read:** “And the **dead** were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged,...”

The alteration of “nations” to “dead” is another nonsense reading.

The Received Text of Stephanus, the so-called ‘Majority’ Text and the Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s have “nations.”

The Wycliffe (“folks”), Tyndale, Coverdale (“Heathen”), Great, Geneva (“Gentiles”), Bishops’ bibles have “nations” or similar.

The modern versions DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB have “nations.”

Note that Revelation 11:18 is a statement from eternity looking back on the End Times and the judgement of the Great White Throne, Revelation 20:11. The reading “dead” in Revelation 11:18 therefore contradicts Revelation 14:13 “And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours;”

and their works do follow them.” That is, not *all* the dead could be angry. Those that “*die in the Lord*” are “*blessed*.”

The critic is making up the reading from his DIYV. It has no tangible support whatsoever, not even from the usually corrupt sources such as the Critical/Minority Text, the so-called ‘Majority’ Text and the modern versions.

#### Revelation 12:6

**Verse should read:** “And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she has **there** a place prepared of God...”

Insertion of a second “there” (see whole verse) is stupid, superfluous and ungrammatical, as shown by the location of the word “where.”

The Received Text of Stephanus does not have “there.”

The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ bibles do not have “there.”

Some editions of the Critical/Minority Text, Griesbach, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth and Nestle have “there” along with the Farstad-Hodges ‘Majority’ Text. However, the modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB do not have “there.”

The critic has once again resorted to his futile DIYV and the extra “there” can be ignored.

#### Revelation 13:5

**Verse should read:** “...and power was given it **to make war** forty-two months...”

The Received Text of Elzevir, which normally supports the 1611 Holy Bible, has “to make war” instead of “continue” in Revelation 13:5, along with the Farstad-Hodges ‘Majority’ Text, although the NKJV has “continue” in agreement with the AV1611.

The alteration is incorrect because it contradicts Revelation 13:4, 7. The other Greek texts read as the 1611 Holy Bible.

“And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him?”

“And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations.”

The beast is not making war generally, only with the saints. The alteration obscures this information.

The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ bibles read as the 1611 Holy Bible, with slight variation in wording.

The modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB read as the 1611 Holy Bible, with some variation in wording.

The critic has only two sources with which to try unsuccessfully to overthrow the text of the 1611 Holy Bible. He is naturally prejudiced enough to use them.

#### Revelation 14:1

**Verse should read:** “...having **His name and the name** of His Father written on their foreheads...”

Dr Moorman notes in *When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text* p 99 that alteration of “His Father’s name” to “His name and the name of His Father” is an error because the Lord’s servants have only one name in their foreheads, that of Deity and the alteration contradicts Revelation 3:12, 7:3, 9:4.

The Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s, the so-called ‘Majority’ Text and the modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB contain the alteration.

Dr Mrs Riplinger in *Which Bible is God's Word?* p 103 warns against the alteration because it subtly introduces the name of the beast Revelation 13:17 as being applied to God's servants. See also Dr Mrs Riplinger's similar warning in *New Age Versions* Chapter 6.

Dr Moorman notes that the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir and the Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles do not have the alteration. Coverdale's Bible does not have the alteration.

Dr Moorman identifies one uncial ms. and 5 cursives that do not contain the alteration, with a 6<sup>th</sup> having the 1611 Holy Bible reading in its margin. Dr Mrs Riplinger in *King James Version Ditches Blind Guides* p 55 [www.av1611.org/kjv/ripwhit6.html](http://www.av1611.org/kjv/ripwhit6.html) states that a total of 9 mss. do not contain the alteration.

The critic is wrong, again. The 1611 Holy Bible is right, as usual.

### Revelation 15:3

**Verse should read:** "And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvellous *are* thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true *are* thy ways, thou King of **nations**."

Dr Moorman notes in *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text* p 101 that the substitution of "nations" for "saints" is incorrect because "At the time of the statement, Christ is king of saints. He has not yet returned; the nations have not yet acknowledged his kingship."

The Lord imposes His kingship by force at the Second Advent. "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power" 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9.

He will then rule "with a rod of iron" Psalm 2:9 "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth" Zechariah 14:9a but this is subsequent to Revelation 15 in time.

Dr Moorman notes that the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir and the Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles have "saints" in agreement with the 1611 Holy Bible. He identifies 3 cursives that have the word "saints" and 2 4<sup>th</sup> century writers, Victorinus and Tyconius, who quote "saints" in Revelation 15:3. Coverdale's Bible has "saints."

The Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's, the so-called 'Majority' Text and the modern versions, TNIV, JB, NJB, HCSB have "nations."

The DR, RV, NIV, NWT ("eternity") have "ages" or similar.

The ms. evidence in support of the 1611 Holy Bible's reading of "saints" is clearly sparse but again, the witness of the pre-1611 Bibles, together with the unanimity of the corrupt modern versions in favour of the alteration is decisive for any Bible believer. In spite of the lack of support from the majority of mss., the witness of the pre-1611 Bibles in favour of "saints" considerably outweighs that of the corrupt modern sources that on this occasion even disagree amongst themselves.

The God-honoured reading of the 1611 Holy Bible is therefore correct and the alteration is wrong.

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes in *Hazardous Materials* p 753ff that the Greek Orthodox Church is an a-millennial church state and therefore has tampered with many readings in the Book of Revelation that correctly bear testimony to the biblical doctrine of pre-millennialism. Revelation 15:3 is one example, where the word "nations" has been substituted to encourage the exercise of political control by the church to 'bring in the kingdom.'

## Revelation 17:8

**Verse should read:** "...when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and shall be present..."

Dr Moorman notes in *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text* pp 103-104 that about 31 of the Andreas mss. contain, with slight variation, the reading of the 1611 Holy Bible "and yet is" instead of the alteration "and will come" that the critic gives as "and shall be present." The Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir and the Geneva, Bishops' bibles have "and yet is" with the 1611 Holy Bible.

The Critical/Minority Text of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth, Nestle\*, the so-called 'Majority' Text and the modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB have "shall be present" or similar.

The DR has only "the beast that was and is not," omitting the third part of the beast's description. The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great bibles also omit "and yet is."

\*Nestle has "and is present" in the interlinear English text but reads with the other critical texts in the Greek text.

Dr Ruckman in his commentary *The Book of Revelation* p 469 states that "the beast...yet is" because the beast is the Devil incarnate as "the son of perdition" 2 Thessalonians 2:3 and although his appearance as such is yet future, the Devil is active in the world now, such that in that sense "the beast...yet is."

See Ephesians 2:2.

"Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience:"

The reading "and shall be present" obscures the fact that the beast, though now in the bottomless pit Revelation 17:8, is not hindered "from going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it" Job 1:7 in the person of the Devil. See Ephesians 4:27, 6:11, 2 Timothy 2:26, James 4:7 and especially 1 Peter 5:8.

"Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour:"

Note also the warnings of the apostle John in 1 John 2:18 (!), 4:3.

"Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time."

"And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world."

The correct reading "and yet is" in Revelation 17:8 prompts these cross references. The incorrect reading "and shall be present" obscures these cross references.

The critic is therefore wrong again and the 1611 Holy Bible is right.

## Revelation 18:17

**Verse should read:** "...everyone who sails to any place..."

The correct reading, as found in the 1611 Holy Bible is "For in one hour so great riches is come to nought. And every shipmaster, and all the company in ships, and sailors, and as many as trade by sea, stood afar off,"

Dr Moorman notes in *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text* p 105 that the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir and the Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles have "all the company of ships" with the 1611 Holy Bible with slight variation. The Wycliffe and Coverdale bibles read with the 1611 Holy Bible with slight variation.

Dr Moorman identifies Hippolytus, a 3<sup>rd</sup> century writer together with 14 cursives that have the reading “all the company of ships.”

The Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s, the so-called ‘Majority’ Text (although the NKJV has no note to this effect) and the modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB (“seafaring men”), NJB (“seafaring men”), NWT, HCSB (“seafarers”) have the alteration with some variation but omitting the vital word “ships.”

The expression “all the company in ships” is clearly that from which the modern expression “ship’s company” is derived and a ship’s company is defined collectively as “sailors” in the verse because, even today, when steam has replaced sail, ships still sail and they obviously sail to destinations, or places. The alteration adds nothing to the text, therefore and obscures the familiar expression “ship’s company” by removing the vital word “ships.” The effect is therefore to distance the scripture from the ordinary reader. Even if only to a small extent in this one reading, that kind of effect is heinous.

The alteration is therefore another botched reading and is rightly discarded.

#### **Revelation 18:20**

**Verse should read:** “...ye holy saints and apostles and prophets.”

The correct reading as found in the 1611 Holy Bible is “Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her,” without the insertion “saints and.”

The alteration has retained the word “holy” although Dr Moorman reveals in *When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text* p 105 that this vital word is omitted from the underlying texts that have the alteration, namely the Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle’s and the so-called ‘Majority’ Text.

The Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops bibles read with the 1611 Holy Bible. Dr Moorman lists 3 uncials, C, E, 051 and 5 cursives as agreeing with the 1611 Holy Bible and reveals that most of the Andreas mss., including 30 of Hoskier’s cursives read with the 1611 Holy Bible, along with 2 Old Latin sources. Von Soden identified 18 cursives that read with the 1611 Holy Bible.

The Wycliffe, Coverdale bibles read with the 1611 Holy Bible.

The DR reads with the AV1611.

The modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, HCSB have the alteration with some variation but all without the vital word “holy.” The NWT inserts “you holy ones” instead of “saints.”

The alteration is stupid because by inspection “holy saints” is a tautology but removal of the word “holy” as the alteration does in its underlying texts illustrates Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning in *Which Bible is God’s Word?* p 18, *King James Version Ditches Blind Guides* p 3 and the brochure for *New Age Versions* that “men shall be...unholy” 2 Timothy 3:2.

The 1611 Holy Bible has the term “holy apostles and prophets” in Ephesians 3:5, Revelation 18:20.

It has the term “holy prophets” in Luke 1:70, Acts 3:21, 2 Peter 3:2, Revelation 22:6.

It has the term “holy men” in Exodus 22:31, 2 Peter 1:21.

It has the term “holy angels” in Matthew 25:31, Mark 8:38, Luke 9:26, Revelation 14:10.

It has the term “holy brethren” in 1 Thessalonians 5:27, Hebrews 3:1.

It has the term “Holy Ghost” in 89 verses, including Matthew 12:31, John 7:39, Acts 6:3, 8:18, 1 Corinthians 2:13.

The NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB omit “holy” from Exodus 22:31, Matthew 12:31, 25:31, John 7:39, Acts 6:3, 8:18, 1 Corinthians 2:13, 1 Thessalonians 5:27, 2 Peter 1:21, Revelation 18:20, 22:6 i.e. in 11 vital references. These versions have no “holy men.” The NWT omits “holy” in all the verses except Exodus 22:31 and Revelation 18:20.

However, as the above information shows, the NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT are among the versions that the critic repeatedly prefers above the 1611 Holy Bible. He is as unholy as they are.

#### Revelation 19:12

**Verse should read:** "...and on his head were many crowns, having **names written, and** a name written that no man knew..."

One edition of the Critical/Minority Text, that of Alford and the so-called 'Majority' Text have the addition "names written, and." The NKJV, based on the so-called 'Majority' Text, however, does not have the addition.

The Received Text of Stephanus does not have the addition.

The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles do not have the addition.

The modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB do not have the addition.

The addition conflicts with Revelation 19:13, where only one name is mentioned, with respect to what it is called, i.e. not what it is, because only the Lord knows that, but what His name is *called*.

**"And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God."**

Observe that the only individual in the Book of Revelation with names plural is the satanic beast of Revelation 17:3.

**"So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns."**

For obvious reasons, therefore, the critic's addition to Revelation 19:12 should be discarded immediately.

#### Revelation 19:17

**Verse should read:** "...gather yourselves together unto the **great** supper of God..."

The 1611 Holy Bible reads "And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God;"

The critic does not want God to be called "great."

Dr Moorman states in *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text* p 107 that the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir and the Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles have "the great God" with the 1611 Holy Bible. Coverdale's Bible reads "the great God" with the 1611 Holy Bible.

Dr Moorman lists 2 uncials, E, 051 and 34 cursives that read with the 1611 Holy Bible, together with "many of the Andreas mss.."

The Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's, the so-called 'Majority' Text and the modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB have the alteration.

Any Bible believer who believes in "the great God" will assuredly discard the alteration on the basis of the above evidence.

#### Revelation 21:24

**Verse should read:** "And the nations shall walk by means of its light."

The critic has misplaced this verse. It should be listed with the supposed "Text to Remove" verses. The 1611 Holy Bible reads as follows.

**"And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it."**

The critic is clearly following the false doctrine of universal salvation by adopting the omission.

Dr Moorman states in *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text* p 112 that the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir and the Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles have "of them which are saved" in agreement with the 1611 Holy Bible. He notes that part of the Andreas ms. tradition supports the 1611 Holy Bible reading with variation. Coverdale's Bible agrees with the 1611 Holy Bible.

The Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's, the so-called 'Majority' Text and the modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB ("pagan nations"), NJB, NWT, HCSB omit the words "of them which are saved."

The omission contradicts Psalm 9:17, Revelation 11:18 (which the critic would have appreciated if he hadn't tampered with Revelation 11:18).

"The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God."

"And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldst destroy them which destroy the earth."

See also Ezekiel 32:17-32 where specific nations are said to be in hell. These nations will no doubt have their counterparts in the End Times, probably as Moslem nations, e.g. Egypt, Elam, the Zidonians.

The omission is therefore another attempt to corrupt "the scripture of truth" Daniel 10:21 and the words "of them which are saved" should be retained in Revelation 21:24.

#### **Revelation 22:19**

**Verse should read:** "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 **tree** of life, and out of the holy city, and *from* the things which are written in this book."

Dr Moorman in *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text* pp 113-114 states that the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir and the Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles read "book of life" with the 1611 Holy Bible. He notes little ms. support for the 1611 Holy Bible reading but indicates that the 4<sup>th</sup> century early church writer Ambrose has the reading. The Wycliffe and Coverdale bibles have "book of life."

The Critical/Minority Text such as Nestle's, the so-called 'Majority' Text and the modern versions, RV, NIV, TNIV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB have the alteration "tree of life."

The lack of ms. support for the 1611 Holy Bible reading notwithstanding, Dr Moorman rightly asks "What are we to make of a man's "part in the tree of life"?"

Answer: nothing.

"The tree of life" is mentioned in Revelation 22:2 but by inspection, the only way the alteration in Revelation 22:19 would make any sense would be if explicit reference was made to the fruits and the leaves of the tree of life but such reference is not made.

By contrast, the expression "part...of the book of life" does make sense in the context of Revelation 22:19.

"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."

Researcher Will Kinney in [brandplucked.webs.com/rev2219bookoflife.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/rev2219bookoflife.htm) has extensive comments on Revelation 22:19 from which the following extract is taken.

*"The Providence of God has seen fit to place this reading in most Bibles that have been used throughout history to reach millions for Christ. These include Wycliffe 1380, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, the Great*

*Bible (Cranmer 1539), Matthew's Bible (John Rogers) 1549, the Bishops' Bible 1568, and the Geneva Bible 1557...*

*"It is also the reading of the 1569 Sagradas Escrituras, and the Spanish Reina Valera versions from 1602, 1909, 1960 and 1995 used throughout the Spanish speaking world, as well as the 2004 Reina Valera Gomez translation, the French Martin 1744 and the French Ostervald 1996, the Italian Diodati of 1602, 1649 and the New Italian Diodati 1991 - "libro della vita" and the Modern Greek N.T. used by the Greek Orthodox churches throughout the world today.*

*"Martin Luther's translation of 1545, using Greek texts before Stephanus' 1550 edition, also reads "book of life". I met a Russian pastor a couple years ago and asked him what his Russian Bible said here. He told me it reads book of life too.*

*"Besides all these English, Spanish, French, Italian, German and Greek bibles, I have been able to confirm that the following Bible versions also read "book of life": The Afrikaans Bible of 1953, the Albanian, the Basque New Testament (Navarro-Labourdin), the Dutch Staten Vertaling, the Hungarian Karoli, the Icelandic Bible version and the Douay-Rheims..."*

All of which leaves the critic with very little useful support for the alteration "tree."

See *Whitewashed, A Critique of James White* pp 119ff by this writer, available from A. V. Publications Corp. for a detailed summary on Revelation 22:19.

Again, on the basis of the above evidence, the 1611 Holy Bible reading is undoubtedly right and the alteration is undoubtedly wrong.

#### **Revelation 22:21**

**Verse should read:** Should close with "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with all **of the saints**. Amen."

Dr Moorman in *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text* p 114 states that the Received Texts of Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir and the Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' bibles read "with you all" with the 1611 Holy Bible. He specifies 3 cursives and notes that about 15 of Hoskier's cursives read with the 1611 Holy Bible along with 4 Old Latin sources. The Wycliffe and Coverdale bibles agree with the 1611 Holy Bible.

The so-called 'Majority' Text has the alteration "with all of the saints" along with the Griesbach, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth editions of the Critical/Minority Text. Nestle's and other editions read "with all."

The NKJV does not follow the so-called 'Majority' Text but agrees with the 1611 Holy Bible. The other modern versions are divided over the alteration.

The DR, JB, NJB agree with the 1611 Holy Bible.

The RV, NIV ("God's people"), TNIV ("God's people"), NWT ("with the holy ones"), HCSB ("with all the saints") have the alteration with variation.

The alteration therefore has only tenuous support, from largely corrupt sources that disagree amongst themselves.

In addition, the alteration is stupid and therefore wholly unwarranted, because it is inconsistent with John's salutation to his readers. John is writing a personal letter as set out in Revelation 1:4, which prophetically includes believers to the present day, for whom his personal address is therefore retained.

"John to the seven churches which are in Asia: Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne;"

It is fitting, therefore that John should conclude his letter with the words "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen." in Revelation 22:21.



The alteration de-personalises John's address and therefore has no place in "the scripture of truth" Daniel 10:21.

Again, the 1611 Holy Bible is right and the critic is wrong.

In sum, the critic has objected to 126 verses in the 1611 Holy Bible. See the conclusion at the end of this section of this work. It can be said unequivocally that the critic has been wrong in 100% of his 126 objections to the 1611 Holy Bible, for which he has resorted to no fewer than 12 authorities\* of which none was his final authority and by which he sought to shore up false doctrine.

See remarks on 1 Corinthians 1:18, 1 Peter 2:2, 1 John 5:7, Revelation 21:24.

Mr Curley has wholly supported the critic's attacks on the 1611 Holy Bible. "He...is partaker of his evil deeds" 2 John 11.

Likewise Mr Twister, who has a postscript. See below.

\*In contrast to accessing multiple witnesses in favour of the 1611 Holy Bible. These witnesses *bear testimony* to the text of the 1611 Holy Bible. They do not *determine* the text. God has determined the text of the 1611 Holy Bible that He has vindicated over the last 400 years. See Dr Moorman's remarks to this effect in *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text* p 28.

Mr Curley signs himself off as "Yours in ignorance." That is the only sensible statement he makes in his entire submission.

Note also that Mr Curley says that he will stick with Tyndale and Geneva because he doesn't like the modern perversions. That statement is sheer hypocrisy on Mr Curley's part. Inspection of the verses listed above shows that the Tyndale and Geneva bibles repeatedly support the 1611 Holy Bible *against* the changes that Mr Curley advocates and the modern perversions that he professes to eschew repeatedly *support* the changes.

It is therefore hoped that this study will provide some knowledge to help Bible believers combat the "ravening wolves" Matthew 7:15 who seek to maul both the Book of God and in turn the Body of Christ, as Proverbs 11:9 states.

"An hypocrite with his mouth destroyeth his neighbour: but through knowledge shall the just be delivered."

## Conclusion

Between them, by means of the Seventh Day Adventist heretical cult, Twist and Curl have charged 126 verses of scripture with error of some kind:

Genesis 1:2, 10:9, Leviticus 16:8, 10, 26, Deuteronomy 24:1, 2 Kings 2:23, Psalm 81:4, Isaiah 65:17, Ezekiel 20:25, Daniel 8:14, Malachi 4:6, Matthew 5:48, 23:13, 14, 24:22, 24, 27:35, 49, 28:1, Mark 16:9, Luke 2:14, 3:23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 9:50, 10:22, 14:26, 23:43, John 1:17, 28, 31, 33, 8:9, 10, 28, 13:2, Acts 9:5, 6, 19, 10:6, 21, 12:4, 20:28, 21:8, Romans 1:7, 13:9, 16:20, 25, 26, 27, 1 Corinthians 1:18, 7:19, 15:29, 2 Corinthians 6:2, Philippians 3:3, Colossians 1:6, 14, 2:13, 17, 1 Thessalonians 5:21, 2 Thessalonians 2:10, 1 Timothy 3:11, 4:8, 6:10, 2 Timothy 2:19, Hebrews 2:7, 4:8, 9, 8:8, 9:28, 11:13, 12:20, 13:9, 1 Peter 2:2, 2 Peter 2:5, 1 John 2:23, 5:7, 8, Revelation 1:8, 11, 20, 2:17, 21, 5:4, 14, 6:12, 8:7, 13, 11:1, 18, 12:6, 12, 13:5, 14:1, 4, 5, 15:2, 3, 16:7, 14, 17:8, 18:17, 20, 19:12, 17, 20:5, 10, 21:3, 24, 22:2, 19, 21.

Twist and Curl have been shown to be wrong each time, along with their heretical cult mentors.

## Twister's Postscript

He states as follows:

### Word Differences

Another thing to keep in mind is the fact that the 1611 A.D. King James English is somewhat different than today's English language. The meaning of certain words has changed, and/or the King James sometimes uses words not familiar to most people today in their common speech. In addition, certain idioms in the original Hebrew and Greek are a little difficult to understand today. The *Oxford Wide Margin KJV* has excellent marginal references which often explain the correct meanings. Here is a partial listing of changed word meanings:

King James Phrase (on top)

Modern English (on bottom)

Twister lists a total of 79 words or expressions that he claims have changed their meaning. Many in fact will be found to be still in current use with their King James Biblical meanings or to have a current usage in a particular context in the AV1611. See *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version* by Dr Laurence M. Vance, Vance Publications, ISBN 0-9268898-4-9. Examples from Twister's list include betimes, blains, bruit, charity, communicate, communications, convince (according to *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*), corn (according to *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*), dissimulation (according to *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*), divers, gay, glass, hell, husbandman, iniquity, knew (as in carnal knowledge), nether (Twister and Twister's lister forget the Netherlands), outlandish, him that "pisseth against the wall" (crude but contemporary, nevertheless), prophesy, quicken, quit, rain, rentest (as in rend, rent), requite, rudiments, servant, tongues (according to *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*), virtue, visage.

That is 30 out of 79 words or 38% of Twister's list, well over one in three. That proportion does not account for the instances where *Oxford Wide Margin* meaning is *wrong* as in creature, cross, damned, devils, dividing, doting, hardness, jealous, mansions, sprinkle, stranger or where Twister and/or his lister have unwittingly or otherwise introduced SDA doctrinal heresy, as in Abraham's bosom, he, hell. These 14 instances are 18% of Twister's list, nearly one in five, an appreciable proportion.

Twister, like his twisted counterpart Curley, is therefore a liar, as the following explanations show in more detail, using scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13 and wherever appropriate the AV1611's own built-in dictionary, in fulfilment of Matthew 24:35.

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

See *The Language of the King James Bible* and *In Awe of Thy Word* Parts 1-3 both by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger with respect to the AV1611's own built-in dictionary.

Whatever the vagaries of secular English usage, the words of the 1611 Holy Bible *as defined in the 1611 Holy Bible* do not change their meanings.

Note that for the explanations of the words and terms that follow, depending on the contexts of the terms given, sometimes the whole of scripture applies for the explanation and sometimes consideration of a particular section is appropriate for how a particular writer uses a word, e.g. the Pauline Epistles.

### Abraham's bosom

"the Kingdom of God" in which the redeemed will have an intimate relationship with father Abraham in sharing the eternal inheritance of the earth.

Twister and possibly the *Oxford Wide Margin* are wrong. Lazarus "the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom:" Luke 16:22. "Abraham's bosom" is a *place*, "in the heart of the earth" Matthew 12:40, where the Lord was between the crucifixion and the resurrection. "Abraham's bosom" was entered at death by the righteous dead *before the crucifixion*. The righteous dead *now go*

straight to “the third heaven” 2 Corinthians 12:2. “The kingdom of God” by contrast is *a spiritual kingdom* that is now entered *only* by the new birth.

“Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God... Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God” John 3:3, 5.

See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* pp 1254, 1386, 1557.

#### adoption

“sonship”, as in Romans 8:23, 9:4, Ephesians 1:5.

The modern definition is not very precise. The adoption in Romans 8:23 is “the redemption of our body” according to Romans 8:11 “But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.”

The adoption in Romans 9:4 is Israel’s adoption according to Hosea 11:1 “When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt.”

Ephesians 1:5 specifically concerns “the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself” according to Hebrews 2:13 “And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me.” Paul does speak of receiving “the adoption of sons” Galatians 4:5 but he clearly uses the expressions “children of God” and “sons of God” to depict *stages of spiritual growth following the new birth*. Compare Romans 8:16, 21, Galatians 3:26 with Romans 8:14, 19, Philippians 2:15. Ephesians 1:5 rightly therefore has “children” rather than “sons” emphasising that adoption accompanies conversion, at the very beginning of spiritual growth.

Pauline precision in the above respects is beyond the Twister/lister definitions, however.

#### affections

“passions”, as in Galatians 5:24, “mind” as in Colossians 3:2.

The associated word in Galatians 5:24 is “lusts” as in Romans 13:14, 1 John 2:15-16, passages that are good, practical guidance for the Christian. The additional definition is unnecessary.

“But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.”

“Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.”

“Affection” is the correct word in Colossians 3:2, not “mind,” which refers only to mental assent. Paul had “affection” with respect to “things above” not simply “mind.”

“For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better” Philippians 1:23.

#### afflict soul

“fast” as in Leviticus 23:27, 32 (Psalms (sic) 35:13).

The expression “afflict your souls” occurs 5 times in scripture, in association with the seventh month and the Day of Atonement. See Leviticus 16:29, 31, 23:27, 32, Numbers 29:7. The expression essentially has to do with the Jew humbling and lowering himself at that time, after the manner of James 4:9.

“Be afflicted, and mourn, and weep: let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness.”

Fasting could be part of that voluntary affliction, as it was for Nehemiah in his voluntary affliction over Jerusalem.

“And it came to pass, when I heard these words, that I sat down and wept, and mourned certain days, and fasted, and prayed before the God of heaven” Nehemiah 1:4.

Fasting can, however, be for the wrong reasons.

Observe that the individuals whom God rebukes through Isaiah had fasted and professed to have afflicted their souls *but they hadn't*. Note in the following verses that affliction of the soul was meant to be accompanied *by refraining from any work*, Leviticus 16:29, 23:28, 31, Numbers 29:7.

The individuals whom God rebukes through Isaiah had not obeyed Leviticus 16:29, 23:28, 31, Numbers 29:7.

“Wherefore have we fasted, say they, and thou seest not? wherefore have we afflicted our soul, and thou takest no knowledge? Behold, in the day of your fast ye find pleasure, and exact all your labours. Behold, ye fast for strife and debate, and to smite with the fist of wickedness: ye shall not fast as ye do this day, to make your voice to be heard on high” Isaiah 58:3-4.

Fasting may be part of afflicting the soul but the essential aspects are mourning over sinfulness that needs atonement and refraining from any work, *because works cannot make “an atonement for the soul”* Leviticus 17:11, Numbers 15:28.

beguile

“judge against you”, as in Colossians 2:18.

Note the following scriptures.

“And this I say, lest any man should beguile you with enticing words” Colossians 2:4.

“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” Colossians 2:8.

“Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days” Colossians 2:16.

“Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind” Colossians 2:18.

To beguile an individual is to use enticing words to spoil him by deceiving him into embracing man's wisdom that is “earthly, sensual, devilish” James 3:15, like trying to ‘correct’ the 1611 Holy Bible. Such an individual is then vulnerable to further beguilement by means of judgement passed on him by the beguiler for failure, say, to observe “the new moon.”

See the critic's false teaching in that respect under **Which *italicized* words in the King James Bible are INCORRECT?**

In Psalms (sic) 81:4, “was” is totally uncalled for and not in the original Hebrew. New Moons are still a statute of God.

The *Oxford Wide Margin* and *Twister/lister* clearly fail to give the full definition for the word “beguile” as used in Colossians 2.

betimes

“early”, as in Proverbs 13:24.

The discerning Bible reader, trusting God for wisdom, Proverbs 2:1-5, James 1:5, will note the expressions “rose up early in the morning” Genesis 22:3, “rose up betimes in the morning” Genesis 26:31, the first mentions of the words “betimes” and “rose up early in the morning” Genesis 28:18.

He would also note that the expression “rising up betimes” 2 Chronicles 36:15 with respect to the Lord’s messengers and prophets 2 Chronicles 36:16 matched the expression “rising up early” with respect to the ministry of the prophet Jeremiah and “my servants the prophets,” Jeremiah 7:13, 25, 26:5, 29:19, 32:33, 35:15.

The discerning Bible reader would then correctly deduce that the word “betimes” means “early,” *having seen it used in context* and then make figurative application in Proverbs 13:24 with respect to the word “betimes” referring to early in life.

#### blains

“blisters”, as in Exodus 9:9.

Exodus 9:9, 10 are the only occurrences of the word “blains” in scripture. They show that “blains” are boils, which are potentially more serious than blisters.

#### bosom, in his

“have an intimate relationship with”, as in II Samuel 12:3, 8, John 1:18.

Expressions such as “into thy bosom” Genesis 16:5, Exodus 4:6 or similar, Numbers 11:12, Ruth 4:16, 1 Kings 3:20 clearly denote closeness and intimacy. Yet again, the scripture is its own interpreter.

#### bruit

“report, rumor”, as in Jeremiah 10:22, Nahum 3:19.

Jeremiah 10:22 associates “the noise of the bruit” with “a great commotion.” Nahum 3:2 associates “The noise of a whip, and the noise of the rattling of the wheels, and of the prancing horses, and of the jumping chariots” with the chaos as “Nineveh is laid waste” Nahum 3:7.

“All that hear the bruit of thee” Nahum 3:19 would therefore refer *primarily* to those who would have heard the noise of the commotion of the fall of Nineveh i.e. “bruit” would refer to “confused noise” Isaiah 9:5. This would have been reported but that is a secondary or derived meaning. Again, the scripture defines its own terms. Note with respect to Jeremiah 10:22 that if “confused noise” is substituted for “bruit,” double-barrelled expressions do occur in scripture e.g. “shout(ed) with a great shout” Joshua 6:5, 20, 1 Samuel 4:5, Ezra 3:11. See also Dr Ruckman’s commentary *The Book of Minor Prophets Vol. I Hosea-Nahum* pp 495-496.

#### charity

“spiritual love”, as in I Corinthians 13.

“Charity” covers considerably more than “spiritual love.” “Charity” first occurs in scripture as its derivative “charitably” in Romans 14:15.

“But if thy brother be grieved with *thy* meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died.”

Paul then says in Romans 14:19:

“Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.”

To edify is the opposite of destroy but the opposite of destroy is also to build.

“For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor” Galatians 2:18.

“Let every one of us please his neighbour for his good to edification.” That is, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” Romans 13:9. Note then 1 Corinthians 8:1 and Ephesians 4:16:

“Now as touching things offered unto idols, we know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth.”

“From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.”

Charity, therefore, is a brotherly, neighbourly love that aims at building up another person, especially a fellow believer *by means that may be entirely material*, as Romans 14:15 shows. The term therefore is rightly in use today with the essentially the same meaning as in scripture.

Yet again, the scripture is its own interpreter.

clean heart

“right attitude”, as in Psalms 51:10, 73:1.

Psalms 51:10 states “Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me.”

Psalms 51:10 includes the given definition but is much more precise, with specific reference to part of the individual’s tripartite nature, which is “spirit and soul and body” 1 Thessalonians 5:23. Note also 1 Corinthians 2:11 with respect to “the spirit of man which is in him.” David is praying that his spirit will be made anew by a release from guilt and despair and therefore be a free spirit, as God’s spirit is. See David’s prayer in Psalm 51:12.

“Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free spirit.”

See Dr Ruckman’s commentary *Volume I of the Book of Psalms* p 340.

The given definition also misses the essentials of “a clean heart” that are given in Psalm 51:6 as truthfulness and godly wisdom. “Heart” is clearly defined in the context as “the inward parts” and “the hidden part.”

“Behold, thou desirest truth in the inward parts: and in the hidden part thou shalt make me to know wisdom.”

Again, comparing scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13 is the only way to understand scripture that is totally trustworthy, not by means of a man-made dictionary.

communicate

“share”, as in Hebrews 13:16.

As is often the case in scripture, the meaning of the word depends on context. Galatians 2:2 shows a derivative of the word “communicate” as having the same meaning as today.

“And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.”

Philippians 4:14-15 then show that to communicate in scripture can mean *both keeping in touch and bestowing material gifts*.

“Notwithstanding ye have well done, that ye did communicate with my affliction. Now ye Philippians know also, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only.”

The given definition therefore does not satisfactorily convey the scriptural meanings of the word communicate. Note the embedded word commune is used in Luke 6:11, 22:4, 24:15, Acts 24:26, not always for a good purpose but clearly with the contemporary meaning, which is to speak together i.e. communicate but not to share as such.

## communications

“associations, companionships”, as in I Corinthians 15:33.

1 Corinthians 15:33 states “Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners.” The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister are trying to cover up for the devious and degenerate media, as a study of the words “communication” and “communications” elsewhere in scripture shows. See the 7 occasions when these words are used apart from 1 Corinthians 15:33; 2 Samuel 3:17, 2 Kings 9:11, Matthew 5:37, Luke 24:17, Ephesians 4:29, Colossians 3:8, Philemon 6. Note especially Paul’s use of the word “communication.”

“Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers” Ephesians 4:29.

“But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth” Colossians 3:8.

“That the communication of thy faith may become effectual by the acknowledging of every good thing which is in you in Christ Jesus” Philemon 6.

Paul’s use of the word “communication” is contemporary in each of the above three instances. His use of the plural form of the term in 1 Corinthians 15:33 is no exception.

## conversation

“conduct”, as in Philippians 2:27, I Peter 3:1, “citizenship” as in Philippians 3:20.

The actual reference for the first verse given is Philippians 1:27. The verses listed read as follows.

“Only let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ: that whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel” Philippians 1:27.

“Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives” 1 Peter 3:1.

“For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ” Philippians 3:20.

Different contexts in scripture may yield different meanings, or shades of meaning. “Your conversation” in Philippians 1:27 is with respect to that which “becometh the gospel of Christ” and is therefore defined in the remainder of the verse as “your affairs” with respect to steadfastness and unity in the ministry of the Gospel i.e. “that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel.”

“Conversation” in 1 Peter 3:1 refers to “chaste conversation” in 1 Peter 3:2. “Conversation” is therefore defined *in a similar context* in Titus 2:4-5, where “conversation” is clearly a generic term for godly living.

“That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.”

1 Peter 3:16 also gives a summary definition of “conversation” in Peter’s letter with respect to what an individual *does in following the Lord Jesus Christ*.

“Having a good conscience; that, whereas they speak evil of you, as of evildoers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.”

The above definition of “conversation” clearly harmonises with Titus 2:4-5, 1 Peter 3:1-2.

It is true that Christians are “fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God” Ephesians 2:19 but “conversation” in Philippians 3:20 is defined by comparison the verses immediately before and after it.

“Whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things)” Philippians 3:19.

“Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself” Philippians 3:21.

“Conversation” in Philippians 3:20 therefore refers to the Christian’s “end” or indeed “expected end” Jeremiah 29:11, which is not “destruction” but to be glorified *bodily* like the Lord Jesus Christ to “bear the image of the heavenly” 1 Corinthians 15:49 and “and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality” 1 Corinthians 15:52-53.

In addition, the term “conversation” has a *further* meaning in scripture that refers to what is *heard* as well as what is *done*.

“And delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked: (For that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds;)” 2 Peter 2:7-8.

“The filthy conversation of the wicked” that vexed Lot was “their unlawful deeds” but the context of the passage shows that it had to include what the wicked *said* as well as what they *did*.

In sum, the proffered definitions “conduct” and “citizenship” do *not* convey the true *scriptural* meanings of the word “conversation” in the scriptures cited.

#### convince

“convict”, as in Titus 1:9, James 2:9.

Titus 1:9 states “Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.”

“Convince” is the correct word. Note Titus 1:13, where Paul describes the intended outcome of Titus 1:9.

“...Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith;”

Paul is using the word “convince” in its contemporary sense, as it is used in Acts 18:28, where “convict” would also be the wrong word.

“For he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by the scriptures that Jesus was Christ.”

It is possible for an individual to be convicted, without being convinced. John 8:9 is the only occurrence in scripture of the word “convict” or any of its derivatives and reads as follows.

“And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst.”

They were not, however, convinced about the Lord Jesus Christ as John 8:13 shows, immediately after the Lord’s statement “I am the light of the world” John 8:12.

“The Pharisees therefore said unto him, Thou bearest record of thyself; thy record is not true.”

James 2:9 states “But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.”

James 2:9 does not refer explicitly to an individual being convicted by the law as in a court of law verdict but that the law itself unequivocally declares the respecter of persons to have broken the whole law, as James 2:10 explains.



**“For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.”**

In that sense, the law is “convinced” against the offender.

The *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition of “convict” for the word “convince” is therefore both inadequate and misleading.

**corn**

**“grain”, as in Leviticus 23:14, Deuteronomy 23:25.**

Leviticus 23:14 states “And ye shall eat neither bread, nor parched corn, nor green ears, until the self-same day that ye have brought an offering unto your God: it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations in all your dwellings.”

Deuteronomy 23:25 states “When thou comest into the standing corn of thy neighbour, then thou mayest pluck the ears with thine hand; but thou shalt not move a sickle unto thy neighbour’s standing corn.”

Both verses are referring to “ears of corn” Genesis 41:5 or “corn in the ear” Mark 4:28 in the contemporary sense. Note that “corn” in scripture can refer to a kernel John 12:24 or a specific type of grain.

“Brought beds, and basons, and earthen vessels, and wheat, and barley, and flour, and parched corn, and beans, and lentiles, and parched pulse” 2 Samuel 17:28.

“Saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsifying the balances by deceit?” Amos 8:5.

See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1255, 1303.

Note that the word “grain” occurs 8 times in the AV1611, 5 times in the expression “grain of mustard seed” Matthew 13:31, 17:20, Mark 4:31, Luke 13:19, 17:6. It is used to describe “corn” in Amos 9:9 and as a general term in 1 Corinthians 15:37.

“For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth.”

“And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain:”

Again, the *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition is both inadequate and misleading. Only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, is trustworthy for defining scriptural terms.

**cover his feet**

**“go to the toilet”, as in I Samuel 24:3.**

The expression “cover his feet” occurs only once in the AV1611, in 1 Samuel 24:3. By inspection, it is just as descriptive as the proposed modern alternative, or indeed more so.

**creature**

**“creation”, as in Romans 8:20-21, II Corinthians 5:17, Galatians 6:15.**

A distinction must be drawn between “creature” and “creation.” The “creation” is the world that the “creature” inhabits.

“For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse” Romans 1:20.

It is true that both the creature and the creation need deliverance from decay by means of the return of the Creator because both the creature and the creation are wearing out.

“For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now” Romans 8:19-22.

“Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath: for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner: but my salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished” Isaiah 51:6.

“For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day” 2 Corinthians 4:16.

However, the Gospel is preached to “every creature” Mark 16:15, not “all creation” as in the NIV, which is a nonsensical reading. Moreover, circumcision, Galatians 6:15, relates to *creatures*, not *creation*!

The *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition is therefore misleading and should be discarded.

cross

“stake”

The word “cross” occurs 28 times in scripture; Matthew 10:18, 16:24, 27:32, 40, 42, Mark 8:34, 10:21, 15:21, 30, 32, Luke 9:23, 14:27, 23:26, John 19:17, 19, 25, 31, 1 Corinthians 1:17, 18, Galatians 5:11, 6:12, 14, Ephesians 2:16, Philippians 2:8, 3:18, Colossians 1:20, 2:14, Hebrews 12:2.

The Jehovah’s Witness NWT, New World Translation, changes each reference to “torture stake.” The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister are lining up with heretics. Twister should have checked his list before circulating it.

Exodus 12:7 shows that “cross” is right and “stake” is wrong, especially insofar as the Lord Jesus Christ said that He is “the door” John 10:7, 9. Exodus 12:7 refers to the blood of “Your lamb” Exodus 12:5 that is in type “the blood of the Lamb” Revelation 7:14, 12:11, “the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot” 1 Peter 1:19.

“And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts and on the upper door post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it.”

By inspection, Exodus 12:7 shows that the orientation of the blood on the doorposts could only be matched by a victim on a *cross*, not a *stake*.

The *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition is both wrong and heretical.

damned

“judged”, as in Mark 16:16.

The word “damned” occurs 3 times in scripture.

“He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned” Mark 16:16.

“And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin” Romans 14:23.

“That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness” 2 Thessalonians 2:12.

“Damned” in Mark 16:16 is clearly the opposite of “saved,” that is, to be “damned” in the sense of Mark 16:16 is to be *lost*. Judgement on the individual has already been passed. That is also the sense of the word “damned” in 2 Thessalonians 2:12.

“Damned” in Romans 14:23 does not mean *lost* but it does mean that the individual has *sinned*, in this case against a weaker brother, Romans 14:21. Again, judgement has already been passed, so “judge” is the wrong word.

The *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister are wrong again.

devils

“demons”, as in I Timothy 4:1.

The word “devils,” plural, occurs 48 times in scripture. 1 Timothy 4:1 states “Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;”

The word “demons” is inferior because it has no sense of evil as such. Note the embedded word *evil* in “devils.” Dr Ruckman notes that not only is the word “demon(s)” a transliteration\* rather than a translation but that demons are not necessarily perceived as evil. Greek philosophers such as Aristotle, Plato and Socrates believed in ‘good’ demons that could impart higher knowledge indeed as “seducing spirits” as the King’s men rightly revealed in 1 Timothy 4:1. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1269. Dr Mrs Riplinger states in *Which Bible Is God’s Word?* pp 19-20 that belief in ‘good’ demons defined in Webster’s Dictionary as “*tutelary divinities*” persists to the present time. That explains why “they...worship devils” Revelation 9:20 in the End Times. The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister are helping to set the stage for that End Times deception.

\*Dr Mrs Riplinger notes in *Which Bible Is God’s Word?* p 79 other transliterated words that occur in the AV1611; “heresies” 1 Corinthians 11:19, Galatians 5:20, 2 Peter 2:1, “heretick” Titus 3:10, “Jesus” (changed incorrectly to “Joshua” by modern editors in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8), “martyr(s)” Acts 22:20, Revelation 2:13, 17:6. However, none of these transliterations obscure meaning, in the way that the word “demon(s)” does.

This writer has an extensive summary on the word “devil(s)” versus “demon(s)” in *Grievous Wolf KJB Questions, Question 22*.

See [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php) *Answers to the Wolf Man*, Part 1, from which the following extract is taken. It too shows that the *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister are wrong again and once again are aiding and abetting false doctrine.

*Dr Bouw in The Book of Bible Problems pp 207-208 has these instructive comments.*

*“Devils are bad, even to the Greeks, but this is not so for the demons. Socrates saw some demons as bad and others as good. The “good” demons taught men and made geniuses on them.”*

*The scripture warns emphatically against these ““good” demons” 15 times as “familiar spirits” Leviticus 19:31, 20:6, 27, Deuteronomy 18:11, 1 Samuel 28:3, 7, 8, 9, 2 Kings 21:6, 23:24, 1 Chronicles 10:13, 2 Chronicles 33:6, Isaiah 8:19, 19:3, 29:4. The King’s men were therefore entirely correct to translate *daimonion* as “devil(s)” and not to transliterate the word as “demon(s).” Dr Bouw continues.*

*“Not until the eighteenth century did the word demon enter common English. This was only through pastors who liked to strut their knowledge of Greek [like Grievous Wolf] to their congregations. In the course of that prideful show, the derivation of devil (“d’evil,” that is, “doer of evil”) was lost to the clergy and laity alike, and the evil inherent in the devils was watered down since demon, by virtue of its meaning as “people,” [Dr Bouw shows that the root word of “demon” is *demo*, referring to the human spirit or “people” as in democracy, demography, demonstrate] humanized devils and made them seem kinder and more humane. Devil, on the other hand, communicates inhumanity and evil. The King James translating committee was right not to transliterate the Greek word *demon* but to translate it into the perfectly good English word, *devil*.”*

Will Kinney has this informative article *Devils or Demons?*

See [brandplucked.webs.com/devilsordemons.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/devilsordemons.htm).

Bro. Kinney shows how pervasive demonic influence is today.

*“New Agers today refer to demons as good spirits who guide us in this life. I have heard some of the lectures on the Power of Myth by the late Joseph Campbell. He frequently used the word “daemon” in a positive way as some sort of spiritual guide. I’m sure he now knows how wrong he was during his life-time.”*

The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister will know that too, eventually.

**dissimulation**

“hypocrisy”, as in Galatians 2:13.

The word “dissimulation” occurs twice in the 1611 Holy Bible.

“Let love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good” Romans 12:9.

“And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation” Galatians 2:13.

The word “dissimulation” clearly describes the act or sin of dissembling. The term “dissembled” or one of its derivatives occur a total of 5 times in scripture, including Galatians 2:13.

“Israel hath sinned, and they have also transgressed my covenant which I commanded them: for they have even taken of the accursed thing, and have also stolen, and dissembled also, and they have put it even among their own stuff” Joshua 7:11.

“I have not sat with vain persons, neither will I go in with dissemblers” Psalm 26:4.

“He that hateth dissembleth with his lips, and layeth up deceit within him” Proverbs 26:24.

“For ye dissembled in your hearts, when ye sent me unto the LORD your God, saying, Pray for us unto the LORD our God; and according unto all that the LORD our God shall say, so declare unto us, and we will do it” Jeremiah 42:20.

The above passages show that to dissemble is to cover up or hide, according Joshua 7:21 “behold, they are hid in the earth in the midst of my tent.”

To dissemble is also to go against the truth, as Psalm 26:3 shows. “...I have walked in thy truth” and to speak falsely from inward deceit, or lie, as Proverbs 26:24 shows and Jeremiah 42:20 illustrates, together with Jeremiah 43:2 where the dissemblers bear witness against themselves.

“Then spake Azariah the son of Hoshaiah, and Johanan the son of Kareah, and all the proud men, saying unto Jeremiah, Thou speakest falsely: the LORD our God hath not sent thee to say, Go not into Egypt to sojourn there:”

Observe how the words “dissembled” and “dissimulation” are defined in a similar fashion in Galatians 2:14.

“But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?”

In sum, “dissimulation” is deception, both inward and outward and Romans 12:9 therefore enjoins *truthful* love, as 3 John 1 states.

“The elder unto the wellbeloved Gaius, whom I love in the truth.”

The scripture therefore gives simple definitions, such as to hide, go against the truth, speak falsely, harbour deceit or do wrong instead of right. The word *hypocrisy* applies to those definitions but what the *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister don’t appreciate is that the scripture defines “hypocrisy”

in the same manner as it does “dissimulation,” bypassing the need for the *Oxford Wide Margin* definitions.

“Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron” 1 Timothy 4:2.

See also *The Language of the King James Bible* by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger pp 9-10.

## divers

“different” places, persons or things as in Matthew 24:7 and Acts 19:9, Hebrews 1:1, James 1:2.

The word “divers” occurs in 30 more verses in scripture, in addition to Matthew 24:7, Acts 19:9, Hebrews 1:1, James 1:2.

The scriptural definition of divers is one of emphasis, i.e. *distinctly* different, or diverse as in the modern idiom with respect to more than one item.

“Thou shalt not wear a garment of divers sorts, as of woollen and linen together” Deuteronomy 22:11.

“Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small” Deuteronomy 25:13.

The expression “divers colours” occurs 8 times in scripture, 6 times in association with garments, Judges 5:30 three times, 2 Samuel 13:18, 19, Ezekiel 16:16, which immediately brings to mind Joseph’s “coat of many colours” Genesis 37:3, 23, 32.

The word “divers” therefore can have the meaning of *many* and distinctly varied as well as *distinctly* different or diverse. See *The Language of the King James Bible* p 7.

The word “divers” in 2 Chronicles 21:4 therefore indicates that when “Jehoram...slew all his brethren with the sword, and divers also of the princes of Israel” it was *many* of the princes of Israel *regardless of their youth, maturity or status in the kingly line*.

The word “divers” in 2 Chronicles 30:11 therefore indicates that when “divers of Asher and Manasseh and of Zebulun humbled themselves, and came to Jerusalem,” it was many from all walks of life, not simply “some” as the NIV, NKJV wrongly state.

The word “divers” in Matthew 24:7 therefore indicates that the calamities of the End Times will strike in many and various places all over the globe, including those that may not now be associated with the particular calamities listed i.e. “famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes,” e.g. the (for now) still affluent West.

The word “divers” in Acts 19:9 therefore indicates that many and varied individuals opposed the Gospel, just as the Lord Jesus Christ united diverse individuals against Himself.

“And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together: for before they were at enmity between themselves” Luke 23:12.

The word “divers” in Hebrews 1:1 would therefore refer to the many and varied ways that the Lord sought to speak to His people in the Old Testament times, e.g. “dreams...Urim...prophets” 1 Samuel 28:6, 15, “signs and wonders upon Pharaoh” Nehemiah 9:10, “upon mount Sinai...right judgments, and true laws” Nehemiah 9:13, “thy good spirit to instruct them” Nehemiah 9:20 and when the people were disobedient “the hand of their enemies” Nehemiah 9:27, 28, drought Amos 4:7 and other “divers” environmental disasters as in Amos 4:9 “I have smitten you with blasting and mildew: when your gardens and your vineyards and your fig trees and your olive trees increased, the palmerworm devoured them: yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the LORD.” That list is not exhaustive but it is embodied in the word “divers.”

The word “divers” in James 1:2 would therefore refer to *many and varied temptations* such as the Lord Jesus Christ suffered.

“And when the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season.”

Again, only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, can bring out the full sense of a Biblical word such as “divers.” The *Oxford Wide Margin’s* substitute of “different” is insufficient for that purpose.

### dividing

“expounding, dissecting”, as in II Timothy 2:15.

The word “dividing” occurs 7 times in scriptures. Each time it occurs it means separating into parts or to *divide* as the word is commonly understand in the present day, e.g. 1 Kings 3:25 “And the king said, Divide the living child in two, and give half to the one, and half to the other.” “Dividing” does not mean “expounding” and the word “dissecting” is no easier to understand than the word “dividing.”

The other 6 instances of the word “dividing” are as follows.

“When they had made an end of dividing the land for inheritance by their coasts, the children of Israel gave an inheritance to Joshua the son of Nun among them” Joshua 19:49

“These are the inheritances, which Eleazar the priest, and Joshua the son of Nun, and the heads of the fathers of the tribes of the children of Israel, divided for an inheritance by lot in Shiloh before the LORD, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. So they made an end of dividing the country” Joshua 19:51.

“That led them by the right hand of Moses with his glorious arm, dividing the water before them, to make himself an everlasting name?” Isaiah 63:12.

“And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time” Daniel 7:25.

“But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will” 1 Corinthians 12:11.

“For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart” Hebrews 4:12. Compare Colossians 2:10-12 with respect to “the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh...through the faith of the operation of God.”

By inspection, “dividing” in each of the above verses has the same meaning as its companion part of speech “divide” in 1 Kings 3:25, separating into parts. 2 Timothy 2:15 is no different.

“Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.”

Right divisions in scripture must be observed to get the Bible right, as the following examples show. These examples are by no means exhaustive.

- “The old testament” is not the same as “the new testament” 2 Corinthians 3:6, 14.
- Salvation in the Old Testament, Psalm 15, is not the same as End Times salvation, Matthew 24:13, which in turn is not the same as salvation by grace through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ without works, Ephesians 2:8, 9 according to the Pauline Epistles that apply explicitly for the Christian in the Church Age. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1234.
- Israel and the Church are not the same, Romans 9:1-5, Colossians 1:24.
- “The kingdom of heaven” and “the kingdom of God” are not the same, although they meet in the Lord Jesus Christ, Matthew 13:33, Romans 14:17, Matthew 4:17, Mark 1:15.
- The Lord coming “with all his saints” 1 Thessalonians 3:13 i.e. the Second Advent is not the same as the Lord returning to catch up His saints, living and dead, 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17.

- The Lord's physical, visible reign on earth following the Second Advent, Isaiah 2:2-4, is not the same as His spiritual reign now "on the right hand of God" 1 Peter 3:21, 22.

See the following works for a detailed scriptural understanding of "rightly dividing the word of truth."

*How to Teach The Bible* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman

*How To Teach Dispensational Truth* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman

*Dispensationalism* by David E. Walker

Again, the *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition is no help to the genuine student of scripture, Acts 17:11.

"These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so."

doting

"sick", as in I Timothy 6:4.

1 Timothy 6:4 is the only occurrence of the word "doting" in scripture. The verse states "He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings,"

The companion words "dote" and "doted" occur a total of 7 times; Jeremiah 50:36, Ezekiel 23:5, 7, 9, 12, 16, 20.

"Dote" in Jeremiah 50:36 is defined in Jeremiah 50:37 as "they shall become as women," namely "silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts" 2 Timothy 3:6, which is the sense of the word "doted" in Ezekiel 23:5, 7, 9, 12, 16, 20.

The same sense is found in 1 Timothy 6:4 with respect to "doting." Note that 1 Timothy 6:5 shows that the doter supposes "that gain is godliness." 1 Timothy 6:9 therefore describes the doter and in turn his "doting" in a way that matches Jeremiah, 50:36, 37, Ezekiel 23:5, 7, 9, 12, 16, 20, 2 Timothy 3:6.

"But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition."

1 Timothy 6:4, 5, 9 also warn of the consequences of "doting." Luke 12:16-21 describes the man who doted on his riches and suffered the consequences. "Doting about questions and strifes of words" leads, for example, to rejection of "the scripture of truth" Daniel 10:21 in favour of ungodly multiple authorities used, supposedly, to 'correct' the 1611 Holy Bible, see the first part of this work, and eventually to the damnation of nations.

"...for them that honour me I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed" 1 Samuel 2:30.

See [www.chick.com/reading/tracts/1069/1069\\_01.asp](http://www.chick.com/reading/tracts/1069/1069_01.asp) *Still No Revival?*

Again, the *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition is no help to the genuine student of scripture, Acts 17:11.

## due benevolence

“sexual dues”, as in I Corinthians 7:3.

The expression “due benevolence” occurs in scripture only in 1 Corinthians 7:3.

“Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence: and likewise also the wife unto the husband.”

“Due benevolence” is “to avoid fornication” 1 Corinthians 7:2 and to “come together” 1 Corinthians 7:5.

The sense of those expressions is clear and the *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition adds nothing.

## ensamples

“examples, types”, as in I Corinthians 10:11.

The words “ensample” and “ensamples” occur 6 times in the AV1611; 1 Corinthians 10:11, Philippians 3:17, 1 Thessalonians 1:7, 2 Thessalonians 3:9, 1 Peter 5:3, 2 Peter 2:6.

The words “example” and “examples” occur 9 times in the AV1611; Matthew 1:19, John 13:15, 1 Corinthians 10:6, 1 Timothy 4:12, Hebrews 4:11, 8:5, James 5:10, 1 Peter 2:21, Jude 7.

The words are used interchangeably in scripture. Compare John 13:15, Philippians 3:17, 1 Thessalonians 1:7, 2 Thessalonians 3:9, 1 Timothy 4:12.

However, the embedded word “sample” in “ensample(s)” and “example(s)” defines both words. Note 1 Corinthians 10:6, 11.

“...these things were our examples...”

“...these things happened unto them for ensamples...”

1 Corinthians 10:5 describes the “samples” of those who incur God’s judgement on sin.

“But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness.”

The *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition fails to highlight the defining word “sample.” Only the AV1611 does that, with the word(s) “ensample(s).” See *In Awe of Thy Word* by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger p 292.

## faint

“give up” as in Luke 18:1, Galatians 6:9.

The word “faint” in Luke 18:1 and Galatians 6:9 is defined in the context of each verse.

“Yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me” Luke 18:5.

“And let us not be weary in well doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not” Galatians 6:9.

To be “weary” is how the word “faint” is defined elsewhere in scripture, according to context, to the point of being worn out and unable to continue on. See Deuteronomy 25:18, Judges 8:4, 1 Samuel 14:28, 30:10, 21, 2 Samuel 21:15, Proverbs 24:10, Isaiah 40:29, 30, 31, 44:12, Lamentations 2:19, Matthew 15:32, Mark 8:3, Hebrews 12:3.

The *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition does not provide the necessary scriptural insight into the use of the word “faint” in scripture.

## froward

“evil, wrong”, as in Proverbs 2:12.

This is an extract from this writer’s earlier work [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php) *KJO (King James Only) Review Full pp 563-564.*



*“Froward” 1 Peter 2:18. “Froward” and related words occur 25 times in the AV1611. This is an appreciable number of occurrences but the meaning of the word is clear from many of them. The first occurrence is in Deuteronomy 32:20, where the “froward” are those that are not trusting in the Lord. Proverbs 2:15 shows that the “froward” are those “whose ways are crooked.” Other occurrences show that to be “froward” is to be “wicked” Psalm 101:4, “evil” Proverbs 2:12 and “perverse” Proverbs 4:24. The dictionary meaning is ‘persistent in error’ or ‘wayward’ and Dr Vance [Archaic Words and the Authorized Version] includes with these meanings, ‘turned away from...what is demanded or reasonable.’ Dr Vance indicates that ‘froward’ is the opposite of ‘toward,’ as in ‘to and fro.’ All these meanings match the scriptural use of the word, which, as shown, is apparent from the verses where it occurs.*

*As the above extract shows, Proverbs 2:12, 15 define the word “froward” and show that the scriptural meaning matches the meaning of the word as the opposite of toward.*

*“To deliver thee from the way of the evil man, from the man that speaketh froward things;”*

*“Whose ways are crooked, and they froward in their paths:”*

The evil man is “forward” in “departing” from the LORD” Hosea 1:2 instead of going toward Him. The scripture, not the *Oxford Wide Margin* and *Twister/lister* definition, provides that full definition.

## gay

*“expensive, costly”, as in James 2:3.*

See [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php) *Answers to the Wolf Man*, Part 1, from which the following extract is taken with respect to Wolf’s Question 52.

*James 2:2...defines “gay clothing” in James 2:3.*

*“For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment;”*

*“Gay clothing” is “goodly apparel” i.e. expensive clothing worn by a rich man who can afford “a gold ring.”*

The Bible reader has the definition for “gay” in James 2:3 in the verse immediately before it. He has no need to consult the *Oxford Wide Margin* and *Twister/lister* definition.

## Ghost

*“Holy Ghost” should be rendered “Holy Spirit.”*

The expression “Holy Ghost” occurs 90 times in scripture, in 89 verses. The expressions “holy spirit,” “Holy Spirit” and “holy Spirit” occur a total of 7 times. Luke 3:22 shows that the expression “Holy Ghost” should be retained.

*“And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.”*

The dove shape is first a distinct, identifiable shape. That is not true of a spirit in its essential form.

*“Now a thing was secretly brought to me, and mine ear received a little thereof. In thoughts from the visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth on men, Fear came upon me, and trembling, which made all my bones to shake. Then a spirit passed before my face; the hair of my flesh stood up: It stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: an image was before mine eyes, there was silence, and I heard a voice, saying, Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his maker?” Job 4:12-17.*

Moreover, a spirit may not necessarily take on “a bodily shape” or even be a single entity.

“And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the LORD, and said, I will persuade him...I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets” 1 Kings 22:21-22, 2 Chronicles 18:20-21, i.e. a shapeless shape.

“And out of the throne proceeded lightnings and thunderings and voices: and there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven Spirits of God” Revelation 4:5.

1 Kings 22:21-22, 2 Chronicles 18:20-21, Job 4:12-17, Luke 3:22, Revelation 4:5 show therefore that “Spirit” should not be substituted for “Ghost.”

Observe how Genesis 1:2, 8:7, 8-9, Job 1:7, 2:2 depict two kinds of spirits by means of two birds, one of which is “the Spirit of God” and the other is “a spirit of an unclean devil” Luke 4:33, principally Satan himself. That depiction never applies to the terms “ghost” or “Holy Ghost” in scripture.

“And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.”

“And he sent forth a raven, which went forth to and fro, until the waters were dried up from off the earth.”

“Also he sent forth a dove from him, to see if the waters were abated from off the face of the ground; But the dove found no rest for the sole of her foot, and she returned unto him into the ark, for the waters were on the face of the whole earth: then he put forth his hand, and took her, and pulled her in unto him into the ark.”

“And the LORD said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the LORD, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it.”

“And the LORD said unto Satan, From whence comest thou? And Satan answered the LORD, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it.”

The association of the Holy Ghost with a dove shape in Luke 3:22 is consistent with the above scriptures.

In addition, the dove shape no doubt had a special significance with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ as “The Prince of Peace” Isaiah 9:6 but the Holy Ghost would not be limited to that particular bodily shape, as the following analysis shows.

Dr Gerardus Bouw in *The Book of Bible Problems* p 220 states that the word *Ghost* is an old English word that means God’s host, so the expression “Holy Ghost” is immediately associated, as it should be, with “an holy God” Joshua 24:19. (It’s also noted in passing that the expression “Holy Ghost” has 9 letters, which immediately brings to mind “the fruit of the Spirit” Galatians 5:22, 23 that number 9 in total.)

Luke 3:22 and Dr Bouw’s observation therefore bear special significance to 1 Corinthians 3:16, 6:19.

“Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?”

“What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?”

In sum, the Holy Ghost is God’s Host for “an holy God” Who indwells “the temple of God” “in a bodily shape” – that of “an holy God” in the body of the believer, permanently.

That summation is a considerable incentive for the believer to seek fulfilment of Paul’s prayer in Ephesians 3:16, 19 in all earnestness.

“That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man;...And to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.”

The *Oxford Wide Margin* and *Twister/lister* definition does not allow for that degree of revelation. Only the scripture does.

glass

“mirror”, as in I Corinthians 13:12, James 1:23.

The glasses referred to are looking glasses.

“And he made the laver of brass, and the foot of it of brass, of the lookingglasses of the women assembling, which assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation” Exodus 38:8.

“Hast thou with him spread out the sky, which is strong, and as a molten looking glass?” Job 37:18.

How else would a “mirror” be defined, *especially in the light of James 1:23?*

“For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass:”

Note that *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* actually defines a mirror as a *looking glass*. That source appears to have the right order with respect to the terms “glass” and “mirror,” unlike the *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister.

hardness

“blindness” as in Mark 3:5.

The words “hardness” and “blindness” each occur 7 times in the AV1611. The correct word in Mark 3:5 is “hardness” with respect to “hardness of their hearts” in Mark 3:5.

Ephesians 4:18 refers to “blindness of their heart” and also to what characterises that blindness.

“Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart:”

Neither ignorance nor lack of understanding was prevalent in Mark 3:5, simply hardness, figuratively equivalent to the way “hardness” is defined in its first mention in scripture.

“When the dust groweth into hardness, and the clods cleave fast together?” Job 38:38.

The other 6 occurrences of “hardness” in scripture all have the sense of unyielding opposition, not blindness, Matthew 19:8, Mark 3:5, 10:5, 16:14, Romans 2:5, 2 Timothy 2:3. Figuratively, they match Job 38:38, which would correspond to fallow ground, only broken up with difficulty, Jeremiah 4:3.

The “hardness of their hearts” in Mark 3:5 is illustrated in Luke 13:14, after the Lord carried out another healing.

“And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the sabbath day, and said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath day.”

The problem is clearly not “blindness.” It is “hardness,” as in Mark 3:5.

The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister have on this occasion misled their readers.

he

In reference to the Holy Spirit, the KJV usage of “he” rather than “it” implies the false notion of the trinity. The Holy Spirit is not a separate person, but the mind of God the Father and God the Son. See John 14:16, 17, 26 and 16:7-8, 13-15.

Twister/lister is/are lining up with heretics again, as are the editors of the *Oxford Wide Margin*, if the above is their reading. See remarks on “cross.”

The *Oxford Wide Margin*/Twister/lister heresy is apparent even in the verses listed.

“Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you” John 16:7.

(See again Luke 3:22 “And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.”)

According to Twister/lister and the editors of the *Oxford Wide Margin*, the Lord Jesus Christ can become separate from His mind, which is both stupid and heretical.

“Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come” John 16:13.

According to Twister/lister and the editors of the *Oxford Wide Margin*, **the mind of God the Father and God the Son** won’t speak of itself but even the mind of man does that.

“And it was so, that all that saw it said, There was no such deed done nor seen from the day that the children of Israel came up out of the land of Egypt unto this day: consider of it, take advice, and speak your minds” Judges 19:30.

Yet again, the *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister are lining up with heretics.

heart

“attitude of mind”, as in Jeremiah 17:9.

It is true that the heart in scripture is repeatedly associated with *thoughts* of the heart; Genesis 6:5, Judges 5:15, 1 Chronicles 29:18, Job 17:11, Psalm 33:11, 139:23, Proverbs 23:7, Jeremiah 4:14, 23:20, Daniel 2:30, Matthew 15:19, Mark 7:21, Hebrews 4:12. However, the scripture gives a much more vivid picture of the heart than mere “attitude of mind” by drawing attention to the heart as at the centre of human anatomy and therefore at the centre of the individual himself according to Proverbs 23:7 “For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he: Eat and drink, saith he to thee; but his heart is not with thee.”

Jeremiah gives insights into this vivid scriptural picture of the heart, as follows.

“Attitude of mind” is not how Jeremiah uses the term “heart” when associating it with other parts of the body, even though the application is figurative.

“My bowels, my bowels! I am pained at my very heart; my heart maketh a noise in me; I cannot hold my peace, because thou hast heard, O my soul, the sound of the trumpet, the alarm of war” Jeremiah 4:19.

“Then I said, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name. But his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay” Jeremiah 20:9.

Jeremiah associates the heart with the bowels and bones, that is, the upper viscera and the rib cage, which is consistent with anatomy and would apply throughout scripture, even though the term “heart” is usually used figuratively in scripture in most of the 765 verses in which the word “heart” is found explicitly. The relatively few exceptions include 1 Samuel 25:37, 2 Samuel 24:10, Psalm 45:5, which could also be figurative, Psalm 104:15, which could also be figurative, Hosea 13:8, which could also be figurative, Matthew 12:40, both figurative and literal.

The *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition is again misleading.

## hell

There are three Greek words rendered “hell” in the New Testament: gehenna, hades (equivalent of Hebrew sheol used in the Old Testament), and tartaroo. Gehenna is the lake of fire, hades is the grave and tartaroo is the abyss, the place of restraint for Satan. For English speaking people during the time of King James, “hell” [hades] was a cellar to store potatoes, not a lake of burning brimstone. In Acts 2:27, “hell” is hades, meaning the grave, while in Matthew 10:28 and Mark 9:43-48 “hell” means the lake of fire. The only place tartaroo is used is in II Peter 2:4.

Distinctions in ‘the Greek’ with respect to the word “hell” are meaningless in English. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1313 with respect to Mark 9:43-48.

“Hades” cannot possibly be the grave in scripture. See Matthew 11:23, 16:18, Luke 10:15, 16:23, Acts 2:27, 31, Revelation 1:18, 6:8, 20:13, 14. These are the verses where “hades” has been translated as “hell” and by inspection they could not refer to the grave by any stretch of the imagination – or of the scripture. Twister/lister and possibly the *Oxford Wide Margin* editors do not appear to have checked these verses.

Acts 2:27 states “Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.”

The soul does not go to the grave at death.

“And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, (for she died) that she called his name Benoni: but his father called him Benjamin. And Rachel died, and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem. And Jacob set a pillar upon her grave: that is the pillar of Rachel’s grave unto this day” Genesis 35:18-20.

Rachel’s body went to “Rachel’s grave.”

Rachel’s soul went “Abraham’s bosom” Luke 16:22. Note Jeremiah 31:15, Matthew 2:18 and compare with Matthew 8:12, 22:13, 24:51, 25:30, Luke 13:28. Rachel wept only for “her children.” She had no cause for “weeping and gnashing of teeth” as in Matthew 8:12, 22:13, 24:51, 25:30, Luke 13:28. The passage is said to be figurative, see Dr Ruckman’s commentary, *The Book of Matthew* p 38 but Rachel would still have to typify an Old Testament saint who, by definition, did not go to the place of “weeping and gnashing of teeth.”

Rachel’s spirit returned “unto God who gave it” Ecclesiastes 12:7.

In sum, the notion that “hell” in Acts 2:27 is the grave is gravely wrong.

The notion that For English speaking people during the time of King James, “hell” [hades] was a cellar to store potatoes, not a lake of burning brimstone is totally unsupported by any evidence. Dr Miles Smith, who wrote *The Translators to the Reader*, the Preface to the AV1611 states that “*But we desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of Canaan, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar.*” The King’s men used the term “hell” for the translation of “hades” in scripture in precisely the way that ordinary individuals at that time used the term and have done so before and since. That usage clearly has nothing to do with any kind of domestic storage cellar.

2 Peter 2:4 refers to “the angels that sinned,” not the Devil, who is yet to be confined, Romans 16:20, 1 Corinthians 5:5, 7:5, 2 Corinthians 2:11, 11:14, 12:7, Ephesians 4:27, 6:11, 16, 1 Thessalonians 2:18, 2 Thessalonians 2:9, 1 Timothy 1:20, 3:7, 5:15, 2 Timothy 2:26, James 4:7, 1 Peter 5:8, Revelation 12:3, 9, 12, 13:4, but who will be confined in “the bottomless pit” Revelation 20:2, 3, not “hell” as such.

The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister miss all of the above by tampering with “the scripture of truth” Daniel 10:21. So will any of their readers who take any notice of them.

## husbandman

“farmer, rancher”, as in James 5:7.

“Husbandman” occurs 7 times in scripture; Genesis 9:20, Jeremiah 51:23, Amos 5:16, Zechariah 13:5, John 15:1, 2 Timothy 2:6, James 5:7. Genesis 9:20 shows that the husbandman is first associated with tending a vine\* and that is the description in scripture of the Lord’s relationship to Israel “as a fruitful vine” Psalm 128:3, noting the embedded word “husband.” See Dr Ruckman’s commentary *The Book of Genesis* pp 249-250 and the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 20.

\*The related term “husbandmen,” which occurs 21 times in 19 verses also has this emphasis or association. See 2 Kings 25:12, 2 Chronicles 26:10, Jeremiah 31:24, 52:16, Joel 1:11, Matthew 21:33, 34, 35, 38, 40, 41, Mark 12:1, 2, 7, 9, Luke 20:9, 10, 14, 16.

“For the vineyard of the LORD of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant: and he looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry” Isaiah 5:7.

“For thy Maker is thine husband; the LORD of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; The God of the whole earth shall he be called” Isaiah 54:5.

The relationship extends to the Lord Jesus Christ, Who typifies Israel, Hosea 11:1, Matthew 2:15 and is “the true vine” John 15:1.

The relationship extends further to the Body of Christ in the Church Age.

“For we are labourers together with God: ye are God’s husbandry, ye are God’s building” 1 Corinthians 3:9.

James 5:7 refers to further husbandry at the time of the Second Advent.

“Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain.”

“The precious fruit of the earth” is described in Revelation 14:4 as saints gathered to the Lord Jesus Christ in the End Times at the Second Advent.

“These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb.”

See also Revelation 14:15, 16 and Dr Ruckman’s commentary *The Books of The General Epistles* Volume 1 p 135.

The embedded word “husband” of course underlies the special nature of the relationship between God and His “husbandry.”

“Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it” Ephesians 5:25.

The *Oxford Wide Margin* and *Twister/lister* definition is of no help in any of the above important aspects of the scripture.

Moreover, as Dr Vance shows in *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version*, “husbandman” is still very much in contemporary use and for that reason alone, any change is totally unnecessary.

## iniquity

“lawlessness”, as in Matthew 24:12.

The word “iniquity” occurs 334 times in scripture in 314 verses. In the Old Testament it denotes what God perceives as great wickedness against Him, Genesis 13:13, 19:15. The word “iniquity” occurs 5 times in the Gospels, spoken by the Lord Jesus Christ each time, Matthew 7:23, 13:41, 23:28, 24:12, Luke 13:27. Where the Lord Jesus Christ uses the term on the first occasion, He is condemning *inner* wickedness that is covered by outward righteousness.

“Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity” Matthew 7:22-23.

The Lord used the term “iniquity” in the same context later in the Book of Matthew.

“The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; The enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity” Matthew 13:38-41.

“Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men’s bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity” Matthew 23:27-28.

“And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold” Matthew 24:11-12.

The Lord Jesus Christ showed that the doers of iniquity even sought respectability by association with Him and His teaching.

“Then shall ye begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets. But he shall say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity” Luke 13:26-27.

The Lord’s use of the term “iniquity” consistently associates it with deceit and opposition to truth. This is how the term is used repeatedly, even if not exclusively, in the New Testament. See Acts 1:18, 8:23, 1 Corinthians 13:6, 2 Thessalonians 2:7, 2 Timothy 2:19, James 3:6, 2 Peter 2:16 and the context of those verses, where deceit of some kind accompanies “iniquity.”

2 Thessalonians 2:7, 9-10 yield the most striking example in the New Testament.

“For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way.”

“Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.”

“Lawlessness” is effectively defined in scripture as being against the law.

“Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers” 1 Timothy 1:9.

“Lawlessness” therefore is not the same as “iniquity,” which in the New Testament has the sense of “deceivableness of unrighteousness” and “lawlessness” should not therefore be substituted for “iniquity.”

## jealous

“zealous”, as in II Corinthians 11:2.

“Jealous” and “zealous” are not synonyms, in either Testament. Note first the Old Testament.

God is *jealous* with respect to receiving the worship of His people.

“Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me” Exodus 20:5.

A Man may be *jealous* of his wife’s fidelity.

“And the spirit of jealousy come upon him, and he be jealous of his wife, and she be defiled: or if the spirit of jealousy come upon him, and he be jealous of his wife, and she be not defiled” Numbers 5:14.

The same sense is preserved in the New Testament, with Paul making spiritual application with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ and the Church in 2 Corinthians 11:2.

Paul is focused on the saints in Corinth and in the whole Church being members of the Lord Jesus Christ, according to his godly *jealousy*, not zeal. He does not want them to be “members of an harlot” e.g. Rome, Revelation 17:1-5, 18:4-6.

“Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid” 1 Corinthians 6:15.

“For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ” 2 Corinthians 11:2.

Jealousy, not zeal, is the basic reaction to the intrusion of a third party into a marriage relationship as in 2 Corinthians 11:2.

“For jealousy is the rage of a man: therefore he will not spare in the day of vengeance” Proverbs 6:34, noting the context.

“Zealous” or “zeal” occurs 24 times in the scriptures, 12 times in each Testament. It is not jealousy but it may be *prompted* by jealousy.

“Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest, hath turned my wrath away from the children of Israel, while he was zealous for my sake among them, that I consumed not the children of Israel in my jealousy” Numbers 25:11.

The term “zeal” in the sense of being “zealous” is suitably defined in 2 Corinthians 7:11.

“For behold this selfsame thing, that ye sorrowed after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you, yea, what clearing of yourselves, yea, what indignation, yea, what fear, yea, what vehement desire, yea, what zeal, yea, what revenge! In all things ye have approved yourselves to be clear in this matter.”

“Vehement desire” or vehemently desirous will fit every occurrence of the words “zeal” or “zealous” in the scripture, with respect to the *accomplishment* of that desire, Proverbs 13:19.

“Jealousy” in the Old Testament is “a consuming fire,” an attribute of God, Deuteronomy 4:24 and anger or fury on God’s part with respect to His people and their faithfulness to him, or otherwise, Deuteronomy 6:15, 29:20, 32:16, 21, Psalm 78:58, 79:5, Ezekiel 16:38, 42, 23:25, 36:5, 6, 38:19, Nahum 1:2, Zephaniah 1:18, 3:8, Zechariah 8:2.

The New Testament has the same association of anger and jealousy, with respect to individuals.

“But I say, Did not Israel know? First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish nation I will anger you” Romans 10:19.

Note Paul’s expression of anger, with respect to any rupture of the betrothal in 2 Corinthians 11:2.



**“Who is weak, and I am not weak? who is offended, and I burn not?”**

In sum, if “zeal” is “a vehement desire” then jealousy is “a most vehement flame” Song of Solomon 8:6 that may kindle zeal but the two are not the same.

Yet again, only scripture with scripture 1 Corinthians 2:13 will yield the correct sense of Biblical words.

**knew**

**“had sexual relations with”, as in Genesis 4:1.**

The sense of the word “knew” is clear from the verse, as it is every time the word is used in that sense throughout scripture.

**“And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD.”**

See also Genesis 4:17, 25, 38:26, Judges 11:39, 1 Samuel 1:19, 1 Kings 1:4, Matthew 1:25.

As indicated under **Twister’s Postscript**, carnal knowledge is still a common term and the clinically-sounding *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition adds nothing essential.

**leasing**

**“lying”, as in Psalms 4:2, 5:6.**

**“Leasing” is defined in Psalm 5:6. It has the sense of deceiving with violent intent, which is stronger than simply lying.**

**“Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing: the LORD will abhor the bloody and deceitful man.”**

However, Psalm 4:2 also associates “vanity” with “leasing” and “vanity” is in turn associated with deceit.

**“O ye sons of men, how long will ye turn my glory into shame? how long will ye love vanity, and seek after leasing? Selah” Psalm 4:2.**

**“His mouth is full of cursing and deceit and fraud: under his tongue is mischief and vanity” Psalm 10:7.**

**“They speak vanity every one with his neighbour: with flattering lips and with a double heart do they speak” Psalm 12:2.**

Absalom is the embodiment of a vain, deceitful, bloody and leasing flatterer whom the Lord abhorred and destroyed. See 2 Samuel 14:25, 25, 15:1-14, 18:9, 10, 14, 15.

Yet again, only scripture with scripture 1 Corinthians 2:13 will yield the correct sense of a Biblical word.

**letteth**

**“restrains”, as in II Thessalonians 2:7.**

Will Kinney has an excellent article on the supposed archaisms of the 1611 Holy Bible. See [brand-plucked.webs.com/archaicjbsbship.htm](http://brand-plucked.webs.com/archaicjbsbship.htm) and [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) Will Kinney’s articles on the AV issue. Extracts from Will Kinney’s article follow with respect to the word “letteth.” “Letteth” is one of the supposed archaisms of the 1611 Holy Bible. See also [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php) Answers to the Wolf Man, Part 2, pp 58-59.

**“Webster’s defines the noun “a let” as an obstacle, a hindrance, or a delay. In tennis if a ball hits the net, it is called a let ball. In 2 Thessalonians 2:6-7, “And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth, will let, until he be taken out of the way.”**

**A fellow KJB believer writes: “Some words that are deemed archaic are actually still used frequently by some segment of the population as terms of art. For example, “let” (Romans 1:13) is considered to be a prime example of an archaic word in the KJV (“let” in this usage means “hindered”). However, the term**

*“without let or hindrance” is used in the passport notes of Britain, Canada, Australia, South Africa, Nigeria, India, Pakistan, and Israel. Thus people who work with immigration, such as border guards, lawyers, policy makers, and many educated people are familiar with the term “without let or hindrance.” This makes “let” at most a bit of jargon rather than an archaism. Also, anybody who plays or watches tennis will know that a “let” is called when a stroke does not count and hinders the gameplay (including when it hits/is hindered by the net and lands in the correct service box). Thus a word such as “let” may be infrequently used today, but it is not entirely obsolete.”*

The word “letteth” is defined in 2 Thessalonians 2:6.

*“And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time.”*

The definition “withholdeth” is straightforward and the embedded word “withhold” is in common use today. Again, the *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition adds nothing essential.

lusteth after

*“earnestly desires” as in Deuteronomy 14:26.*

The expression “lusteth after” is defined in Deuteronomy 12:20, 14:26.

*“When the LORD thy God shall enlarge thy border, as he hath promised thee, and thou shalt say, I will eat flesh, because thy soul longeth to eat flesh; thou mayest eat flesh, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after.”*

*“And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen, or for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth: and thou shalt eat there before the LORD thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou, and thine household,”*

To lust after is clearly to have a longing desire. Again, the *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition adds nothing essential.

mansions

*“offices” as in John 14:2.*

The *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition is stupid and misleading. Who would want to live in an office instead of a mansion?

It should also be noted that the word “offices” in scripture always refers to offices of service, not places, so that no confusion can arise with respect to the word “mansions.” See 1 Samuel 2:36, 1 Chronicles 24:3, 2 Chronicles 7:6, 23:18, Nehemiah 13:14.

meat offering

*“meal offering”, as in Leviticus 23:13, etc.*

*“Meat” in scripture refers to any kind of food. See for example Genesis 1:29, 9:3, 25:29 with Hebrews 12:16, 27:4, 40:17, Leviticus 2:4, 14, Judges 14:14, 2 Samuel 13:10, 1 Kings 19:8, Psalm 78:25, Isaiah 62:8, Ezekiel 16:19, 45:15, 47:12, Matthew 3:4, 15:37, John 21:5-6.*

A “meat offering” is clearly and explicitly defined in scripture, for example in the verse listed, so that no supposed ‘up-dating’ of the term is necessary.

*“And the meat offering thereof shall be two tenth deals of fine flour mingled with oil, an offering made by fire unto the LORD for a sweet savour: and the drink offering thereof shall be of wine, the fourth part of an hin” Leviticus 23:13.*

See also Exodus 29:40, 41, Leviticus 2:1, 4, 5, 14, 6:20, 21, 14:10, 21, 23:13 etc.

meet

“fitting, proper”, Matthew 3:8, Genesis 2:18.

The appropriate expression is “meet for.” It occurs 12 times in the AV1611; Genesis 2:18, 20, Deuteronomy 3:18, Judges 5:30, Ezra 4:14, Ezekiel 15:4, 5, Matthew 3:8, Acts 26:20, Philippians 1:7, 2 Timothy 2:21, Hebrews 6:7.

The expression “prepared unto” is found in 2 Timothy 2:21 adjacent to the words “meet for.” By inspection, the words “prepared unto” could easily be substituted for “meet for” in most of the 12 verses listed above. The expression could be inserted into Ezra 4:14 to give the sense of “we’re not prepared to,” which would be correct.

Again, the *Oxford Wide Margin* /Twister/lister ‘up-dating’ is unnecessary.

mocked

“deceived”, as in Galatians 6:7.

The word “mocked” and associated words occur in 50 verses in the 1611 Holy Bible, by inspection with its usual, contemporary meaning of scorn, despise, deride, 2 Chronicles 30:10, 36:16, Job 12:4, Proverbs 30:17, Jeremiah 20:7 and “set...at nought” Luke 23:11, though at times accompanied by deceit, Judges 16:10, 13, 15. It appears that the *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister would have Galatians 6:7 read “Be not deceived, God is not deceived...”

Taking the context of Galatians 6:7, 8 with respect to sowing and reaping, Jude 18 shows that “mocked” in Galatians 6:7 retains the range of meanings listed above.

“How that they told you there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts.”

The “mockers” “set at nought” God’s counsel and reproof, Proverbs 1:25, in order to satisfy “their own ungodly lusts” and they will reap what they have sown for mocking God in this way, as Jude himself reveals.

“And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him” Jude 14-15.

“Their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him” are sheer mockery or scoffing, as Peter shows, not deceit.

“Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, And saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation” 2 Peter 3:3-4.

Yet again, only scripture with scripture 1 Corinthians 2:13 will yield the correct sense of a Biblical word.

morning stars

“angels”, as in Job 38:7.

Job 38:7 states “When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy...” “The morning stars” are the Old Testament “sons of God” by creation, Genesis 6:2, 4, Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7. They are also called “gods” Genesis 3:5, Exodus 15:11, 18:11, Joshua 22:22, 1 Samuel 28:13, Psalm 82:1, 6, 86:8, 95:3, 96:4, 97:7, 9, 135:5, 136:2, 138:1, Daniel 2:47, 4:8, 9, 18, 5:11, 14, 11:36, John 10:34, 35, Acts 14:11, 1 Corinthians 8:5.

“The sons of God” in Genesis 6:2, 4, Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7 and the “gods” of Genesis 3:5 etc. are identified as “angels” in 2 Peter 2:4 with respect to “the angels that sinned” and Jude 6 “the angels that kept not their

first estate.” However, “morning stars,” also identified in Revelation 12:4, 7 as “the stars of heaven” and “angels,” and “sons of God” are more appropriate terms in the context of Job 38:7 because these terms refer specifically to particular beings (who can sing), whereas the term “angels” refers specifically to *appearances*, such as “their angels” in Matthew 18:10 and “his angel” in Acts 12:15. See Dr Ruckman’s commentaries *The Book of Matthew* pp 17-18, 342-343 and *The Book of Acts* pp 363-364, the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1270 and Dr Ruckman’s *Theological Studies*, No. 18, *Angelology*.

In sum, the 1611 Holy Bible is precise in all its terms and again, only scripture with scripture 1 Corinthians 2:13 will yield the correct sense of Biblical words.

#### nether

“lower”, as in Deuteronomy 24:6.

The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister don’t seem to have heard of the Netherlands, or Low Countries, [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Netherlands](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Netherlands).

Dr Vance in *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version* that the word “nether” is still in contemporary use and cites a reference from the well-known contemporary journal *Popular Science* as an example.

The word “nether” occurs 15 times in the 1611 Holy Bible; Exodus 19:17, Deuteronomy 24:6, Joshua 15:19, 16:3, 18:13, Judges 1:15, 1 Kings 9:17, 1 Chronicles 7:24, 2 Chronicles 8:5, Job 41:24, Ezekiel 31:14, 16, 18, Ezekiel 32:18, 24.

It is defined repeatedly as *lower*, i.e. the opposite of “upper,” in the contexts where that term applies, even in the verse cited.

“No man shall take the nether or the upper millstone to pledge: for he taketh a man’s life to pledge.”

See also Joshua 15:19, Judges 1:15, 1 Chronicles 7:24, 2 Chronicles 8:5.

The word “nether” has an additional sense in the 1611 Holy Bible, again with respect to context, that shows its superiority to the word *lower*.

“I made the nations to shake at the sound of his fall, when I cast him down to hell with them that descend into the pit: and all the trees of Eden, the choice and best of Lebanon, all that drink water, shall be comforted in the nether parts of the earth” Ezekiel 31:16.

See also Ezekiel 31:14, 17, 18, 32:18, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30 with respect to the repeated use of the terms “nether parts of the earth,” “hell,” and “the pit,” which is “the bottomless pit” Revelation 9:1, 2, 11, 11:7, 17:8, 20:1, 3. Although modern versions such as the NKJV change “nether” to “lower” in the above references, the word “nether” to this writer conveys a sense of that which is “gone down...to the pit” Ezekiel 32:24, 30, *never* to return. That is certainly the sense of “hell” in scripture:

“And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched” Mark 9:43.

“And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched” Mark 9:45.

The *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition does not convey that additional sombre sense that the word “nether” does, in the contexts where it is used with respect to “the nether parts of the earth.”

#### outlandish

“foreign”, as in Nehemiah 13:26.

Nehemiah 13:26 is the only occurrence of the word “outlandish” in scripture. It states “Did not Solomon king of Israel sin by these things? yet among many nations was there no king like him, who was beloved of his God, and God made him king over all Israel: nevertheless even him did outlandish women cause to sin.”

They were clearly woman from out of the land, i.e. out of Israel, as the term “strange women” indicates in the context of 1 Kings 11:1 with respect to Solomon and “outlandish women.”

“But king Solomon loved many strange women, together with the daughter of Pharaoh, women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites;

Though “a virtuous woman” Ruth 3:11, “Ruth the Moabite” Ruth 1:22, 2:2, 21, was a strange woman, for that reason.

“Then she fell on her face, and bowed herself to the ground, and said unto him, Why have I found grace in thine eyes, that thou shouldst take knowledge of me, seeing I am a stranger?”

The definition of the word “outlandish” is clear from the structure of the word itself i.e. *out of the land* and from comparing scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13. No input from the *Oxford Wide Margin* and *Twister/ister* is needed.

perfect

“spiritually mature”, as in II Timothy 3:17, or “upright or sincere” as in Genesis 17:1.

“Spiritually mature” and “upright or sincere” are not good definitions for the word “perfect” in scripture.

The word “perfect” occurs 99 times in scripture in 94 verses. It refers to a mortal man in his devotion to God in 54 verses; Genesis 6:9, 17:1, Deuteronomy 18:13, 1 Kings 8:61, 11:4, 15:3, 14, 20:3, 1 Chronicles 12:38, 28:9, 29:9, 19, 2 Chronicles 15:17, 16:9, 19:9, 25:2, Job 1:1, 8, 2:3, 8:20, 9:20, 21, 22, 22:3, 37:37, Psalm 64:4, 101:2, 6, 139:22, Proverbs 2:21, 11:5, Isaiah 38:3, Matthew 5:48, 19:21, Luke 6:40, 1 Corinthians 2:6, 2 Corinthians 13:11, Galatians 3:3, Ephesians 4:13, Philippians 3:12, 15, Colossians 1:28, 4:12, 1 Thessalonians 3:10, 2 Timothy 3:17, Hebrews 11:40, 12:23, 13:21, James 1:4, 3:2, 1 Peter 5:10, 1 John 4:17, 18, Revelation 3:2.

The word “perfect” with respect to an individual’s devotion to God is defined in Genesis 6:9, 22.

“These are the generations of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God.”

“Thus did Noah; according to all that God commanded him, so did he.”

Noah’s perfection was that of full obedience to God, as it was with Abraham, according to Genesis 17:1, 23, 18:19. Note that like Noah, Abraham “walked with God.”

“And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the LORD appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect.”

“And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of Abraham's house; and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin in the selfsame day, as God had said unto him.”

“For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the LORD, to do justice and judgment; that the LORD may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him.”

Perfection in the sense of full obedience to God also applies for 2 Timothy 3:17, with respect to fullness of obedience to the scriptures, in all respects *as set out in 2 Timothy 3:16*.

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.”

As the old-time expositors used to say for 2 Timothy 3:16 “*Where right, where wrong, how to get right, how to stay right*.”

Perfection as fullness of obedience to God, “thoroughly” or through and through, for the purpose of being “careful to maintain good works” Titus 3:8, as Noah and Abraham did, is then fully set out in 2 Timothy 3:17, *in accordance with Ephesians 2:10*.

“That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”

“For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.”

Again, scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, explains the Biblical term. The *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition does not.

perform

“finish”, as in Philippians 1:6.

Inspection of Philippians 1:6 shows that the *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition is stupid and misleading.

“Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ:”

The *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition implies that the “good work” is finished while it is yet in progress, which is nonsense.

The word “perform” is found 42 times in the 1611 Holy Bible in 41 verses. By inspection, the definition of “perform” is found in Romans 7:18, 19.

“For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.”

“For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.”

The word “perform” in scripture is simply “do.” That simple definition will fit every one of the 42 occurrences in scripture of the word “perform” as 2 Corinthians 8:10-11 confirm.

“And herein I give my advice: for this is expedient for you, who have begun before, not only to do, but also to be forward a year ago. Now therefore perform the doing of it; that as there was a readiness to will, so there may be a performance also out of that which ye have.”

Again, scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, explains the Biblical term. The *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition does not.

him that “pisseth against the wall”

“males”, as in II Kings 9:8, etc.

The graphic 1611 Holy Bible expression could be described as crude but the *Oxford Wide Margin*/Twister/lister definition adds nothing to add understanding.

The AV1611 expression is found in 6 verses; 1 Samuel 25:22, 34, 1 Kings 14:10, 16:11 (!), 21:21, 2 Kings 9:8.

press, the

“the crowd”, as in Luke 19:3.

The word “press” is found a total of 6 times in the AV1611, in the sense of Luke 19:3; Mark 2:4, 5:27, 30, Luke 8:19, 45, 19:3.

Luke 18:45 defines the word “press” as it is used in the context of the above 6 references.

“And Jesus said, Who touched me? When all denied, Peter and they that were with him said, Master, the multitude throng thee and press thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me?”

The word “press” in the 1611 Holy Bible therefore refers to a multitude that throngs about the individual and literally presses him. Although the word “crowd” refers to a multitude, it does not convey the full Biblical sense of the word “press.” Only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, achieves that level of explanation.

Dr Ruckman has a wry observation with respect to the use of the word “press” in Luke 8:19. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1346. He notes that the modern use of the word “press” refers to the printed news media that tries to keep the individual from the Lord Jesus Christ, just as a thronging multitude would do. Its electronic counterpart is no different in intent.

## prevent

“precede”, Psalms 88:13, I Thessalonians 4:15.

The word “prevent” and its derivatives occur a total of 17 times in the 1611 Holy Bible; 2 Samuel 22:6, 19, Job 3:12, 30:27, 41:11, Psalm 18:5, 18:18, 21:3, 59:10, 79:8, 88:13, Psalm 119:147, 148, Isaiah 21:14, Amos 9:10, Matthew 17:25, 1 Thessalonians 4:15.

The basic meaning of the word “prevent” is embedded in the word itself and is clearer than “precede.” “Prevent,” as Dr Ruckman notes in *Manuscript Evidence* p 149, consists of two words, pre-event, or that which goes before something else.

That is the sense of how the word “prevent” is used in scripture, only slightly modified in different contexts.

“The sorrows of hell compassed me about; the snares of death prevented me” 2 Samuel 22:6.

“Prevent” in the above context means that David is beset by trouble *before him on all sides*, whichever way he turns.

“When I looked for good, then evil came unto me: and when I waited for light, there came darkness. My bowels boiled, and rested not: the days of affliction prevented me” Job 30:26-27.

“Prevent” in the above context means to *come unto*. By inspection, the expression *come unto* according to tense can be satisfactorily substituted for “prevent” and its derivatives in almost every instance where the word “prevent” in its various forms occurs in scripture, including Psalm 88:13, where the word “precede” makes little sense. (In Psalm 119:148, it appears that David came unto “the night watches” wide awake “that I might meditate in thy word.”)

Exceptions are Job 41:11, where “prevent” appears to mean “stand before” Job 41:10 and 1 Thessalonians 4:15, where meaning of “prevent” shows the order in which the saints will rise at the Lord’s Return.

“For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first” 1 Thessalonians 4:15-16.

The meaning of “prevent” in the above context is clear. It is simply to *rise before*, because “the dead in Christ shall rise first.”

The *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition fails to provide any of the above revelation and, as indicated, fails to show how the sense of a Biblical word may change slightly with context.

## prophesy

“inspired preaching”, as in I Corinthians 14.

“Prophesy” and related words occur 12 times in 1 Corinthians 14, 1 Corinthians 14:1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 22, 24, 29, 31, 32, 37, 39. The expression “inspired preaching” does not convey the sense of “prophesy” as found in 1 Corinthians 14. The expression “inspired preaching” doesn’t convey anything in particular and fails in one important respect as set out in Jeremiah 23:28.

“The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the LORD.”

The prophet, 1 Corinthians 14:29, 32, is identified in John 3:34, “For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God” John 3:34.

Jeremiah, Jeremiah 1:5, was a prophet in that respect.

“Then Jeremiah called Baruch the son of Neriah: and Baruch wrote from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the LORD, which he had spoken unto him, upon a roll of a book” Jeremiah 36:4.

“And it came to pass, that when Jeremiah had made an end of speaking unto all the people all the words of the LORD their God, for which the LORD their God had sent him to them, even all these words” Jeremiah 43:1.

The ministry of those who prophesied in the church at Corinth was the same.

“But he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort” 1 Corinthians 14:3.

“For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted.” 1 Corinthians 14:31.

Observe the association between “the words of God,” building and “edification” with respect to the saints.

“And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified” Acts 20:32.

“In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit” Ephesians 2:22.

“But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love” Ephesians 4:15-16.

Observe the association between “the words of God” and “exhortation.”

“Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine” 2 Timothy 4:2.

“Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers” Titus 1:9.

“And I beseech you, brethren, suffer the word of exhortation: for I have written a letter unto you in few words” Hebrews 13:22.

Observe the association between “the words of God” and “comfort,” together with the association with prophecy as foretelling in the context of 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17.

“Wherefore comfort one another with these words” 1 Thessalonians 4:18.

To prophesy, therefore, is to speak “the words of the LORD” “unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort.”



The *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition fails to give that revelation.

quicken

“make alive”, as in Romans 8:11.

The *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition fails to give the scriptural precision for the word “quicken” and its derivatives that occur 12 times in the New Testament, with meanings associated with that in Romans 8:11. Note the following verses, the first being the first occurrence of the word “quicken” in the New Testament.

“For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will” John 5:21.

“It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life” John 6:63.

“Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus” Ephesians 2:5-6.

“Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses” Colossians 2:12-13.

“Quicken” according to scripture means to be risen from the dead with Christ to die no more because “Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him” Romans 6:9.

The *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition fails to give that revelation.

quit

“keep on”, as in I Corinthians 16:13.

1 Corinthians 16:13 is the only instance of the word “quit” in the New Testament. However, the first occurrence of the word “quit” helps explain its Biblical use in 1 Corinthians 16:13. Note the similar wording.

“Be strong, and quit yourselves like men, O ye Philistines, that ye be not servants unto the Hebrews, as they have been to you: quit yourselves like men, and fight” 1 Samuel 4:9.

“Men” who “quit” themselves “like men” in a scriptural sense are identified by none other than the pharaoh of Moses’s time.

“...go now ye that are men, and serve the LORD; for that ye did desire...” Exodus 10:11.

To “quit you like men” therefore is to “go now...and serve the LORD” “with desire” Luke 22:15, after the manner of the Lord Jesus Christ, therefore.

The *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition fails to give that revelation.

rain

“teach”, as in Hosea 10:12, [according to] Isaiah 2:3.

The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and *Twister/lister* seem unaware that the word “rain” as found in Hosea 10:12 is used in the same sense in a contemporary context.

1945: ‘A rain of ruin from the air’


See [news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/witness/august/6/newsid\\_4715000/4715303.stm](https://www.bbc.com/news/thisday/hi/witness/august/6/newsid_4715000/4715303.stm).

Note also the following. Read the entire article dry-eyed if you can and remember that by such Allied efforts in WW2, the 1611 Holy Bible is available today.

**"Ploesti – When Heroes Filled The Sky, Black Sunday, August 1<sup>st</sup> 1943.**

See [www.homeofheroes.com/wings/part2/09\\_ploesti.html](http://www.homeofheroes.com/wings/part2/09_ploesti.html)

**"As many as 200 Axis fighters were in the vicinity of Ploesti, including four wings (52 planes) of ME-109s at Mizel, twenty miles east of the city. All pilots were put on alert for immediate takeoff, with spotters already in the air. More than 200 big anti-aircraft guns ringed the city limits to protect the refineries, including 88-mm flak guns and 37-mm and 20-mm rapid-fire cannon. Well-trained German gunners heard the sounds of the sirens and rushed to their stations, ready to rain death on the Americans they now believed were heading towards them. Across the city barrage balloons were raised on their explosive laden steel cables, to snare wings and destroy the bombers that might soon arrive."**



A [B-24 Liberator](#) called "Sandman" during a bomb run over the [Ploesti Astra Romana refinery](#) during Operation Tidal Wave

See also [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation\\_Tidal\\_Wave](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Tidal_Wave).

The word "teach" does not fit the context of Hosea 10:12.

The following verses explain the expression "rain righteousness" in Hosea 10:12.

**"The princes of Judah were like them that remove the bound: therefore I will pour out my wrath upon them like water" Hosea 5:10. Here "wrath" not "righteousness" is poured out but the sense is the same.**

**"And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit" Joel 2:28-29.**

In addition to a *literal* rain, Psalm 68:9, Hosea 6:3, Joel 2:23, Zechariah 10:1, the Lord "will pour out," or "rain" "a right spirit," or "righteousness" on His people Israel at the Second Advent. It will be "showers of blessing" Ezekiel 34:26 in both respects and "they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness...shall be filled" Matthew 5:6.

Then will come to pass Jeremiah 31:33-34, noting again that the word "teach" is not correct.

**"But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."**

The *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition fails to give that revelation.

rentest

"distort", as in Jeremiah 4:30.

The word "rent" in scripture means to rip or tear "in pieces" Genesis 37:33, 1 Kings 11:30, 2 Kings 2:12 as it does today. Two scriptures explain the use of the term "rentest." The meaning is not to "distort." Observe that the context of each verse is similar.

**"And when thou art spoiled, what wilt thou do? Though thou clothest thyself with crimson, though thou deckest thee with ornaments of gold, though thou rentest thy face with painting, in vain shalt thou make thyself fair; thy lovers will despise thee, they will seek thy life" Jeremiah 4:30. This is the only occurrence of the word "rentest" in scripture.**

**"And furthermore, that ye have sent for men to come from far, unto whom a messenger was sent; and, lo, they came: for whom thou didst wash thyself, paintedst thy eyes, and deckedst thyself with ornaments" Ezekiel 23:40.**

Painting the eyes, e.g. heavily with a mascara-like substance, would certainly make the face appear “rent” into different-coloured components but not necessarily distorted.

The *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition fails to give that revelation.

requite

“offer support for”, as in I Timothy 5:4.

The word “requite” and its derivatives occur 11 times in the 1611 Holy Bible; Genesis 50:15, Deuteronomy 32:6, Judges 1:7, 1 Samuel 15:21, 2 Samuel 2:6, 16:2, 2 Kings 9:26, Psalm 10:14, 41:10, Jeremiah 51:56, 1 Timothy 5:4.

The following verses yield the meaning of the word “requite” in scripture.

Jeremiah 51:6, 56, Ruth 2:12, 2 Samuel 22:21, Psalm 18:20, Isaiah 59:18, Romans 12:19, Hebrews 10:30.

To “requite” is to “recompense” according to Jeremiah 51:6, 56. To “recompense” is to “reward” Ruth 2:12, 2 Samuel 22:21, Psalm 18:20 or “repay” Isaiah 59:18, Romans 12:19, Hebrews 10:30.

In 1 Timothy 5:4, in the context of Christian households that make up the local church, “children or nephews,” insofar as they are “to shew piety at home,” are exhorted “to requite their parents” or “repay” or “reward” them for having brought “them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord” Ephesians 6:4 according to the admonition of 1 Timothy 5:8.

“But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.”

Scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, gives the true meaning of the Biblical word. The *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition does not.

rereward

rear guard” as in I Samuel 29:2.

The expression “rereward” occurs 6 times in the 1611 Holy Bible; Numbers 10:25, Joshua 6:9, 13, 1 Samuel 29:2, Isaiah 52:12, 58:8.

Dr Vance in *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version* notes that “rereward” is the same as *rearward*. This is why, as Dr Vance explains, the word is changed to “rear guard” in modern versions. “Rereward” i.e. rearward is of course the opposite of *forward* and therefore denotes what comes after in contrast to what goes before.

This sense is found in scripture.

In Numbers 10:25 “the standard of the camp of the children of Dan” is the last to “set forward” and is therefore “the rereward of all the camps.”

“Rereward” in scripture is defined as follows.

“And the armed men went before the priests that blew with the trumpets, and the rereward came after the ark, the priests going on, and blowing with the trumpets” Joshua 6:9.

“And seven priests bearing seven trumpets of rams' horns before the ark of the LORD went on continually, and blew with the trumpets: and the armed men went before them; but the rereward came after the ark of the LORD, the priests going on, and blowing with the trumpets” Joshua 6:13.

The reference to “the armed men” shows that “the rereward” does in this case constitute a rear guard. “The rereward,” however, is essentially that which “came after” what “went before” as the structure of the word implies as do the following references.

“For ye shall not go out with haste, nor go by flight: for the LORD will go before you; and the God of Israel will be your rereward” Isaiah 52:12.

“Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily: and thy righteousness shall go before thee; the glory of the LORD shall be thy rereward” Isaiah 58:8.

Again, the word “rereward” clearly refers to that which will come after that which “will go before,” constituting a rear guard where “the armed men” are present.

Again, only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, gives complete clarity with respect to the meaning of a Biblical word.

#### rudiments

“elements”, as in Colossians 2:8.

The word “rudiments” occurs twice in the 1611 Holy Bible, Colossians 2:8, 20. Colossians 2:8, 20-22 define the term.

“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.”

“Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, (Touch not; taste not; handle not; Which all are to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men?”

“The rudiments of the world” are simply manmade rules, either religious or secular. The *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition does not give that full definition of the Biblical word. Only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, yields that insight.

See Dr Ruckman’s commentary *The Books of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians* pp 542-546, 565-566 for details.

those who “seemed to be somewhat”

“boasters”, as in Galatians 2:6.

They were not “boasters,” as Galatians 2:6 itself shows.

“But of these who seemed to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person:) for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me:”

Peter, James and John added nothing to Paul’s Gospel that he preached and did not try to amend it. That is not the way of “boasters.” Galatians 2:9 defines the term “seemed to be somewhat.”

“And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.”

“Peter, and James, and John” Acts 1:13 and the other apostles were prominent in the early church as Acts 5:12-13 show.

“And by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people; (and they were all with one accord in Solomon’s porch. And of the rest durst no man join himself to them: but the people magnified them.”

“James, Cephas, and John...seemed to be pillars” because “the people magnified them.” They did not “magnify themselves” Psalm 35:26, 38:16, Zechariah 12:7.

They were not “boasters.”

The *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition is wrong.

## servant

“slave”, as in [Philippians 2:7](#).

The term “servant” in the singular or plural form occurs 38 times in 34 verses in the Pauline Epistles. The term is explained in [Romans 6:17-18](#), [Ephesians 6:6](#), [Colossians 3:22](#).

“But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness.”

“Not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart;”

“Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God:”

A servant according to Paul, see his first mention of the term “servant” in [Romans 1:1](#), is one who fears and obeys God and does God’s will “from the heart,” including faithful service to his earthly master.

“Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God.”

That was how the Lord Jesus Christ “took upon him the form of a servant” in [Philippians 2:7](#).

“...Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done” [Luke 22:42](#).

The term “slave” occurs twice in the 1611 Holy Bible.

“Is Israel a servant? is he a homeborn slave? why is he spoiled?” [Jeremiah 2:14](#). Jeremiah is actually *contrasting* a servant and a slave.

“And cinnamon, and odours, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men” [Revelation 18:13](#).

“Slaves” in [Revelation 18:13](#) are victims of human trafficking, especially in the End Times. They are not “servants.”

“And they have cast lots for my people; and have given a boy for an harlot, and sold a girl for wine, that they might drink” [Joel 3:3](#).

See *Which Bible Is God’s Word?* by Dr Mrs Riplinger pp 68-70 for details.

Again, the *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition is wrong.

## simple

“harmless”, as in [Romans 16:19](#).

Paul uses the word “simple” twice, [Romans 16:18](#), [19](#).

“For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.”

“For your obedience is come abroad unto all men. I am glad therefore on your behalf: but yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil.”

Those are the only occurrences of the word “simple” in the New Testament, although Paul uses the word “simplicity” in [Romans 12:8](#), [2 Corinthians 1:12](#), [11:3](#). However, [Romans 16:19](#) defines the word “simple” by contrasting it with the word “wise” as part of the contrast between “good” and “evil.”

“...I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil.”

Paul explains wisdom and simplicity in the context of [Romans 16:19](#) in [Romans 16:17](#).

“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.”

To be “wise unto that which is good” in Romans 16:19 is to follow “the doctrine which ye have learned” as Paul states in Romans 6:17 and 2 Thessalonians 2:15:

“But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you.”

“Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.”

To be “simple concerning evil” is to “avoid...divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned.”

Simple, really

As usual, the *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition *simply* doesn't 'cut it.'

sincerity

“with incorruption”, as in Ephesians 6:24.

“Sincerity” occurs 6 times in the Pauline Epistles; 1 Corinthians 5:8, 2 Corinthians 1:12, 2:17, 8:8, Ephesians 6:24, Titus 2:7. The companion words “sincere” and “sincerely” each occur once, in Philippians 1:10, 16 respectively.

“Sincerity” is defined in 1 Corinthians 5:8, its first occurrence in the Pauline Epistles, together with Luke 12:1, as without hypocrisy i.e. *consistently* true without underhand evil intent.

(1 Corinthians 5:8 also designates the nature of the bread to be used for communion, 1 Corinthians 10:16.)

Luke 12:1, 1 Corinthians 5:8 read as follows.

“In the mean time, when there were gathered together an innumerable multitude of people, insomuch that they trode one upon another, he began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.”

“Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.”

The definition of “sincerity” in 1 Corinthians 5:8 is reinforced by the expressions “sincere and without offence till the day of Christ” Philippians 1:10 and “shewing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity” Titus 2:7.

“Sincerity” as Paul uses the term is even characteristic of “the grace of God” and God Himself.

“For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward” 2 Corinthians 1:12.

“For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ” 2 Corinthians 2:17.

The *Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister* definition is not wrong on this occasion but again, only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13 yields the full sense of the Biblical term in the context where it is used.

slept with his fathers

“died”, as in II Kings 13:9, II Chronicles 16:12.

The expression “slept with his fathers” is found 36 times in 36 verses in the 1611 Holy Bible. The word “buried” is found in 26 of those verses, including 2 Kings 13:9, with respect to the individual who “slept with his fathers” and therefore the meaning of the expression is clear. See also 1 Kings 11:21 “And when Hadad heard in Egypt that David slept with his fathers, and that Joab the captain of the host was dead, Hadad said to Pharaoh, Let me depart, that I may go to mine own country.”

“Slept with his fathers” is the correct expression and should not be changed, as David explains in Psalm 13:3-4.

“Consider and hear me, O LORD my God: lighten mine eyes, lest I sleep the sleep of death; Lest mine enemy say, I have prevailed against him; and those that trouble me rejoice when I am moved.”

David is referring to an earthly enemy but the expression “slept with his fathers” is a repeated reminder that not even a king can indefinitely keep at bay what Paul calls “the last enemy” *but the Lord Jesus Christ can and does.*

“The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death” 1 Corinthians 15:26.

That is the curtain-raiser to Paul’s great resurrection passage that should be kept in mind whenever the expression “slept with his fathers” is encountered in scripture.

“So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ” 1 Corinthians 15:57.

The Christian will one day “be ever with the Lord” 1 Thessalonians 4:17 where “Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him” Romans 6:9.

Only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, yields that kind of revelation. It is hidden from Bible correctors/corrupters like the *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister.

sons of God

“angels”, as in Job 1:6.

See remarks under:

morning stars

“angels”, as in Job 38:7.

spiritual wickedness

“wicked spirits”, as in Ephesians 6:12.

“Spiritual wickedness in high places” together with “the rulers of the darkness of this world” is the reason why “the whole world lieth in wickedness” 1 John 5:19.

The change to “wicked spirits” breaks the cross reference and obscures the Biblical explanation for the wickedness of “this present evil world.”

The term “spiritual wickedness” also shows that devils can act in unison as a cohesive entity, which the term “wicked spirits” does not.

“And he asked him, What is thy name? And he answered, saying, My name is Legion: for we are many” Mark 5:9.

## sprinkle

**“astonish, startle”, as in Isaiah 52:15.**

The word “sprinkle” in scripture is correct. “Startle etc.” is not. “Sprinkle” is mentioned in 9 verses of scripture in association with cleansing; Leviticus 14:7, 16:19, Numbers 8:7, 19:13, 18, 19, 20, 21, Ezekiel 36:25. The word “startle” never occurs in the 1611 Holy Bible.

Note especially Ezekiel 36:25, with respect to the Lord’s ministry “to the house of Israel” Ezekiel 36:22 at the Second Advent.

“Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you.”

The Lord will do likewise and “sprinkle many nations” at the Second Advent.

“He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass: as showers that water the earth. In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth.”

“And the LORD shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one LORD, and his name one.”

“And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles. And it shall be, that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, even upon them shall be no rain. And if the family of Egypt go not up, and come not, that have no rain; there shall be the plague, wherewith the LORD will smite the heathen that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles. This shall be the punishment of Egypt, and the punishment of all nations that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles” Zechariah 14:16-19.

In sum, the nations will have to do right and “worship him in spirit and in truth” John 4:24 when the Lord is “king over all the earth” in order to be sprinkled, otherwise “upon them shall be no rain.”

Only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13 gives this revelation. The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister fail in that respect.

## stranger

**“newcomer, new convert”, as in Deuteronomy 14:29.**

The word “stranger” occurs 211 times in the 1611 Holy Bible in 198 verses. “Newcomer, new convert” is not correct. An individual can be a “stranger” without being a “newcomer, new convert.”

“And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years” Genesis 15:13.

“Neither shall ye build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any: but all your days ye shall dwell in tents; that ye may live many days in the land where ye be strangers” Jeremiah 35:7.

A “stranger” is someone “in a land that is not theirs” and an individual may be a “stranger” for a long or indeed an indefinite period of time. The word may also apply, as it does today, to a strange or unfamiliar individual, or indeed a foreigner. The term “stranger” has both physical and spiritual application.

“And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers” John 10:5.

“That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world” Ephesians 2:12.

“Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God” Ephesians 2:19.



Note that Ephesians 2:12, 19 contradict the definition “new convert” and show that it is wrong.

Noting that “the earth is the LORD’S, and the fullness thereof” Psalm 24:1 with 1 Corinthians 10:26, 28:

“For we are strangers before thee, and sojourners, as were all our fathers: our days on the earth are as a shadow, and there is none abiding” 1 Chronicles 29:15.

“These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth” Hebrews 11:13.

“Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul” 1 Peter 2:11.

Note again the extended time period over which the individuals mentioned above “were strangers and pilgrims on the earth” and *not* “new converts.”

Only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13 gives this revelation. The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister fail in that respect, as well as giving wrong definitions.

suffer

“let, allow, permit” as in Mark 10:14, Revelation 11:9.

The word “suffer” and its derivatives occur a total of 206 times in the 1611 Holy Bible in 153 verses. It often means to suffer in the contemporary sense of bearing discomfort, pain or affliction. See Esther 3:8, Psalm 9:13, 34:10, 88:15, 101:5, Proverbs 19:15, 19, Matthew 11:12, 16:21, 17:12, 17, 27:19, Mark 5:26, 8:31, 9:12, 19, Luke 9:22, 13:2, 17:25, 22:15, 51, 24:26, 46, Acts 3:18, 5:41, 7:24, 9:16, 13:18, 17:3, 26:23, Romans 8:17, 1 Corinthians 3:15, 4:12, 6:7, 9:12, 12:26, 13:4, 2 Corinthians 7:12, 11:25, Galatians 3:4, 5:11, 6:12, Philippians 1:29, 3:8, 4:12, 1 Thessalonians 2:2, 14, 3:4, 2 Thessalonians 1:5, 1 Timothy 4:10, 2 Timothy 1:12, 2:9, 12, 3:12, Hebrews 2:9, 18, 5:8, 9:26, 11:25, 13:3, 12, James 5:10, 1 Peter 2:19, 20, 21, 23, 3:14, 17, 18, 4:1, 15, 16, 19, 5:10, Jude 7, Revelation 2:10, 76 verses in total.

The Oxford Wide Margin/Twister/lister definition is therefore misleading in not pointing out the meaning of the word “suffer” in the above verses.

In the remaining 77 verses, the meaning of the word “suffer” or its derivatives is defined for the Old Testament by its very first occurrence in scripture.

“And God said unto him in a dream, Yea, I know that thou didst this in the integrity of thy heart; for I also withheld thee from sinning against me: therefore suffered I thee not to touch her” Genesis 20:6.

To “suffer” therefore, in the above sense, is to *not withhold from* or *not hold back from* (followed by a present participle e.g. “sinning” instead of an infinitive “to touch”). This is the essential meaning of the word “suffer” in the Old Testament where the word does not mean to bear discomfort, pain or affliction.

For example:

“...God suffered him not to hurt me” Genesis 31:7 i.e. God held him back from hurting me.

“...hast not suffered me to kiss my sons and my daughters...” Genesis 31:28 i.e. hast held me back from kissing my sons and daughters.

“...will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses...” Exodus 12:23 i.e. will hold back the destroyer from coming into your houses.

“Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live” Exodus 22:18 i.e. Thou shalt hold back a witch from living i.e. *judicially* terminate with extreme prejudice, [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terminate\\_with\\_extreme\\_prejudice](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terminate_with_extreme_prejudice).

“...neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from...” Leviticus 2:13 i.e. thou shalt hold back the salt of the covenant of thy God from being lacking i.e. supply it in abundance.

“Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart: thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him” Leviticus 19:17 i.e. thou shalt...hold back sin from him.

By inspection, the definitions of *not withhold from* or *not hold back from* will hold for the word “suffer” in the Old Testament, with the sense of not seeking to apply force or restraint.

The expressions “allow” and “permit” are found a total of 5 times in the 1611 Holy Bible. By inspection, the terms do not have the same force as “suffer” and therefore they are not satisfactory definitions for the word “suffer.” See Luke 11:48, Acts 24:15, Romans 7:15, 1 Corinthians 16:7, Hebrews 6:3.

“Suffer” also means to *forbid not*. This is the essential meaning of the word “suffer” in the New Testament where the word does not mean to bear discomfort, pain or affliction.

“But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him” Matthew 3:14-15.

“But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven” Matthew 19:14.

The same definition is found in the very verse cited by the *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister, who did not read it carefully.

“But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God” Mark 10:14.

By inspection, the definition *forbid not* for the word “suffer” will fit all applications of the word in the New Testament where the word does not mean to bear discomfort, pain or affliction.

Only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13 gives the full sense of the Biblical word. The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister fail in that respect, as usual.

## tarry

“wait”, as in Luke 24:49, 1 Corinthians 16:8, which is explained in Acts 1:4.

The word “tarry” and its derivatives occur 88 times in scripture in 87 verses. Like other words encountered in this study, it can have more than one meaning according to context. “Wait” is not a satisfactory definition to cover all the occurrences of “tarry.”

“And he said, Behold now, my lords, turn in, I pray you, into your servant’s house, and tarry all night, and wash your feet, and ye shall rise up early, and go on your ways. And they said, Nay; but we will abide in the street all night” Genesis 19:2.

“Tarry” in the context means “abide in” or *reside*. It does not mean “wait.”

“Haste ye, and go up to my father, and say unto him, Thus saith thy son Joseph, God hath made me lord of all Egypt: come down unto me, tarry not” Genesis 45:9.

“Tarry not” in the context means “Haste” i.e. to tarry means to *delay* or *linger*.

“Depart not hence, I pray thee, until I come unto thee, and bring forth my present, and set it before thee. And he said, I will tarry until thou come again” Judges 6:18.

“Tarry” in the context means “depart not” or *stay*, which is one example of where the definition “wait” could apply.

“And Elijah said unto Elisha, Tarry here, I pray thee; for the LORD hath sent me to Bethel. And Elisha said unto him, As the LORD liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee. So they went down to Bethel” 2 Kings 2:2.

“Tarry” in the context could be taken to mean “leave” or *part company*. See 2 Kings 2:4, 6.

“And the remnant of Jacob shall be in the midst of many people as a dew from the LORD, as the showers upon the grass, that tarrieth not for man, nor waiteth for the sons of men” Micah 5:7.

“Tarrieth” in the context means “waiteth” i.e. this is one example where “tarry” means “wait.”

“For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry” Habakkuk 2:3.

“Tarry” in the context could mean “wait” or *not come*, i.e. *delay*.

“But they constrained him, saying, Abide with us: for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them” Luke 24:29.

Luke 24:29 was cited above as an example of “tarry” meaning “wait.” The *correct* definition is “abide” or *stay*, *not* “wait.” See also John 4:40.

“Paul said to the centurion and to the soldiers, Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved...And while the day was coming on, Paul besought them all to take meat, saying, This day is the fourteenth day that ye have tarried and continued fasting, having taken nothing” Acts 27:31-33.

“Tarried (tarry)” in the context again means “abide (abode).”

“And it may be that I will abide, yea, and winter with you, that ye may bring me on my journey whither-soever I go. For I will not see you now by the way; but I trust to tarry a while with you, if the Lord permit. But I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost” 1 Corinthians 16:6-8.

1 Corinthians 16:8 was cited above as an example of “tarry” meaning “wait.” Again, the correct definition is “abide” or *reside*, *not* “wait,” according to 1 Corinthians 16:6 in the context of the passage, *not* Acts 4.

Only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13 gives the full sense of the Biblical word. The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister fail in that respect, as usual.

## tempted

“tried or tested”, as in 1 Corinthians 10:13, James 1:13.

“Tempted” and associated words occur 80 times in scripture, in 48 verses. The word, like others in this study, may have different meanings according to context. Note Numbers 21:5-6 and 1 Corinthians 10:9.

“And the people spake against God, and against Moses, Wherefore have ye brought us up out of Egypt to die in the wilderness? for there is no bread, neither is there any water; and our soul loatheth this light bread. And the LORD sent fiery serpents among the people, and they bit the people; and much people of Israel died.”

“Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.”

“Tempted” in the above contexts means “spake against.” It does not mean “tried or tested.”

Note that in the judgement of the fiery serpents, God did “also make a way to escape” 1 Corinthians 10:13.

“And the LORD said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole: and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live. And Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole, and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived” Numbers 21:8-9.

The temptation in 1 Corinthians 10:9 is expressed in 1 Corinthians 10:12 with Proverbs 30:8-9.

“Remove far from me vanity and lies: give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with food convenient for me: Lest I be full, and deny thee, and say, Who is the LORD? or lest I be poor, and steal, and take the name of my God in vain.”

“Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.”

One lives by his wealth in Proverbs 30:8-9 and speaks against the Lord, one lives by his wits and speaks against the Lord. Both fulfil 1 Corinthians 10:12. As rich and poor respectively, they picture extremes of temptation, with all others in between. That is why 1 Corinthians 10:13 refers to “no temptation...but such as is common to man” such that “God...will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it” as He did with those who “spake against” Him in Numbers 21:5. The temptation, therefore, in the context of 1 Corinthians 10:9-13 is to speak against the Lord Jesus Christ, which can lead to *acting* against the Lord Jesus Christ, for which the essential “way to escape” is “the Son of man...lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life” John 3:14-15. That is, the Lord Himself is “the way” John 14:6.

Note also Jude’s warning about “the gainsaying of Core” Jude 11 and company, who, as an example of 1 Corinthians 10:11, 12, “spake against” God and Moses, “gathered together against the LORD” Numbers 16:1, 2, 3, 11, defiantly “stood in the door of the tabernacle of the congregation with Moses and Aaron” Numbers 16:18 but suddenly *fell* and “went down alive into the pit” Numbers 16:30, 31, 32, 33.

Even a Christian may align himself with those that “spake against God” as indicated by 1 Corinthians 10:12 if he insists that what God said is “in the Greek” and “in the Hebrew” Revelation 9:11 and *not* the 1611 Holy Bible *in English*. He will not “go down quick into the pit” Numbers 16:30 but his ministry effectively *will*, which is fitting in the light of Revelation 9:11, with reference to “the bottomless pit.” Study the decline of the church in the English-speaking nations since the abandonment of the 1611 Holy Bible in 1881 by Westcott and Hort and their appeal to supposedly ‘older and better manuscripts.’ See *Did the Catholic Church Give Us the Bible?* by David W. Daniels [www.chick.com/catalog/books/1252.asp](http://www.chick.com/catalog/books/1252.asp).

“Tried or tested” does not fit the context of 1 Corinthians 10:9-13.

That definition only partly fits the context of James 1:12-14.

“Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him. Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.”

Temptation, or being tempted, therefore, may be a trial, or being tried, or it may be the enticement of lust, 1 John 2:15, 16. Once again, only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, gives the full sense of the Biblical term, according to context.

tenor

“intent or purpose”, as in Exodus 34:27.

The scriptural meaning of the word “tenor” is *strict certainty*.

“And they said, The man asked us straitly of our state, and of our kindred, saying, Is your father yet alive? have ye another brother? and we told him according to the tenor of these words: could we certainly know that he would say, Bring your brother down?” Genesis 43:7.

“And the LORD said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel” Exodus 34:27.

The words were strict and certain. They were cast in stone.

“...And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments” Exodus 34:8.

“Have not I written to thee excellent things in counsels and knowledge, That I might make thee know the certainty of the words of truth; that thou mightest answer the words of truth to them that send unto thee?” Proverbs 22:20-21.

Once again, only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, gives the full sense of the Biblical term, according to context.

## tongues

“foreign languages”, Mark 16:17, I Corinthians 14.

The word “tongue,” singular or plural, is used in the sense of language in 45 verses in the 1611 Holy Bible; Genesis 10:5, 20, 31, Deuteronomy 38:49, Ezra 4:7, Daniel 1:4, Mark 16:17, Acts 2:4, 8, 11, 10:46, 19:6, 21:40, 22:2, 26:14, 1 Corinthians 12:10, 28, 30, 13:1, 8, 14:2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 13, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 39, Revelation 5:9, 7:9, 9:11, 10:11, 11:9, 13:7, 14:6, 16:10, 16, 17:15.

The word “language,” singular or plural, is used 34 times in the 1611 Holy Bible, in 29 verses; Genesis 11:1, 6, 7, 9, 2 Kings 18:26, 28, Nehemiah 13:24, Esther 1:22, 3:12, 8:9, Psalm 19:3, 81:5, 114:1, Isaiah 19:18, 36:11, 13, Jeremiah 5:15, Ezekiel 3:5, 6, Daniel 3:4, 7, 29, 4:1, 5:19, 6:25, 7:14, Zephaniah 3:9, Zechariah 8:23, Acts 2:6.

“Foreign languages” is not a good definition for “tongues.” Mark 16:17 refers to “new tongues.” Insertion of the word “foreign” would be not only unnecessary but misleading. Moreover, the word “foreign” must itself be defined. The scriptural definition for the nature of *all* tongues in 1 Corinthians 14 is found in 1 Corinthians 12:10, 28.

“To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues:”

“And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.”

See remarks earlier with respect to the word “divers.”

The definition of “tongues” itself is found at the beginning of the usage of the word in both the Old and New Testaments.

“And the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech” Genesis 11:1. This was before different tongues, or languages, arose as set out in Genesis 10.

“Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech” Genesis 11:7.

“Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language...And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?” Acts 2:6, 8.

Scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, gives the *precise* definition of the Biblical term. The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors and Twister/lister do not.

## virtue

“power” as in Mark 5:30.

The word “virtue” is found 7 times in the 1611 Holy Bible in 6 verses; Mark 5:30, Luke 6:19, 8:46, Philipians 4:8, 2 Peter 1:3, 5. Where it is used in the Gospels, it applies only to the Lord Jesus Christ and it is not simply “power.” It is *the power of God to heal and to make whole* (which may be in response to faith).

“And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague” Mark 5:34.

“And it came to pass on a certain day, as he was teaching, that there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come out of every town of Galilee, and Judaea, and Jerusalem: and the power of the Lord was present to heal them” Luke 5:17.

Such “virtue” is “virtuous” Ruth 3:11, Proverbs 12:4, 31:10 and worthy of praise, Proverbs 31:30, 31: “...He hath done all things well: he maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak” Mark 7:37.

“Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things” Philippians 4:8.

See also the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1347 on the use of the word “virtue” instead of “power” in Luke 8:46.

Again, only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, gives the full sense of the Biblical term. The *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition does not.

visage

“appearance”, as in Isaiah 52:14.

“Visage” occurs 3 times in the 1611 Holy Bible; Isaiah 52:14, Lamentations 4:8, Daniel 3:19. “Appearance” is not a satisfactory definition of “visage.”

Isaiah 50:6 is a cross reference to Isaiah 52:14 and defines the word “visage.”

“I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting.”

“As many were astonished at thee; his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men” Isaiah 52:14.

The “visage” is *the face and facial features*, not simply the “appearance.”

Lamentations 4:8 confirms this definition.

“Their visage is blacker than a coal; they are not known in the streets: their skin cleaveth to their bones; it is withered, it is become like a stick.”

They were not known because their facial features, or “visage” were unrecognisable. Such disfigurement is confirmed in history. Note the testimony of John Hunter, of Maghera, who served as a common soldier throughout the siege of Londonderry April 18<sup>th</sup> to July 28<sup>th</sup> 1689, where the loyal Protestants were besieged by the Catholic Irish allies of James II. Under-linings are this writer’s.

See [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siege\\_of\\_Derry](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siege_of_Derry).

See [www.libraryireland.com/Derry1689/IV-21.php](http://www.libraryireland.com/Derry1689/IV-21.php) *Hardships of the Garrison at Derry*.

*“The famine was so great that many a man, woman, and child died from want of food. I myself was so weak from hunger, that I fell under my musket one morning as I was going to the walls; yet God gave me strength to continue all night at my post there, and enabled me to act the part of a soldier as if I had been as strong as ever I was; yet my face was blackened with hunger. I was so hard put to it, by reason of the want of food, that I had hardly any heart to speak or walk; and yet when the enemy was coming, as many a time they did, to storm the walls, then I found as if my former strength returned to me. I am sure it was the Lord kept the city [Psalm 127:1], and none else; for there were many of us that could hardly stand on our feet before the enemy attacked the walls, who, when they were assaulting the out-trenches, ran out against them most nimbly and with great courage. Indeed, it was never the poor, starved men that were in Derry that kept it out, but the mighty God of Jacob, to whom be praise for ever and ever.”*

Note further that the “visage” is also the “countenance” or the “face.”

“And the prince of the eunuchs said unto Daniel, I fear my lord the king, who hath appointed your meat and your drink: for why should he see your faces worse liking than the children which are of your sort?

then shall ye make me endanger my head to the king...Then let our countenances be looked upon before thee, and the countenance of the children that eat of the portion of the king's meat: and as thou seest, deal with thy servants" Daniel 1:10, 13.

"Then was Nebuchadnezzar full of fury, and the form of his visage was changed against Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego: therefore he spake, and commanded that they should heat the furnace one seven times more than it was wont to be heated" Daniel 3:19.

"Then the king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another" Daniel 5:6. See also Daniel 5:9, 10.

Again, only scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, gives the full sense of the Biblical term. The *Oxford Wide Margin* and Twister/lister definition does not and in this case is misleading.

## Conclusion

Twister, by means of the *Oxford Wide Margin* editors, has undertaken to redefine or 'update' 79 words or expressions in scripture:

Abraham's bosom, adoption, affections, afflict soul, beguile, betimes, blains, bosom, in his, bruit, charity, clean heart, communicate, communications, conversation, convince, corn, cover his feet, creature, cross, damned, devils, dissimulation, divers, dividing, doting, due benevolence, ensamples, faint, forward, gay, Ghost, glass, hardness, he, heart, hell, husbandman, iniquity, jealous, knew, leasing, letteth, lusteth after, mansions, meat offering, meet, mocked, morning stars, nether, outlandish, perfect, perform, him that "pisseth against the wall," press, the, prevent, prophesy, quicken, quit, rain, rentest, requite, rereward, rudiments, those who "seemed to be somewhat," servant, simple, sincerity, slept with his fathers, sons of God, spiritual wickedness, sprinkle, stranger, suffer, tarry, tempted, tenor, tongues, virtue, visage

In doing so, Twister and the *Oxford Wide Margin* editors directly charged 137 verses of scripture with inferior readings and over 2300 more verses indirectly, these being cross references containing the same words as the 137 verses cited as containing inferior readings.

Not one of the 79 supposedly updated definitions of the words of scripture has been found to be superior to the reading of the 1611 Holy Bible. Quite the reverse has been found and many of the supposedly updated definitions have been shown to be invalid.

The *Oxford Wide Margin* editors ought perhaps to consider compiling a new set of definitions, based on "the scripture of truth" Daniel 10:21.

---

## References

<sup>1</sup> [samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=02.htm](http://samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=02.htm), *The Answer Book* by Dr Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D., Daystar Publishing, [www.daystarpublishing.org/king-james-defense/](http://www.daystarpublishing.org/king-james-defense/), 1989

<sup>2</sup> [sovereignword.org/?series=dr-thomas-hollands-manuscript-evidence-class](http://sovereignword.org/?series=dr-thomas-hollands-manuscript-evidence-class) Lesson 11 *Translational Considerations*

<sup>3</sup> *Conies, Brass and Easter* by J.A. Moorman, B.F.T. #1737 *The Bible for Today*, pp 13-15

<sup>4</sup> *Whitewashed, A Critique of James White* by Alan O'Reilly, A. V. Publications Corp., 2010, pp 542ff, [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php)