5 Ilkley Grove
Guisborough TS14 8LL
January 15th 2008

Dear John and Donna,

Re: 'Textual Criticism' #2

As promised in my earlier communication, I will now address Mr Amué's third letter. It is little more than a rant but some useful observations may be made, although Proverbs 14:16 applies.

"A wise man feareth, and departeth from evil: but the fool rageth, and is confident."

Mr Amué's third letter displays considerable 'raging confidence,' in addition to repeated inconsistency, as in his first two letters. Before addressing his third letter, some clarification is needed with respect to a couple of comments that I made in my response to Mr Amué's first and second letters.

Mark 2:15

I stated in my comments on this verse that the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible gives *"the correct reading in Mark 2:15, which reading is undoubtedly idiomatic."* See pages 29-30 of my earlier work. Dr Mrs Riplinger[1] provides more precise insight as follows. Note again that Mr Amué would most likely deny all of this material, given that he has already declared, without proof, that Dr Mrs Riplinger's book *New Age Versions "is the most inaccurate book on the market filled with lies and false information"* point XIX. See pages 26-7 of my earlier work.

However, the material should be useful to bible believers ☺. Dr Mrs Riplinger writes, her emphases.

*"In Mark 2:15, the name of Jesus occurs **twice** in today's Spanish Valera Bible…as it does in today's pure foreign Bibles such as the French Le Nouveau…'Jesus' also occurs **twice** in the Polish Bible…Both the French and the Polish state that they were translated out of the 'original Greek'…The omission of 'Jesus' is one of the several errors in currently printed editions of the Textus Receptus (i.e. the Trinitarian Bible Society and Baker Books' Interlinear Greek-English New Testament by Berry)."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes that in addition to occurring twice in Mark 2:15 in the pre-1611 foreign bibles, ***"Jesus"*** also appears twice in Mark 2:15 in the Old Latin. The King James translators had access to the Old Latin[2] and could well therefore have relied on this source to confirm their rendering of Mark 2:15, along with the earlier English bibles. It is noteworthy that the Latin Vulgate[3] omits the first ***"Jesus"*** from Mark 2:15, 200 years *after* it was preserved in the Old Latin.

In sum, if the first ***"Jesus"*** is accurate idiomatically in Mark 2:15, it nevertheless also has widespread and ancient textual support as well.

The Masoretic Hebrew and Receptus Greek "Holy Bible"

Mr Amué insists on page 1 of his second letter that, *"God wrote one book and called it the Holy Bible…the Old Testament in Hebrew known as the Masoretic Text and the New Testament in Greek known as the Received text (aka Textus Receptus)."* See pages 64-5 of my earlier work.

In my response to Mr Amué's assertion, I ask the question, *"Where can anyone get a* single *copy, i.e. between two covers, of* this book, *called (in English)* "the Holy Bible" *and consisting of a* Hebrew *Masoretic Old Testament and a* Greek *Received Text New Testament?"*

An answer of sorts is possible. The Trinitarian Bible Society[4] does stock a book entitled *The Holy Scriptures in the Original Languages, The Hebrew and Greek Texts underlying the Authorised Version.* But note the wording of the title. The original language texts are those that *underlie* the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, *not those from which the Holy Bible was actually translated by the King James translators.*

In other words, these texts will be 'back translations,' i.e. from the English of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible back into Hebrew and Greek, of which more will be said later, because this particular consideration is relevant to some of Mr Amué's statements in his third letter.

For now, it should be understood that a Hebrew/Greek Bible consisting of 'back translations' is clearly not what Mr Amué is referring to. He clearly means, his emphasis and capitalization, ***"THE ORIGINAL BIBLE,"*** to which he attributes God's authorship, from which all other bibles are derived. See his point VII below. My question is meant to highlight the fact that such a 'bible' never existed as such and as indicated in my work, Mr Amué provides no clue about where a copy of such a 'bible' may be found. He alludes on page 3 of his third letter to *"the Masoretic and Received Text that is published by the Trinitarian Bible Society"* and that he recommends *"to advanced scholars"* (most likely meaning himself but further comment will be made on this remark of his later) although for what purpose is unclear. However, this particular TBS publication cannot be the 'bible' that *"God wrote"* for the reasons given above, reinforced by the discussion on the Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament and Greek Textus Receptus given in the earlier work.

See comments under **Changes in the Masoretic Text and Sources for the Textus Receptus**, pages 59ff.

19 Points of Dogma

Turning now to Mr Amué's third letter, I will address his 19 of his 20 points in turn, set out as I, II, III etc., with quotes as necessary according to his emphases. Some of his points, e.g. IX-XII, border on hysteria and need only be answered briefly. Point XV deals only with recipients for correspondence and can therefore be bypassed.

"I. …you are lying to your followers (lie number one). There is nowhere mentioned in history where God said He would preserve the AV as His perfect Word. ***PROVE THIS****."*

Mr Amué's challenge is itself a lie, for at least two reasons. He has already declared that no evidence exists to show that *"God said He would preserve the AV as His perfect Word."* He is therefore not open to any display of proof to the contrary – although a summary will be provided, see below. Moreover, anything that *"God said"* is not found *"mentioned in history"* as such. Anything that *"God said"* is found in a *book.*

"Thus speaketh the LORD God of Israel, saying, Write thee <u>all the words that I have spoken</u> unto thee <u>in a book</u>" Jeremiah 30:2.

"If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that <u>the things that I write</u> unto you <u>are the commandments of the Lord</u>" 1 Corinthians 14:37.

Bible believers have direct access to that Book as *[God's] perfect [w]ord."* The level of Mr Amué's access appears less certain.

As for the preservation of *"the AV as [God's] perfect Word,"* bible-believing proof is as follows.

Psalm 12:6, 7[5] describes the preservation of the Lord's words.

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

Dr Vance[6] shows how this verse was fulfilled by means of:

- A received Hebrew text, 1800 BC to 389 BC
- A received Aramaic text at the same time (Genesis, Daniel, etc.)
- A received Greek text from AD 40 to AD 90
- A received Syrian text from AD 120 to AD 200

- A received Latin text from AD 150 to AD 1500
- A received German text from AD 1500 to AD 2006
- A received English text from AD 1611 to AD 2006

Dr Vance then lists the fulfillment of Psalm 12:6, 7 in English, derived from *The Rules to be Observed in the Translation of the Bible*, Rules 1 and 14[7]:

- Tyndale's Bible (15250
- Coverdale's Bible (1535)
- Matthew's Bible (1537)
- The Great Bible (1539)
- The Bishops' Bible (1568)
- The Geneva Bible (1582)
- The King James 1611 Authorized Version

Apart from minor refinements in subsequent editions, mostly for the correction of printing errors, God's refining process was complete with the publication of the 1611. God's refining process summarized above is the actual testimony of history, regardless of Mr Amué's unsubstantiated opinion to the contrary.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states[8], her emphases *""Seven" times "they purge…and purify it…" (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. The KJV translators did* ***not*** *see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations. They wanted their Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, 'It is good,* ***except*** *this word or* ***that*** *word…' They planned[9]:*

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

"The "mark" to which the KJV translators strove was to retain and polish the "perfection of the scriptures" seen in earlier editions. Tyndale himself said of his own edition (pictured in John 20:17), "count it as a thing not having his full shape…a thing begun rather than finished…to seek in certain places more proper English…"

"The KJV translators wrote of their final "perfected" work,

""Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and perfected at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser: so, if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, do endeavor to make that better which they left so good; no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike us; they, we persuade ourselves, if they were alive, would thank us… For by this means it cometh to pass, that whatsoever is sound already…the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished; also, if anything be halting, or superfluous, or not so agreeable to the original, the same may be corrected, and the truth set in place.""

Never to be dislodged by the likes of Mr Amué.

"II. The 1611 AV contained the Apocrypha books, and they were removed later on. The AV advocates tampered with the Word of God by removing some books. These same people…do not condemn those who removed the Apocrypha from the KJV. ***DENY THIS CLAIM****."*

Mr Amué's statement implies that he believes that the Apocrypha is *"the Word of God."* Yet in his first letter, page 3, paragraph 1, he insists that the phrase ***"raise the dead"*** in Matthew 10:8 *"should be removed from the Bibles because it is from the Latin Vulgate"* but the Vulgate of Jerome *contains* the Apocrypha[10]. Is he now saying that, in effect, the Vulgate of Jerome is to be *followed* with respect to

reinsertion of the Apocryphal books into the scriptures? If so, he is surely being more than a little inconsistent.

The bible believer can in part deny Mr Amué's claim because bible believers do not consider the Apocrypha to be *"the Word of God."* They cannot therefore charged with tampering with the scriptures by removing them. The following comments[11] about the Apocrypha are in order. References have been updated as necessary.

"The Apocrypha in the AV1611 was contained BETWEEN the Testaments. It was NOT part of the Old Testament and was not stated to be Scripture in the title page of the AV1611…

"Dr Gipp[12] states "In the days when our Bible was translated the Apocrypha was accepted reading based on its historical value, though not accepted as Scripture by anyone outside of the Catholic church. The King James translators therefore placed it BETWEEN the Old and New Testaments for its historical benefit to its readers. They did not integrate it into the Old Testament text as do the corrupt Alexandrian manuscripts...

""These books were never acknowledged as sacred Scriptures by the Jewish Church, and therefore were never sanctioned by our Lord.

""They were not allowed a place among the sacred books, during the first four centuries of the Christian Church.""

According to the TBS[13], the Westminster Confession of Faith states: *"The books called Apocrypha, not being of Divine confirmation, are no part of the Canon of Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God; not to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings."*

So no-one appears to believe that removal of the Apocrypha amounted to anyone having *"tampered with the (w)ord of God"* apart from Rome and Mr Amué.

"III. The Bible was never written in English…It was written in Hebrew and Aramaic for the Old Testament and Greek for the New. ***DISPROVE THIS****."*

No 'bible' such as Mr Amué describes has ever existed. He certainly gives no proof to the contrary. A 'bible' is a *book*. Dr Ruckman[14] writes, his emphasis, *"The word for "Bible" is a Greek word: βιβλος. The first man to refer to the Bible as "***THE** *BIBLE" was Chrysostom (AD 347-407), who referred to it as "THE BOOK" [ό βιβλος]."*

Dr Ruckman is clear, his emphases that "***[Chrysostom] was never speaking of a Book which contained all of the "verbally inspired original autographs."*** *That is some cock-and-bull story that some Bible critic invented at a later date."*

If Mr Amué is referring to *"the "verbally inspired original autographs""* as *"the Bible… written in Hebrew and Aramaic for the Old Testament and Greek for the New"* then he is clearly wrong because no such collation of the autographs ever took place. If he is not referring to *"the "verbally inspired original autographs""* then he has contradicted statements made in his second letter, page 1, points 3, 5 that *"all those Bibles* [in 11 languages, point 3], *in any language, based on the Masoretic and Received Texts, are perfect Bibles [that] can be trusted"* and where he emphasizes that, page 2, *"ALL BIBLES based on the Masoretic and Received Texts are the WORD OF GOD."*

If he really believes that this is the case – the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible excepted – then Mr Amué has disproved his point III himself, insofar as if such *"perfect Bibles [that] can be trusted [as]…the WORD OF GOD"* are available, then it matters not in what languages the autographs were written or that they were actually written by hand rather than reproduced by means of printing, i.e. his point III becomes irrelevant.

See the comments of the King James translators, with respect to *"the King's speech,"* pages 64-5 of the earlier work.

The question remains, to what could Chrysostom have been referring with respect to *"THE BOOK"*? Wilkinson[15] provides an answer. He states concerning the bible of the Waldenses that, *"The Latin Bible, the Italic, was translated from the Greek not later than 157 AD."* This was clearly a book, whether derived from Greek manuscripts or codices (early bound volumes) or both is unclear but nevertheless, the reference is to a *book*.

Wilkinson states further *"the Italic* [Waldensian] *Church handed [the scriptures] down in their apostolic purity, Allix, the renowned scholar, testifies. He reports the following as apostolic articles of faith: "They receive only, saith he, what is written in the Old and New Testament. They say, that the Popes of Rome, and other priests, have depraved the Scriptures by their doctrines and glosses.""*

Following compilation of their New Testament, it appears that Latin-speaking believers possessed a complete bible by the end of the 2nd century – and it did not contain the Apocrypha. Dr Ruckman[16] writes, *"Tertullian speaks of a complete Latin Bible which was circulating all over North Africa as far back as 190…This "Old Latin" was constantly being brought back into European Bibles and used instead of Jerome…"*

Dr Ruckman[17] states that although no single codex, i.e. book, of the entire Old Latin Bible has survived, the documents that remain are listed as codices, i.e. *books*, indicating that they were once complete bibles, or at least New Testaments, or at the very least, parts thereof, e.g. the Gospels, bound into single *volumes*. That is, they were *written* bibles and they sustained faithful bible believers during much of the Dark Ages, contrary to Mr Amué's opinion that the only written 'bible' was a never-extant one that, if not a collation of the actual autographs, nevertheless consisted of a Hebrew Old Testament and a Greek New Testament that apparently pre-dated all else that could be called 'the Holy Bible.'

In addition, Dr Ruckman refers to the Gothic Version, *"produced by the "little wolf" (Ulfilas)*[18]*, a missionary bishop to the Goths. This Bible was in circulation before Vaticanus was written (350 AD), and according to Kenyon, the text in it is for the most part that which is found in the Textus Receptus of the A.V. 1611."*

Note that the Gothic Version was in circulation during the lifetime of Chrysostom. It is called a *"Bible"* i.e. a *book.* Dr Ruckman[19] reveals further that *"Ulfilas was born in 311 and was in Constantinople in 321. He studied Latin, Greek, and Hebrew…A survivor of Ulfilas' work is Codex Argenteus ("the Silver Codex") now found in Upsala, Sweden."*

As a student of *"Latin, Greek, and Hebrew"* Ulfilas would have been sufficiently equipped linguistically to compile a complete Gothic Bible. Remembering the remarks of the King's men about *"the King's speech,"* it is surely the height of presumption on the part of Mr Amué to imply that the Bible of the missionary to the Goths was less than God's writing.

And, as indicated in the earlier work, page 37, Charles Haddon Spurgeon clearly disagreed with Mr Amué, even *after* the invention of printing. Note my underlinings.

"<u>The Bible is God's word</u>, and when I see it, I seem to hear a voice saying, '<u>I am the Book of God, man, read me; I am God's writing: open my leaves, for I was penned by God</u>'...I plead with you, I beg of you, respect your Bibles, and search them out. Go home and read your Bibles...<u>O Book of books! And wast thou written by my God? Then I will bow before thee, thou Book of vast authority! For He has written this Book Himself</u>...let us love it, let us count it more precious than fine gold!"

*"IV. …the majority of people do not speak English…**CHECK THIS OUT**."*

Saint Ignatius High School[20] in Cleveland, Ohio has carried out a fairly recent study entitled *The World's Most Widely Spoken Languages* and it includes links with extensive detail. The study makes this statement about the importance of English as a global language.

"After weighing six factors (number of primary speakers, number of secondary speakers, number and population of countries where used, number of major fields using the language internationally,

economic power of countries using the languages, and socio-literary prestige), Weber compiled the following list of the world's ten most influential languages:(number of points given in parentheses)

1. *English (37)*
2. *French (23)*
3. *Spanish (20)*
4. *Russian (16)*
5. *Arabic (14)*
6. *Chinese (13)*
7. *German (12)*
8. *Japanese (10)*
9. *Portuguese (10)*
10. *Hindi/Urdu (9)"*

Note that as an influential global language, English is significantly ahead of its nearest competitor, French. The data have been drawn largely from a detailed paper by George Weber[21], entitled *Top Languages, The World's 10 Most Influential Languages*. Although the data were compiled in the 1990s, the author explained, in 2006, that the rankings do not need updating. The only change will have been a systematic one, with the number of speakers worldwide for *all* the top ten languages having increased since the data were accumulated.

The study notes that as a first and second language, English is second to Mandarin Chinese with 480 million speakers worldwide versus 1.12 billion (in 1997). However, the study shows further, from Weber's data, that English is far ahead of its nearest rival, French, with respect to the number of countries, worldwide, where the language is spoken, 115 versus 35.

This study has shown that English is arguably the world's most significant language, even if it may not have the greatest number of speakers but the estimates given above may be conservative for English. Although *Wikipedia* is not always deemed the most authoritative source, its article[22] *English Language* is very detailed with extensive referencing and yields some striking results.

For a world population[23] of 6.6 billion, English may have up to 1.8 billion speakers as a first or second language or 27% of the world's population, far in excess of the 480 million English speakers cited above but estimates are known to vary widely. The *Wikipedia* article suggests that English may therefore have more speakers worldwide than even Mandarin Chinese, making it indeed the most widely spoken language on the planet. This article, like the source given above, is unequivocal about the global dominance of the English language.

"Modern English is sometimes described as the global lingua franca [common language]. *English is a dominant international language in communications, science, business, aviation, entertainment, radio and diplomacy. The influence of the British Empire is the primary reason for the initial spread of the language far beyond the British Isles. Since World War II, the growing economic and cultural influence of the United States has significantly accelerated the adoption of English."*

It is interesting that the two leading bible-believing and Protestant nations (historically) should be instrumental in the worldwide spread of the English *lingua franca.* See comments under ***Missionary Effectiveness*** of the earlier work, pages 7ff.

Although, as indicated, Mr Amué despises both Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work, she nevertheless has valuable insights, her emphasis, into English[24] as the premier missionary language, citing the work of language historian David Crystal, whom the *Wikipedia* article also references. Note that Dr Mrs Riplinger's data on the percentage of English speakers in the world's population approximately matches that of the *Wikipedia* article.

"In 1611 the KJV served only 5 million English-speaking people. Today the KJV could be used to bring this century's nearly 2 billion English speakers to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ (49% of these are native speakers of English; 51% of these can speak some English as their second language). This is nearly 33% of the world's population [year 2000 total world population 6 billion]…The teaching of English is now required in most nations of the world. [Stanford University] English Professor, Seth Lerer, feels that 'in many ways, the central feature of 20th century English is its status as a global language.'"

So Mr Amué's petulance to the effect that *"the majority of people do not speak English"* is beside the point. The point is that God has chosen English as the missionary language of the end times – via the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

"V. You are afraid, like all KJV only advocates, of the truth…the AV is based on the Masoretic and Received Texts and the Latin Vulgate… ***DENY THIS CLAIM****."*

By inspection of Mr Amué's earlier correspondence, he objects to two so-called insertions into the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible from Jerome's Vulgate; ***"only begotten"*** in John 1:18, first letter, page 1, paragraph 3 and ***"raise the dead"*** in Matthew 10:8, first letter, page 2, paragraph 3. Both his objections are false. See pages 31, 57-9 of the earlier work.

Moreover, it is highly likely that the King James translators[25] would themselves deny Mr Amué's claim. *"[The translators] had the Latin Vulgate, though that was suspect because it was popish."*

"VI. The AV is not the only Bible that is perfect without error…All Bibles…that are based on these two text (sic) *(Masoretic and Received) are perfect Bibles.* ***DISPROVE THIS****."*

Mr Amué has contradicted himself again. He has here stated that the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible *"is perfect without error"* and merely added the proviso that it is not the only such bible. Yet he has denied this statement in point V immediately above and in point I, which see.

Denial of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible has of course been the substance of his earlier correspondence throughout. See his first letter, page 1, paragraph 3, page 2, paragraphs 1 and 3. See also his second letter, page 1, last paragraph with respect to the word ***"hell"*** as found in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. See the responses to his objections against the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible in the earlier work, pages 8ff on ***"hell"*** and the study entitled **NKJV Changes, *"Easter," "Son"* versus *"Servant"* and other Supposed KJV 'Errors'** pages 20ff.

Mr Amué reiterates the statement from his second letter, page 1, point 3, that *"All Bibles…that are based on these two text (sic) (Masoretic and Received) are perfect Bibles."*

See his first letter, page 2, paragraphs 2, 3 where he contradicts that statement and the remarks in the earlier work under the headings ***"Perfect Bibles" – except for the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible***, pages 5ff, **Revision of the Textus Receptus**, pages 57-9, **Changes in the Masoretic Text and Sources for the Textus Receptus**, pages 59ff and **Some Questions and Answers**, pages 64ff.

All of which highlight Mr Amué's poor research and repeated inconsistency.

"VII. …you will see that γεεννα [*geena, Gehenna*] *in the preserved and inspired Greek Received Text.* ***STUDY THE ORIGINAL BIBLE****."*

What Mr Amué terms ***"THE ORIGINAL BIBLE"*** has never existed. See remarks under ***The Masoretic Hebrew and Receptus Greek "Holy Bible"*** above. The issue is not where the Greek word *Gehenna* is to be found but how it is to be rendered in English. See remarks under ***"Hell,"* Gehenna, Hades, Tartarus** in the earlier work pages 8ff.

"VIII. I am referring to the Received Text on which the AV is based. That is the right Received Text. ***DO NOT BEHAVE FOOLISH*** (sic)*."*

Strictly speaking, no such single Received Text that predates the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible exists or has ever existed, that anyone specifically knows of. The association between the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and the Greek Received Text may be outlined as follows, first by Dr Hills.

Dr Hills[26] writes.

"The King James Version a Variety of the Textus Receptus

"The translators that produced the King James Version relied mainly, it seems, on the later editions of Beza's Greek New Testament, especially his 4th edition (1588-9). But also they frequently consulted the editions of Erasmus and Stephanus and the Complutensian Polyglot. According to Scrivener (1884), out of the 252 passages in which these sources differ sufficiently to affect the English rendering, the King James Version agrees with Beza against Stephanus 113 times, with Stephanus against Beza 59 times, and 80 times with Erasmus, or the Complutensian, or the Latin Vulgate against Beza and Stephanus. Hence the King James Version ought to be regarded not merely as a translation of the Textus Receptus but also as an independent variety of the Textus Receptus."

The Complutensian Polyglot[27], or parallel bible, was the first printed bible. It was compiled under the auspices of Cardinal Ximenes and published in Alcala, Spain in 1520. The work occupied 6 volumes and consisted of parallel versions of both Testaments, the Old Testament, in Masoretic Hebrew (Ben Chayyim's text), Jerome's Latin Vulgate and the Greek Septuagint, LXX, the New in Greek and in the Latin of Jerome's Vulgate. The polyglot cannot, of course, be thought of as *"the original bible"* – see Mr Amué's terminology above – because it consists of a collation of sources of scripture already in existence at the time of its compilation.

The Complutensian Greek New Testament was completed in 1514 and matches that of Erasmus's Greek New Testament, first published in 1516[28]. Dean Burgon[29] remarks that, *"the 'Complutensian,' which was printed in 1514, exhibits the 'Traditional Text' with the same general fidelity as the 'Erasmian,' which did not see the light till two years later."*

Although Rome was therefore the first to publish the Received Greek Text, circulation of the polyglot's parallel New Testament seems to have been providentially outstripped by that of Erasmus's New Testament.

In spite of the Dean's reservations about some readings in the Received Text, e.g. ***"raise the dead"*** in Matthew 10:8, see pages 57-58 of the earlier work, he makes some insightful comments about the overall integrity of this text, in whatever form it has appeared. These comments should be kept in mind even though it is incumbent upon the bible believer to recognize, as Dr Hills so aptly states, *"the King James Version ought to be regarded not merely as a translation of the Textus Receptus but also as an independent variety of the Textus Receptus."*

Taken together, Dean Burgon's and Dr Hills's evaluations provide a much more balanced view of the Greek Received Text(s) than can be gleaned from Mr Amué's inconsistent assertions, i.e. to the effect that the Textus Receptus yields *"perfect Bibles"* that are *"the WORD OF GOD"* second letter, page 1, point 3, page 2 paragraph even though *"the Textus Receptus needs revising"* and has supposedly been contaminated by Jerome's Vulgate, first letter, page 2, paragraphs 2, 3.

Dean Burgon's[30] comments are as follows, his emphases. Note again the reference to the Complutensian New Testament.

*"The one great fact…is **The Traditional Greek Text** of the New Testament Scriptures. Call this Erasmian or Complutensian, - the Text of Stephens, or of Beza, or of the Elzevirs, - call it the 'Received,' or the **Traditional Greek Text**, or whatever other name you please; - the fact remains, that a Text **has** come down to us which is attested by a general consensus of ancient Copies, ancient Fathers, ancient Versions…*

*"Obtained from a variety of sources, this Text proves to be essentially **the same** in all. That it requires Revision in respect of many of its lesser details, is undeniable: but it is at least as certain that it is an excellent Text as it stands, and that the use of it will never lead critical students of Scripture seriously astray…"*

Such revisions as may have been necessary had, in fact, already been effected by the time of the Dean's writing – in the *English* of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, according to the providence of God for a universal language for the end-times. See remarks above on the global nature of English, the remarks on ***Missionary Effectiveness*** in the earlier work and also **Appendix 3** in this work, with respect to the essentially *biblical* English of the 1611 Holy Bible, which is therefore God's masterpiece in all these respects.

For as the Dean[31] himself states, his emphases, *"Whatever may be urged in favour of Biblical Revision, it is at least undeniable that the undertaking involves a tremendous risk. Our Authorized Version is the one religious link which at present binds together ninety millions of English-speaking men scattered over the earth's surface. Is it reasonable that so unutterably precious, so sacred a bond should be endangered, for the sake of representing certain words more accurately, - here and there translating a tense with greater precision, - getting rid of a few archaisms? It may be confidently assumed that no 'Revision' of our Authorized Version, however judiciously executed, will ever occupy the place in public esteem which is actually enjoyed by the work of the Translators of 1611, - the noblest literary work in the Anglo-Saxon language. We shall in fact never have **another** 'Authorized Version.' And this single consideration may be thought absolutely fatal to the project, except in a greatly modified form. To be brief, - As a companion in the study and for private edification: as a Book of Reference for critical purposes, especially in respect of difficult and controverted passages: - we hold that a revised edition of the Authorized Version of our English Bible, (if executed with consummate ability and learning) would at any time be a work of inestimable value. The method of such a performance, whether by marginal Notes or in some other way, we forbear to determine. But certainly only as a handmaid is it to be desired. As something **intended to supersede** our present English Bible, we are thoroughly convinced that the project of a rival Translation is not to be entertained for a moment. For ourselves, we deprecate it entirely."*

Observe that although Dean Burgon believed that the Textus Receptus was in need of revision as Mr Amué was ever so keen to pint out – see above – Burgon was nevertheless totally opposed to any attempt to *replace* the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, a fact that Mr Amué was clearly not so keen to point out. As for the accuracy etc., the words of Alexander Geddes[32], a *Catholic priest*, circa 1792 apply.

"If accuracy, fidelity, and the strictest attention to the letter of the text, be supposed to constitute the qualities of an excellent version, this, of all versions, must, in general, be accounted the most excellent." No 'improvements' have seriously stood the test of time over the last 200+ years.

Indeed, Dr Mrs Riplinger's work, *In Awe Of Thy Word*, has shown that nothing can replace the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible for any purpose whatsoever, including private study. Certainly no other version has, in the 120 years since Burgon wrote *The Revision Revised*. And the only practical suggestion that even he could make was with respect to marginal notes.

In case it is thought, mistakenly, as Mr Amué does, first letter, page 2, paragraph 3, with respect to Matthew 10:8 and the words ***"raise the dead,"*** that the Textus Receptus may have been 'contaminated' by readings from Latin Vulgate, Dr Hills[33] dispels any such false notions. When he discusses Latin Vulgate readings in the Textus Receptus, with respect to Matthew 10:8, 27:35, John 3:25, Acts 8:37, 9:5, 6, 20:28, Romans 16:25-27, Revelation 22:19, he affirms that *"The reader will note that these Latin Vulgate readings are also found in other ancient witnesses, namely, old Greek manuscripts, versions, and Fathers."*

Rev Moorman[34] addresses the manuscript, patristic and versional support for each of the above verses that Dr Hills cites and shows clearly that they each have much more support than the Latin Vulgate only, notably from the Old Latin, to which the King James translators likewise had access, as noted earlier[2]. This is, I believe, most likely true, therefore, with respect to any other passages where the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible appears to have followed Jerome's Vulgate against editions of the Greek Received Text, i.e. the Vulgate has not 'contaminated' them.

Dr Mrs Riplinger[35] has provided detailed information that further refutes the belief, apparently espoused by Mr Amué, that a single version only of the Textus Receptus, i.e. *"the right Received Text"* underlies the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

"A.V. Publications does not offer the currently printed paperback or hardback George Ricker Berry edition of Stephanus (Interlinear Greek English New Testament) for the following reasons:

1. *It includes a lexicon which was drawn from the Christ-hating and blood and Trinity-denying Unitarian, J.H. Thayer (Thayer's Lexicon)! He was on the vile RV/ASV committee.*
2. *Berry's interlinear English-Greek is actually a reprint of the Bagster edition prepared by bible critic Thomas Newberry, who spent "twenty five years" studying his own copy of the corrupt "Sinaiticus" manuscripts, which he naively referred to as the "originals." The body of the book is not Berry's work!*
3. *A comparison of the authentic Stephanus edition has unearthed some errors in Berry's notes.*
4. *The KJV translators had superior Greek & vernacular evidence to that had by Stephanus' (or Berry's) one-man text. See the following examples:*

• *Luke 17:36 (Berry & Stephanus omit the verse!)*

• *Rev. 3:1 (Berry and Stephanus omit "seven.")*

• *Mark 2:15 (Berry and Stephanus omit "Jesus" in its [first] occurrence.)*

• *Acts 19:20 (Berry and Stephanus have "Lord," not "God.")*

• *Berry and Stephanus mis-spell Beelzebub seven times in the New Testament (e.g. Matt. 10:25). (See the correct spelling in the KJV New Testament and any Hebrew Bible in 2 Kings 1:2, 3, and 6.)*

"Many of the above errors are also found in the other one-man Greek New Testament edition by Scrivener (TBS, DBS [Dean Burgon Society] *etc.) and Jay P. Green's Interlinear Bible; See* In Awe of Thy Word*, pp. 947-956 etc. for exhaustive details about this subject.*

"Sadly, Berry's Greek-English Interlinear is used in some good Textus Receptus Bible schools to 'correct' the KJV. The only use for Berry's or Stephanus' text is to prove errors in the corrupt Greek text underlying new versions…

"A.V. PUBLICATIONS offers the Beza 1598 Greek New Testament on CD-ROM. This is a good exemplar of the Greek Textus Receptus, useful in proving errors in corrupt Greek texts underlying new versions. This one-man edition, culled from both Greek and vernacular sources (Syriac and Aramaic), is not a tool to 'correct' the Holy Bible (KJV). Imagine using a Greek text (Beza's) to 'correct' a pure vernacular Bible, when Beza's text was created using both Greek and vernacular Bibles. (See In Awe of Thy Word*, p. 947.)*

"A.V. PUBLICATIONS offers Scrivener's Greek New Testament *by F. H. A. Scrivener (1908) in hardback and on CD-ROM. Scrivener's edition of the Greek New Testament 'Textus Receptus' is published by the Trinitarian Bible Society and the Dean Burgon Society. It is a representative of the Greek New Testament Textus Receptus and is therefore very useful in proving errors in the new versions and their underlying Greek texts. To present this, or any other 'one-man' printed Greek text,*

as the inspired 'originals,' in the minutia, one must bury his head in the sand about their letter-by-letter details and their one-man origin [like Mr Amué does]. *This Greek text was edited by F.H.A. Scrivener, member of the Westcott and Hort Revised Version committee! If that doesn't make you a little nervous, then read for yourself what Scrivener concedes in his original preface, not included in most printed editions:*

- *Scrivener created his Greek text by back-translating almost all of the KJV into Greek. He did this to see where the KJV's 'Greek' basis varied from the Greek adopted in his Revised Version. This includes, as Scrivener admits, 190 or so alterations from Beza's Greek text. A list of those changes is noted in his original appendix (pp. iii-xi et al.).*

- *Scrivener's Greek text also is marred by Scrivener's admitted "uncertainties" and his "presumed" ideas about just what the KJV translators "likely" had before them and what "appears" to be their source. It is also marred by the limitations of Scrivener's own Greek library and notes, which he admits are "probably quite incomplete" (pp. v, vii, viii, xi, 655, 656). If he personally was not aware of the KJV translators' Greek source, he "presumed" it came from the Latin, rather than the "the Originall" noted on a title page of the 1611 KJV New Testament. In these cases he followed Beza's one-man edition (a translation into Greek done in part from vernacular New Testaments in Syriac and Aramaic). The "punctuation" and "paragraphs" in Scrivener's Greek are those of the corrupt Revised Version of 1881 (p. x).*

"Therefore, Scrivener's Greek New Testament, although generally representative of the Received Text, is, in the minutia, a mutated and hybrid product of Scrivener's own mind. Unless you believe that this Westcott and Hort committee member was 'inspired,' this Greek New Testament has no more 'authority' to 'correct' the Holy Bible than any other one-man edition and 'private interpretation.' It has many of the errors cited earlier for Stephanus' text.

"Since Scrivener's Greek New Testament was generally back-translated from the King James English Bible into Greek [as well as from Beza's sometimes vernacular-based (Syriac and Aramaic) Greek], it makes no sense to send missionaries and translators to Scrivener to create or check foreign language editions. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools..." (Rom. 1:22)."

Dr Ruckman[36] has these additional comments about "*the right Received Text,*" his emphases.

*"When it comes to the issue of **Final Authority**, the latest gimmick used by the apostate Laodiceans is this: "We believe the **King James Bible** is the best translation, but we believe the Textus Receptus (the correct Greek text) is **the final authority**." That means they have taken away your Bible from you so that **you have no final authority**. All Textus Receptus manuscripts are written in **Greek**, and Greek makes up less than 1% of the common languages of today: **LESS than 1%**. These egotistical reprobates are telling you that your **final authority** is a pile of manuscripts you can't understand unless you study **Greek**."*

Which understanding would most likely require fee-paying full or part-time attendance at a theological college for up to 3 years, hardly a practical proposition for the vast majority of saved individuals. Note that Mr Amué's professed 'final authority' differs from the one that Dr Ruckman outlines only in that Mr Amué 'prefers' the NKJV to the 'old' KJV. Dr Ruckman continues.

*"When they told you the final authority was the Textus Receptus, they lied about the Textus Receptus. As we've said many times…you are dealing with the biggest pack of **pathological, professional liars** that ever hit the skids. The Mafia couldn't hold a candle to them. They will lie just about every time they open their mouths. When you hear them say "THE Textus Receptus is the **final authority**," they are just lying like a dog.*

"The Textus Receptus comes in five different major editions[37] *that* ***contradict each other*** *from time to time. There is a Textus Receptus published by Erasmus, there is a Textus Receptus published by Colinaeus, there is a Textus Receptus published by Stephanus, there is a Textus Receptus published by Beza, and there is a Textus Receptus published by the Elzevir brothers. The "TRs" put out by Erasmus, Colinaeus, Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs don't always agree.*

"Question for the stupid idiots who head up the "Bible" schools. "When the editions of the TR conflict, what is your ***final authority****?…*

"Listen, the "Majority Text" doesn't always match Erasmus. Erasmus doesn't always agree with Stephanus. There are times when Beza differs with Stephanus. And Elzevir isn't the same as Colinaeus.

*"****What is your final authority when they disagree****?*

"For 110 Christian institutions of higher education…In such a case the final authority is still ***their own preferences*** *and* ***opinions*** *about the* ***preferences*** *and* ***opinions*** *of* ***some scholar****. Can't you figure that out? They don't have any "Bible" that is their final authority. (I've got the documented evidence right here, signed by the presidents of the institutions or the heads of their Bible departments or their teachers. That would be the administrators or teachers of 110 Conservative, "orthodox" schools.)"*

Mr Amué is therefore making quite bold statement when he speaks explicitly of *"the Received Text on which the AV is based. That is the right Received Text…"*

Dean Burgon is right to conclude – see above - that bible believers do have *"****The Traditional Greek Text*** *of the New Testament Scriptures…that [****has****] come down to us which is attested by a general consensus of ancient Copies, ancient Fathers, ancient Versions"* but it is not a single-volume text as such, which is what Mr Amué wrongly insists it is (and still in need of correction, according to him, as are therefore all bibles stemming from it, even though, also according to Mr Amué, they are *"perfect Bibles"* and *"the WORD OF GOD"* second letter, page 1, point 3, page 2, paragraph 1).

The only single volume embodying this 'Traditional Text' in its ultimate refined form in English is the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. The work of collating the closely related but nevertheless slightly disparate sources of 'the Traditional Text' is finished. As Dr Miles Smith[38], writer of the Preface to the Authorized Version, made clear.

"Many other things we might give thee warning of (gentle Reader) if we had not exceeded the measure of a Preface already. It remaineth, that we commend thee to God, and to the Spirit of his grace, which is able to build further than we can ask or think. He removeth the scales from our eyes, the vail from our hearts, opening our wits that we may understand his word, enlarging our hearts, yea correcting our affections, that we may love it to the end. Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines, neither prefer broken pits before them with the wicked Jews. [Gen 26:15. Jer 2:13.]

"Others have laboured, and you may enter into their labours; O receive not so great things in vain, O despise not so great salvation! Be not like swine to tread under foot so precious things, neither yet like dogs to tear and abuse holy things. Say not to our Saviour with the Gergesites, Depart out of our coast [Matt 8:34]; neither yet with Esau sell your birthright for a mess of pottage [Heb 12:16]. If light be come into the world, love not darkness more than light; if food, if clothing be offered, go not naked, starve not yourselves."

Good advice for bible believers – and Mr Amué.

"IX. …ALL students of the Authorised Version are shallow students. They cannot see beyond their nose. ***THIS IS A FACT****."*

Unfortunately, Mr Amué's statement consists of yet another contradiction. He himself is one of the *"students of the Authorised Version."* He must be, in order to advance all the so-called errors in it that

he has described at some length in his earlier correspondence. Does he therefore consider himself one of *"shallow students"*?

More importantly, does he include the King James translators in his sweeping condemnation? Has he studied the scholarship of Dr Richard Kilbye[39]?

"Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, 1610 and an excellent Hebrew scholar, he was also expert in Greek. He once heard a young preacher give three reasons why a particular word in the AV1611 should have been translated differently. He explained to the young preacher how he and others had considered all three reasons "and found thirteen more considerable reasons why it was translated as now printed.""

Dr Richard Kilbye and his colleagues could see a lot further than Mr Amué.

"X. …when somebody starts to talk to you in Greek you get confused…You cannot reason from either the Hebrew or Greek."

Neither can Mr Amué, to judge by his earlier correspondence, where upon inspection, all the criticisms he has leveled at the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible *"from either the Hebrew or Greek"* have been found to be wrong.

"XI. You ask what language do they speak in Heaven…They speak a heavenly language in Heaven…"

This is like saying, *"Why is it dark in here? Answer, because the lights aren't on."*

Since Mr Amué cannot answer this question *"from either the Hebrew or Greek"* an answer may be provided using the English of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

"And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying in <u>the Hebrew tongue</u>, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks" Acts 26:14.

Dr Ruckman[40] writes.

*"The **"Hebrew tongue"** (vs. 14) is Hebrew and this is the language of heaven according to Revelation 19:3, 4* [according to the three-fold use of the word ***"Alleluia"***]. *Why wouldn't it be when the creation (Genesis) is described in this language and the "new names" in the Book of Life take up more space (I and II Chronicles) than the creation itself?"*

*"XII. You are too proud and arrogant just like all the AV advocates I have come across. **YOU NEED TO CHANGE**."*

The expression 'pots and kettles' comes to mind although bible believers are not *"proud and arrogant"* enough to correct the Holy Bible. See also Paul's rebuke in Romans 2:1.

"Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things."

*"XIII. You are an AV Bible believer, and you have a final authority. I say well done. But you only believe a version that contains some the original books. You reject the Apocrypha that was in the AV of 1611. **THIS IS A FACT, DENY IT**."*

See remarks under Mr Amué's point II above.

*"XIV. The booklet you enclosed…[has] nothing in [it] that can disprove the New King James as being the Word of God. **TRY PROVING IT WRONG**."*

Mr Amué appears unable to advance any reasons why the content of the said booklet is wrong. However, the earlier work, pp 8ff, has shown that the NKJV is wrong in 20+ passages of scripture where it departs from the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. That work has also shown that the NKJV uses

a corrupt Old Testament Hebrew text, departs repeatedly from established Textus Receptus readings and sports a Satanic-Masonic logo on its cover.

These are compelling reasons *"that can disprove the New King James as being the Word of God."*

And do.

Mr Amué's point XV has been skipped because, as indicated earlier, because it deals only with recipients for correspondence.

"XVI. …You…need to grow up. Then you will be able to understand the Bible better. ***FEED ON SOLID FOOD AND NOT MILK****."*

Mr Amué here resorts to personal attack, as he has done in points VIII-XII, which see. He is employing one of the strategies that unsaved evolutionists use in order to avoid addressing biblical creation and the overwhelming support it enjoys from genuine science. Creation scientist Malcolm Bowden[41] has this pertinent evaluation, from Appendix 4 of his book, entitled *A List of Deceptive Stratagems*. The list extends to 28 stratagems in all.

"16) 'AD HOMINEM.' (Against the man)

"The attention is distracted from the weak case by attacking the credibility of the opposition.

"This is an approach often resorted to by evolutionists who have labeled creationists with such descriptions as 'narrow-minded Bible-thumping fundamentalists who have got to get their blinkered view of science from the Bible.' This draws attention away from any factual material evidence that may be presented."

For *"evolutionists"* read 'bible critics, for *"creationists"* read 'bible believers' and for *"'narrow-minded etc.'"* read *"all KJV only advocates…afraid of the truth."* Mr Bowden's evaluation then matches Mr Amué's strategy exactly.

"XVII. Your book list is a laugh. Why are there so many books needed to defend the AV? I have never come across any other version that needs constant defending. If the AV is the perfect word of God it can surely defend itself. ***QUIT DEFENDING IT****."*

Quit attacking it.

In fact, the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible can defend itself. As indicated in the earlier work, page 63.

"The capacity of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible to "defend itself" is evident in the comparison of the 20+ verses listed earlier, with respect to the readings of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and the NKJV, although some additional comment has been necessary for any prospective bible critic, to highlight the significance of the differences between the equivalent readings. The 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is clearly ***"the form of sound words"*** [2 Timothy 1:13] *that has been vindicated by the testimony of church history, missionary effectiveness and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself."*

As an illustrative postcard states, which I'll include with this correspondence ☺, entitled *THE MONARCH OF THE BOOKS – 1611 AUTHORIZED VERSION, "TURN HIM LOOSE! HE CAN TAKE CARE OF HIMSELF!!"*

The following comment is apposite[42].

"FLASHES OF TRUTH

"Defending the Bible. Dr Joseph Parker once said from the pulpit that he had been asked to preach a sermon "defending the Bible." "Defending the Bible," he cried, in his most ringing tones. "You don't speak of defending a lion. Let it loose and it will defend itself." That is certainly true of the Bible. It needs no defence. Men may criticize it and tear it to pieces in their unbelief and ignorance but the fact of the matter is, it criticizes us. "The Word of God is quick and powerful…and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.""

Note that the citation of Hebrews 4:12 is from a 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, *not* an NKJV. It is instructive that nowhere in his correspondence does Mr Amué produce an equivalent quotation for the NKJV. This version evidently *does* need defenders, like him.

However, one reason why newer versions have less published support than the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is that they generally don't last long enough to attract such support. Dr Vance[43] reports that since the publication of the Revised Version New Testament in 1881, approximately 200 bible versions have come and mostly gone. Others[44] have appeared since the publication of Dr Vance's book in 1993 including the TNIV, Today's New International Version (as if one wasn't enough ☹), the HCSB, Holman Christian Standard Bible, the CEV, Contemporary English Version, The ESV, English Standard Version and the ER-KJV, (un)Easy Reading King James Version.

I heard a missionary say, in 1972, that *"the RSV Revised Standard Version will probably have a life of about forty years."* He was correct. The RSV New Testament was published in 1946 and the complete RSV in 1952. The *New* RSV came out in 1989[43] – almost exactly 40 years later – and experiences some limited popularity amongst ecumenicals. While perhaps not at the end of its 'shelf life,' the NKJV, having first appeared in 1982, is likewise definitely 'over the hill,' largely ignored by most of the Body of Christ (even though many are still hooked on the NIV) apart from 'educated' Christians.

Malcolm Bowden[41] also has a relevant comment about Mr Amué's point XVII.

"17 NAME CALLING

"This is to apply a dismissive or derogatory label to any of the ideas of the opposition in order to discredit them. Phrases used would be 'pure imagination,' 'a flight of fancy,' 'laughable'…"

Or *"a laugh"* as in Mr Amué's point XVII. He may find at ***"the judgment seat of Christ"*** Romans 14:10 that he is the object of scorn.

"But ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof: I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh" Proverbs 1:25, 26.

If he is saved, he won't suffer the ***"destruction"*** of verse 27 but ***"If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire"*** 1 Corinthians 3:15.

On that day when any remaining NKJVs are burned.

"XVIII. It is sad that the AV advocates are blinded, and will not admit that there are versions, out there, that are far superior to their Authorized Version. They get uptight as soon as they are told the truth. ***VERY, VERY SAD INDEED****."*

Mr Amué has yet to identify any *"versions…that are far superior to [the] Authorized Version."* As the earlier work shows, the NKJV does not qualify. The only one *"uptight"* so far is Mr Amué. See points V, VII-XII above and his obsession with bold capitalization throughout his third missive.

"XIX. Gayle (Gail) Riplinger's book is the most inaccurate book on the market filled with lies and false information. She misquotes people and takes them out of context to prove a point. Check out the reviews about her book. ***A BOOK FULL OF FALSE INFORMATION****."*

None is which Mr Amué appears able to disclose so this point can be bypassed, although reference to the earlier work, work, pages 26-27, is appropriate.

"XX. I advise you get yourself an Interlinear Bible. I recommend Jay Green's Hebrew-Greek English Interlinear. I also recommend you get yourself other study material, like Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew-English Lexicon, and Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon and Strong's Concordance. These will help you get a better understanding of the Scriptures, and you will not be so narrow-minded. ***YOUR EYES WILL BE OPENED TO THE TRUTH****."*

Note Malcolm Bowden's remarks on the *ad hominem* attack above, with respect to Mr Amué's charge of narrow-mindedness. Concerning sight of the truth, John 9:41 immediately comes to mind.

"Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth."

See the earlier work, under the heading **Good Lexicons (?)** pages 52ff and this work under the discussion of Mr Amué's point VIII with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger's disclosures about J.H. Thayer for a correct evaluation of the 4 multiple authorities that Mr Amué lists above for the purpose of overthrowing the Holy Bible.

Again, it has to be remembered that Mr Amué despises Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work – see his point XIX - and nothing is likely to change his attitude this side of ***"the judgment seat of Christ"*** Romans 14:10, if he's saved. However, as Paul states in 1 Corinthians 14:38.

"But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant."

Concluding Paragraph

In addition to some parting *ad hominem* shots, e.g. *"you do not know half the time what you are talking about, and the other half you are echoing the rubbish what* [sic] *others before you have said…Change your one-track stance,"* by which Mr Amué continues to display his limited command of English, suggesting it would be in his best interests to avoid 'the Hebrew and the Greek' altogether, he makes only a couple of points of substance.

"I do not recommend [the AV] as first choice any more. The New King James Version gets first choice in English. The Masoretic and Received Text that is published by the Trinitarian Bible Society is recommended to advanced scholars."

Mr Amué's correspondence shows unequivocally that he is not one of those. He seems unaware that the NKJV does not follow the Masoretic Text published by the Trinitarian Bible Society and the TBS itself has revealed the repeated departures of the NKJV from the Received Text that it publishes.

See the earlier work, pages 59ff under the heading ***Different Masoretic Texts*** and the statement from the NKJV Preface, pages 37-8 that Mr Amué appears not to have read. See again Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks under point VIII above, concerning Scrivener's 'one man' Received Text and the revelation by the TBS about the NKJV's unwarranted omissions in its New Testament, page 56 of the earlier work.

As for Mr Amué's willingness to assume the mantle of responsibility for designating the *"first choice"* of bible, he evidently sees no irony with respect to this statement, in the light of his point XII.

It would be interesting to know how many of the Lord's people he has recommended the NKJV to in the last 6 months and how many takers he has had but in the meantime, he should take note of Solomon's warning.

"The fear of the LORD is to hate evil: pride, and arrogancy, and the evil way, and the froward mouth, do I hate" Proverbs 8:13.

Dr Hills[45] puts Solomon's warning in context. The title of Dr Hills's thoroughgoing work, *The King James Version Defended*, might draw yet another laugh from the likes of Mr Amué but as a Christian gentleman, Dr Hills was simply speaking rationally in response to academic infidels who were far more practiced as destructive critics of the Holy Bible than Mr Amué has shown himself to be – though no more successful.

It should be noted that Dr Hills makes a summary statement at the end of his remarks about the *true* Masoretic Text, the Greek Textus Receptus editions that converged in the New Testament Text of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and *"The Forerunners of the King James Version*[46]*"* that he refers to as

"other faithful translations." He is not referring to the NKJV, or any equivalent monstrosity, either in the English language or any other.

Since Dr Hills's remarks that follow also sum up not only this third letter of Mr Amué's but also his entire correspondence, ***"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter"*** Ecclesiastes 12:13a, courtesy of Dr Hills.

***"The Conclusion of the Whole Matter"* – Courtesy of Dr Edward F. Hills**

Why Believing Bible Students Must Use the King James Version — A Recapitulation

"In regard to Bible versions many contemporary Christians are behaving like spoiled and rebellious children. They want a Bible version that pleases them no matter whether it pleases God or not…

"But God is bigger than you are, dear friend, and the Bible version which you must use is not a matter for you to decide according to your whims and prejudices. It has already been decided for you by the workings of God's special providence. If you ignore this providence and choose to adopt one of the modern versions, you will be taking the first step in the logic of unbelief. For the arguments which you must use to justify your choice are the same arguments which unbelievers use to justify theirs, the same method. If you adopt one of these modern versions, you must adopt the naturalistic New Testament textual criticism upon which it rests. This naturalistic textual criticism requires us to study the New Testament text in the same way in which we study the texts of secular books which have not been preserved by God's special providence. In other words, naturalistic textual criticism regards the special, providential preservation of the Scriptures as of no importance for the study of the New Testament text. But if we concede this, then it follows that the infallible inspiration of the Scriptures is likewise unimportant. For why is it important that God should infallibly inspire the Scriptures, if it is not important that He should preserve them by His special providence?

Where, oh where, dear brother or sister, did you ever get the idea that it is up to you to decide which Bible version you will receive as God's holy Word? As long as you harbor this false notion, you are little better than an unbeliever. As long as you cherish this erroneous opinion, you are entirely on your own. For you the Bible has no real authority, only that which your rebellious reason deigns to give it. For you there is no comfort no assurance of faith. Cast off, therefore, this carnal mind that leads to death! Put on the spiritual mind that leads to life and peace! Receive by faith the True Text of God's holy Word, which has been preserved down through the ages by His special providence and now is found in the Masoretic Hebrew text, the Greek Textus Receptus, and the King James Version and other faithful translations!"

Amen.

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ, 2 Chronicles 14:11

Alan O'Reilly

Appendix 1

Roy Livesey and the Bury House Christian Books

You asked about Roy Livesey. I don't know a lot about him but I have his book *Understanding the New World Order*, published in 1991. It has evidently been updated as *More Understanding the New Age*, published in 1999. See page 2 of the 2008 Catalogue.

The book I have is both readable and informative and it would probably be useful to have the updated version and any further updates that appear. All scripture quotations are from the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible in the book I have but I don't know about the update – Livesey may since have been 'converted' to the NKJV.

I would suspect that Livesey's approach to the Holy Bible is similar to that of Michael Penfold in his leaflet *Is The King James Version Perfect?* (answer: no, according to Penfold), to judge by Livesey's 2005 publication *The "King James Only" Deception from America*, listed on page 1 of the catalogue that you highlighted.

It is therefore worth noting again that Colin Tyler, of Bethany Evangelical Church, Birmingham has answered Penfold's criticisms in a booklet entitled *The King James Version Is Perfect*, as indicated in the earlier study, page 21. It is most likely that Colin Tyler's response to Penfold would also answer Livesey's criticisms of the Holy Bible, at least in principle, given that Livesey's publication is much longer than Penfold's, occupying 80 pages.

Roy Livesey's main pre-occupation over the last 10 years, approximately, seems to have been to produce a 700+ page tome in order to discredit the late Alberto Rivera, whose 5-part testimony is available from Chick Publications.

I learned of the length of this work from an associate of Livesey's down in Dorset, with whom I no longer have contact, so unfortunately I can't give 'chapter and verse' on this information although I believe it to be correct. The catalogue lists a much-abridged version of this volume, of 52 pages in length, just above Livesey's book on *The "King James Only" Deception from America* and Livesey admits that the *"full story…is still **not** published."* Livesey and/or the catalogue do not disclose the length of the *"full story"* but it is clear that Livesey has been forced to lower his sights considerably in order to get something in print.

In the meantime, I note that the Lord continues to sustain Chick Publications and their distribution of Alberto's testimony. A dedicated researcher into the Jesuits is American author Eric Jon Phelps, who has produced probably the most thorough and detailed work on the Jesuits in existence, entitled *Vatican Assassins*. This work is an 1800+ page e-book, available (only) on CD via www.vaticanassassins.org. I have been a member of Eric's email group for several years and he has always been a staunch supporter of both Jack Chick and Alberto's testimony.

Rome has recently published her own apparent rebuttal of Chick and Alberto. It is a special report found on the *Catholic Answers* site, www.catholic.com/library/sr_chick_tracts_p1.asp entitled *Chick Tracts – Their Origin and Refutation*.

I have not reviewed this report, although I referred it via email to Chick Publications but received no reply.

However, my overall conclusion, by inspection, is that Rome and the Jesuits clearly have an ally in Roy Livesey, his informative publications about the NWO and the New Age notwithstanding. This is also Eric Phelps's conclusion.

Appendix 2

Additional Changes in the NKJV

The following readings have recently been brought to my attention as 'errors' in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible that have supposedly been 'corrected' by the NKJV.

These readings are *"Joshua"* Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8 versus ***"Jesus,"*** *"righteous act"* Romans 5:8, *"righteous acts"* Revelation 19:8 versus ***"righteousness."***

Concerning ***"Jesus"*** versus *"Joshua"* in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8, see the following, including Dr Ruckman's[47, 48, 49] incisive comments, with updated references – note that the correct page number for his Acts Commentary is 255, not 225, apologies for the oversight in *"O Biblios."*

""The Greek text (any Greek text anywhere) says Iesou (Greek for ***"Jesus"****), and if your "Bible" says "Joshua", you have an inferior translation produced by inconsistent critics who cared nothing about ANY Greek text in a showdown. God the Holy Spirit wrote* ***"Jesus"****... to remind you that when Jesus returns He enters the land of Canaan by the same route Joshua entered, attacking a cursed city (Revelation 17, 18) after a seven year period (Joshua 6:15). His rule will be a military dictatorship (Psalm 110, Revelation 20), as Joshua's was, and the celestial phenomena of Joshua 10:12 will accompany His Advent (Matthew 24:29, Luke 21:25). Furthermore, the Jews will divide the land (Ezekiel 40-48) and repossess it at this time.*

""Moral: where scholars find "mistakes" in the King James Bible, the HOLY SPIRIT has often given an ADVANCED REVELATION expressly for the purpose of confounding the "leading authorities who agree."" Moreover, Joshua 5:13-15 and Exodus 23:21 reveal that ***"the captain of the Lord's host"*** *is* ***"the captain of their salvation"*** *Hebrews 2:10, JESUS, to Whom Joshua was subordinate for the entire campaign, Joshua 4:14, 6:27, 7:6-13, 10:25, 42."*

The word[50] in question with respect to Romans 5:18 and Revelation 19:8 is *dikaioma*, for which *"righteous act(s)"* is reckoned to be a superior translation than ***"righteousness,"*** for which the usual word is *dikaiosune*. However, *dikaioma* is also found in Romans 2:26, 8:4. The 1611 Authorized Holy Bible has ***"righteousness"*** in each of these verses, as in Romans 5:18 and Revelation 19:8 but the NKJV has *"righteous requirements"* and *"righteous requirement"* respectively.

The NKJV translation of *dikaioma* is therefore inconsistent, i.e. incorrect, in at least 2 of these 4 verses because by inspection, an *"act"* is essentially different from a *"requirement."* Again, by inspection, the consistent use of ***"righteousness"*** in all 4 verses by the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible covers all the possibilities raised by the underlying word *dikaioma*.

It should be remembered that differences in Greek words that occur in the New Testament do not always have to be maintained in English. The earlier work has illustrated this principle with respect to the various words for ***"hell,"*** i.e. *Gehenna*, *Hades*, *Tartarus*. Other examples include *agapao* and *phileo* for ***"love"*** as in John 21:15-17 and *gramma* and *graphe* for ***"scripture(s)"*** in 2 Timothy 3:15, 16.

The King's men clearly understood this principle better than any group of modern translators.

Comparison of the English bibles[51] that preceded the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible with respect to these 4 four verses, together with Romans 2:26, 8:4 yields interesting results. See Table A1.

Table A1

Comparison of English Bibles Preceding the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible vs. the NKJV

Verse	Wycliffe	Tyndale	Coverdale	Geneva	Bishops'
Acts 7:45	***Jesus***	*Joshua*	*Joshua*	***Jesus***	***Jesus***
Hebrews 4:8	***Jesus***	*Joshua*	*Joshua*	***Jesus***	***Jesus***
Romans 2:26	***righteousness***	*right things*	*right things*	*ordinances*	*ordinances*
Romans 5:18	***righteousness***	*justifying*	***righteousness***	*justifying*	***righteousness***
Romans 8:4	*justifying*	*righteousness required*	*righteousness required*	***righteousness***	***righteousness***
Rev. 19:8	*justifyings*	***righteousness***	***righteousness***	***righteousness***	***righteousness***

Notes

1. Spelling as found in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible has been used.
2. Bold type has been used where the version agrees with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.
3. The Wycliffe New Testament is the 1395 Edition. The 1388 Edition[52] has *"Joshua"* in Acts 7:45. ***"Jesus"*** is clearly an updated reading!
4. The Geneva New Testament is the 1587 Edition. The 1599 Edition[53] reads with the 1587 Edition in all the above verses.

Table A1 shows that of 30 readings, generated by means of 6 verses compared across 5 versions, over half, 16 out of 30, agree directly with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. Only 4 readings agree directly with the NKJV, i.e. *"Joshua"* in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8 in Tyndale's and Coverdale's bibles.

A maximum of 4 readings, i.e. *"right things"* in Romans 2:26 and *"righteousness required"* in Romans 8:4 in Tyndale's and Coverdale's bibles, could be viewed as lying halfway between the equivalent readings in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and the NKJV of ***"righteousness"*** and *"righteous requirement(s)"* respectively.

The remaining 6 readings are appreciably closer to those of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible than those of the NKJV. The readings *"justifying"* and *"justifyings"* match ***"righteousness"*** as single, all-encompassing terms more closely than the narrower expressions *"righteous act(s)"* NKJV, Romans 5:18, Revelation 19:8 and *"righteous requirement"* NKJV, Romans 8:4. Likewise, the term *"ordinances"* in Romans 2:26 more closely matches the whole compass of the law as embodied in the expression ***"the righteousness of the law"*** and including, for example, circumcision of the heart, Deuteronomy 10:16, whereas the NKJV's wording *"righteous requirements"* could be limited to outward observances only.

Note Luke 1:6, with respect to the godly parents of John the Baptist.

"And they were both <u>righteous before God</u>, walking in all the commandments and <u>ordinances of the Lord</u> blameless."

Whenever the words ***"require"*** or ***"required"*** occur in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, as they do on 54 occasions, the context is always one of substance, whether spiritual or physical, and often one of outward manifestation, not one of heart attitude, as in circumcision of the heart. For example:

"And surely <u>your blood of your lives will I require</u>; at the hand of every beast will <u>I require it</u>, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother <u>will I require the life of man</u>" Genesis 9:5.

"For the Jews <u>require a sign</u>, and the Greeks seek after wisdom" 1 Corinthians 1:22.

The NKJV's wording "*righteous requirement(s)"* in Romans 2:26, 8:4 is therefore superficial, compared with the word ***"righteousness"*** in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

In sum, the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is supported for the verses considered in 70-80%, or the equivalent of 22-24 readings out of 30, of the readings from the earlier English bibles that brought in the 16th century English Protestant Reformation. On this basis alone, the King's men therefore had more than sufficient justification for inserting the readings that they did for the above verses.

Moreover, the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible could rightly be perceived as the crowning achievement of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation, one that blesses the Lord's people to this day.

All its readings should therefore be retained. Anything else is at best regression, but more specifically outright rebellion against the Book's Author.

"For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry" 1 Samuel 15:23a.

Appendix 3

The 1611 Authorized Holy Bible – an "Antique Feel"(?)

Dr Alan Clifford, pastor of Norwich Reformed Church and another supporter of the NKJV has stated the following with respect to the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible in his series[54], *The Reformed Alpha Course*. The statement is drawn from Part 3 of the course, entitled *Which Bible?*

"This time-honoured and much-loved version was dominant throughout the English-speaking world for nearly three centuries. In many 'conservative' circles the AV continues to be the first and last word. For some 'AV-only' believers, it is almost as inspired as the original Greek! However, after nearly four centuries, insistence on its continued use gives an antiquarian feel to Christianity. This is something the 21st century Church can do without. Despite its linguistic excellence, the AV is simply dated. The use of archaic seventeenth-century words, verb endings and pronouns cannot be justified… until a new translation based exclusively on the Traditional/Byzantine Text is produced, the NKJV is arguably the best option. Avoiding the archaisms of the AV and the textual contagion evident in other versions, it is the most satisfactory version for present use."

Dr Edward F. Hills[55] has this response. Although written before the publication of the NKJV, Dr Hills's words are timely, nevertheless, his passing reference to the Septuagint notwithstanding. Note that Dr Hills's statement and that of Dr Ruckman which follows it, are not aimed at the textual basis of the scriptures as such but at the suitability of the *language*, in this case English, that conveys the scriptures. It follows that their criticisms of modern speech bibles are just as applicable to the NKJV as they are to the various modern versions mentioned, e.g. Goodspeed, RSV, NEB.

Dr Hills writes.

"Obsolete Words in the King James Version —How to Deal with Them

"But are there still obsolete words in the King James Version or words that have changed their meaning? Such words do indeed occur, but their number is relatively small. The following are some of these archaic renderings with their modern equivalents:

"by and by, Mark 6:25……..at once

"carriages,Acts21:15……..baggage

"charger, Mark 6:25……..platter

"charity, 1 Cor.13:1……..love

"chief estates, Mark 6:21 ……chief men

"coasts, Matt. 2:16 ……...borders

"conversation, Gal. 1:13……..conduct

"devotions, Acts 17:23 ……...objects of worship

"do you to wit, 2 Cor. 8:1 ……make known to you

"fetched a compass, Acts 28:13 ……....circled

"leasing, Psalm 4:2, 5:6……....lying

"let, 2 Thess. 2:7 ……restrain

"lively, l Peter 2:5 ……..living

"meat, Matt. 3:4 ……....food

"nephews, 1 Tim. 5:4 ……grandchildren

"prevent, 1 Thess. 4:15 ……..precede

"room, Luke 14:7-10 ……seat, place

"scrip, Matt. 10:10 ……bag

"take no thought, Matt. 6:25 ……..be not anxious

"There are several ways in which to handle this matter of obsolete words and meanings in the King James Version. Perhaps the best way is to place the modern equivalent in the margin [as Dean Burgon suggested]. *This will serve to increase the vocabulary of the reader and avoid disturbance of the text. Another way would be to place the more modern word in brackets beside the older word. This would be particularly appropriate in Bibles designed for private study.*

"Why the King lames Version Should be Retained

"But, someone may reply, even if the King James Version needs only a few corrections, why take the trouble to make them? Why keep on with the old King James and its 17th-century language, its 'thee' and 'thou' and all the rest? Granted that the Textus Receptus is the best text, but why not make a new translation of it in the language of today? In answer to these objections there are several facts which must be pointed out.

"In the first place, the English of the King James Version is not the English of the early 17th century. To be exact, it is not a type of English that was ever spoken anywhere. It is biblical English, which was not used on ordinary occasions even by the translators who produced the King James Version. As H. Wheeler Robinson (1940) pointed out, one need only compare the preface written by the translators with the text of their translation to feel the difference in style. And the observations of W. A. Irwin (1952) are to the same purport. The King James Version, he reminds us, owes its merit, not to 17th - century English — which was very different — but to its faithful translation of the original. Its style is that of the Hebrew and of the New Testament Greek. Even in their use of 'thee' and 'thou' the translators were not following 17th-century English usage but biblical usage, for at the time these translators were doing their work these singular forms had already been replaced by the plural 'you' in polite conversation.

"In the second place, those who talk about translating the Bible into the "language of today" never define what they mean by this expression. What is the language of today? The language of 1881 is not the language of today, nor the language of 1901, nor even the language of 1921. In none of these languages, we are told, can we communicate with today's youth. There are even some who feel that the best way to translate the Bible into the language of today is to convert it into "folk songs." Accordingly, in many contemporary youth conferences and even worship services there is little or no Bible reading but only crude kinds of vocal music accompanied by vigorous piano and strumming guitars. But in contrast to these absurdities the language of the King James Version is enduring diction which will remain as long as the English language remains, in other words, throughout the foreseeable future.

"In the third place, the current attack on the King James Version and the promotion of modern-speech versions is discouraging the memorization of the Scriptures, especially by children. Why memorize or require your children to memorize something that is out of date and about to be replaced by something new and better? And why memorize a modern version when there are so many to choose from? Hence even in conservative churches children are growing up densely ignorant of the holy Bible because they are not encouraged to hide its life-giving words in their hearts.

"In the fourth place, modern-speech Bibles are unhistorical and irreverent. The Bible is not a modern, human book. It is not as new as the morning newspaper, and no translation should suggest this. If the Bible were this new, it would not be the Bible. On the contrary, the Bible is an ancient, divine Book, which nevertheless is always new because in it God reveals Himself. Hence the language of the Bible should be venerable as well as intelligible, and the King James Version fulfills these two

requirements better than any other Bible in English. Hence it is the King James Version which converts sinners soundly and makes of them diligent Bible students.

"In the fifth place, modern-speech Bibles are unscholarly. The language of the Bible has always savored of the things of heaven rather than the things of earth. It has always been biblical rather than contemporary and colloquial. Fifty years ago this fact was denied by E. J. Goodspeed and others who were pushing their modern versions. On the basis of the papyrus discoveries which had recently been made in Egypt it was said that the New Testament authors wrote in the everyday Greek of their own times. This claim, however, is now acknowledged to have been an exaggeration. As R. M. Grant (1963) admits the New Testament writers were saturated with the Septuagint and most of them were familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures. Hence their language was not actually that of the secular papyri of Egypt but biblical. Hence New Testament versions must be biblical and not contemporary and colloquial like Goodspeed's version.

"Finally, in the sixth place, the King James Version is the historic Bible of English-speaking Protestants. Upon it God, working providentially, has placed the stamp of His approval through the usage of many generations of Bible-believing Christians. Hence, if we believe in God's providential preservation of the Scriptures, we will retain the King James Version, for in so doing we will be following the clear leading of the Almighty."

With reference to HRH Charles, Prince of Wales, Dr Ruckman[56] writes, his emphases.

*"According to the Prince of Wales, who is destined to be the next **head** of the Church of England, "Modern English is a wasteland of clichés, obscenity, and banality." The English Prince, who comes from the land of the **Authorized Version**, that produced the English Protestant Reformation, declares that the English language "has become impoverished, sloppy, and limited, a dismal wasteland (the Daily Telegraph, Dec. 20, 1989, no. 41,832)." The Prince accused the editors of the **New English Bible** and the **Revised Standard Version** of "making changes in the **Authorized Version**, just to lower the tone, and believing that the rest of us wouldn't get the point if the word of God was a bit over our heads." The Prince went on, "the word of God is **supposed to be a bit over our heads**, elevated as God is." Never heard it put better anywhere. It will never be said to anybody over here any better…This is the King with the King's English, and **"where the word of a King is, there is power"** [Ecclesiastes 8:4a]."*

"God save the King" 1 Samuel 10:24, 2 Samuel 16:16, 2 Kings 11:12, 2 Chronicles 23:11.

Don't look for that expression in the NKJV. It isn't there. How the NKJV alternative qualifies as an updated 'improvement' is unclear.

References – 2012 Update

[1] *In Awe Of Thy Word* by G.A. Riplinger, A.V. Publications Corp. www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html, 2003, p 1076

[2] *"O Biblios" - The Book* by Alan O'Reilly, Covenant Publishers, 2001, p 26, uploaded version www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ p 18

[3] www.studylight.org/

[4] www.tbs-sales.org/

[5] *WHY PSALM 12:6, 7 IS A PROMISE OF THE INFALLIBLE PRESERVATION OF SCRIPTURE* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore

[6] *Bible Believers Bulletin*, February 2003, June 2006

[7] *The Men Behind the King James Version* by Gustavus S. Paine, Baker Book House, 1958, pp 70-71

[8] *In Awe Of Thy Word*, pp 560-561

[9] *King James Version – Preface – 1611 Edition*, www.piney.com/DocKJVPref1611.html, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm

[10] en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Books_of_the_Latin_Vulgate

[11] *"O Biblios" - The Book*, pp 34, 222-224, uploaded version www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ pp 25-26, 174-176

[12] *The Answer Book* by Dr Sam Gipp, Bible & Literature Missionary Foundation, 1989, pp 99-100, samgipp.com/answerbook/ *Question 34*

[13] *The English Bible and the Apocrypha*, Article No. 31, Trinitarian Bible Society

[14] *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1988, p 48

[15] *Which Bible?* edited by David Otis Fuller D.D., Grand Rapids International Publications, 1984, pp 208-209. See also kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html

[16] *The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1970, pp 77-78

[17] *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, pp 95-96

[18] *The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*, p 81

[19] *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, p 100

[20] www2.ignatius.edu/faculty/turner/languages.htm

[21] www.andaman.org/BOOK/reprints/weber/rep-weber.htm

[22] en.wikipedia.org/wiki/English_language#_note-28

[23] en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_population

[24] *In Awe Of Thy Word*, pp 19-20

[25] *The Men Behind the King James Version*, p 77

[26] *The King James Version Defended* by Edward F. Hills, The Christian Research Press, 1973, p 220. See also wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html

[27] en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Complutensian_Polyglot

[28] *"O Biblios" - The Book*, p 18, uploaded version www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ p 12

[29] *The Revision Revised* by Dean John William Burgon, Centennial Edition, Hobbs Publications, 1983, p 391

[30] Ibid, p 269

[31] Ibid, pp 113-114

[32] *"O Biblios" - The Book*, p 28, uploaded version www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ p 20

[33] *The King James Version Defended*, pp 200-202, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html

[34] *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text – A New Twist In The Continuing Attack On The Authorized Version* by J.A. Moorman, B. F. T. #1617, 2nd Edition, The Bible For Today, 1988

[35] *The Riplinger Report* Issue #2, February 2007, *In Awe Of Thy Word*, pp 955-956

[36] *Bible Believers' Bulletin*, January 2008, *The Super Superiority of the King James Bible*

[37] *"O Biblios" - The Book*, pp 18-20, uploaded version www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ pp 12-13

[38] *King James Version – Preface – 1611 Edition* www.piney.com/DocKJVPref1611.html, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm

[39] *"O Biblios" – The Book*, p 26, uploaded version www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ p 17

[40] *The Book of Acts* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1974, p 696

[41] *Science Vs Evolution* by Malcom Bowden, Sovereign Publications, 1991, p 220

[42] *The Churchman's Magazine – Vol. 138 Nos. 1661-1662 November-December, 1984*, Protestant Truth Society, p 96

[43] *A Brief History Of English Bible Translations* by Dr Laurence M. Vance, Vance Publications, 1993, pp 106ff

[44] *In Awe Of Thy Word*, p 8

[45] *The King James Version Defended*, pp 242-243, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter9.html

[46] Ibid, pp 213-214, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html

[47] *"O Biblios" - The Book*, pp 34-35, 268-269, uploaded version www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ pp 25-26, 208-210

[48] *The Book of Acts* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1974, p 255

[49] *Problem Texts* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1980, pp 337-338

[50] *Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible*, Robert Young LL.D., Lutterworth Press, 1973

[51] www.studylight.org

[52] *The Wycliffe New Testament 1388* transcribed by W. R. Cooper, The British Library, 2002, www.studylight.org

[53] *The 1599 Geneva Bible*, L.L. Brown Publishing, 1995, www.studylight.org

[54] nrchurch.limewebs.com/alpha.html

[55] *The King James Version Defended*, pp 217-220, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html

[56] *Bible Believers' Bulletin*, April 1990, *The King's English*