

GOODLY WORDS.

BETTER ANSWERS TO KING JAMES BIBLE QUESTIONS.
Matthew Verschuur — copyright 2007 — www.bibleprotector.com

INTRODUCTION

Various King James Bible defenders have at times said things that were poorly expressed, or were mistaken, or were because of erroneous ideas. However, rather than disregard all the general good and truth that supports the King James Bible, it is better to help and heal those things which have been lacking.

It is very important that proper Christians accept truth and acknowledge it, even if it is expressed by enemies. There are various non-Christians, Roman Catholics, apostates, heretics and anti-King James Bible people who have expressed truths and agreed on certain points, and have at times been more articulate, accurate and factual than many King James Bible adherents. While it may be that antichrists must make themselves at least appear truthful, it is neither Christian nor civil to wholly reject or completely blacken those things which are not so. (Otherwise, no man — Romanist, Jew or compromiser — could ever be preached to and saved.) Without the Jews there would be no King James Bible. Without the Roman Catholic Vulgate there would be no King James Bible. Besides, in God's providence, all the actions of enemies, persecutors and terrorists must actually inevitably work out for good.

Thus, it is in the spirit of acknowledgement of truth that these “goodly words” are submitted into the King James Bible issue, especially if they be of a service to those faithful followers of the Authorized Version. And so, the King James Bible only people should find opportunity to be of the more excellent way, and that the gainsayers be convinced of a strong and reasonable King James Bible position.

It has been wrong to accept that there should be a division between reason and faith, for faith is the most reasonable position a person can hold. It is not difficult to know why these things be so. Accepting the King James Bible, therefore, is an act of the will, acknowledging the truth and being persuaded of the force of the testimony of these things.

It has not been helpful, neither has it been Biblical, that Christians should call themselves sinners and build up a monumental doctrine of imperfection. It runs contrary to the King James Bible — which is contended to be the perfect Word — to continually stress the imperfection of the men who acknowledge the same. Surely, the perfect Word would elevate a man, and the perfection of it would cause a man to acknowledge it more and more. “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.” (Matthew 5:48). It is contradictory to the perfect Word that Christian perfectionism and genuine Pentecostal revelation have been rejected by many, and this has been a stumblingblock laid in the way of earnest seekers. But where the fundamentalist and puritan Bible doctrines are wedded together with the Spirit's working of Christian perfection and Holy Ghost revelation, that is where the advance of the Church toward its fuller stature can be realised.

God has been superintending over history, and has manifested the revelation of the very pure Word in direct conjunction with the spiritual advancement of those who have accepted perfection by faith. This is the gathering together of truth while rejecting the manifold chaff. The Spirit has been leading into all truth, and raising the truth alone.

History must be viewed as the outworking of God's divine providence. The prophets and apostles are of the same Church, of the same Word, of the same Spirit as has continued through time to this

present. There is, therefore, a providential continuum, a divine timetable, in which the spirit of such things as pertain to the glorious manifestation of the Church outwork and do appear.

The translators of the King James Bible saw themselves as vessels of God, and to their credit, did not speak of themselves as unable to present the perfect Word. Others who operated in accordance with God's divine providence in regard to the King James Bible have also acknowledged their subjection to God, and though they have at times expressed their own uncertainty, they have decided rather to rely on God's outworking than their own. There may be a degree of unconsciousness to it, but hindsight shows it clearly, for example, that Oliver Cromwell ended several attempts at replacing the King James Bible when he prorogued parliaments. Even though John Burgon wanted to revise the underlying text of the Bible, he acknowledged that it were better to retain the King James Bible, especially after viewing the disastrous Revision of 1881. And even though Edward Hills knew the King James Bible to be God's providentially appointed Bible, he thought it was not absolutely perfect, that it was possible that it could somehow be altered, and that he identified no particular edition of it as definitive; yet he professed that he would rather raise up a spiritually conducive environment consistent with divine providence, which was for the best, since some of his views were clearly wrong.

It is therefore correct that Christians act consistently with the proper tradition, and see that God's working has used all sorts of men, in various places throughout the ages, in His desire for the worldwide witness in power of the Word. Christians should accordingly not merely defer to the past, or wish for the future day, but also see that this very moment is the time to do good in the furtherance of the Gospel.

The following are brief clarifications or corrections to answers about the King James Bible which have been given by those wanting to uphold the authority of the English Bible.

1. IS IT WRONG TO BEGIN FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE?

The King James Bible only position has been attacked by some, being accused of circular reasoning. The argument for the King James Bible is based on the truth that it is correct, and therefore having everything judged in this light is entirely consistent. "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" (Psalm 11:3). By quoting verses from the King James Bible it is easy to establish the pure Word doctrine as entirely correct.

Some King James Bible people have attempted to argue from a position of reason without emphasising or establishing the King James Bible. This stooping to conquer is a slippery position, because it abandons the high ground of the spirit for something bad: "This wisdom descendeth not from above, but *is* earthly, sensual, devilish." (James 3:15). The truth is that Biblical faith is reasonable: "And that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men: for all *men* have not faith." (2 Thessalonians 3:2). Clearly, the preaching of the Gospel is linked with utilising the very Scripture as its basis: "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures, Opening and alleging ..." (Acts 17:2, 3a).

2. WAS THERE A SEPTUAGINT (LXX)?

Despite the fact that various errors appear in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, it can be shown from the Scripture that the Old Testament was available and understood by common Jews and Gentiles alike. For example, in writing to Rome, Paul said, "But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith" (Romans 16:26). Greek as the common language of the day was used to make the Scriptures known to all nations (see Romans 16:26).

The translators of the King James Bible themselves testify that the Septuagint Translation did exist, calling it, “the word of God being set forth in Greek”, and saying that it was by God’s providence that Ptolemy Philadelph, the Grecian king of Egypt, procured the translation. It must have been executed by learned Jews, the translation into Greek taking place in 275 B.C. What these interpreters produced was a work that would precede the coming of the Gospel to the Gentiles. In other words, God planned that the Old Testament would be widely available in the common language of the eastern Mediterranean so that when the Gospel would come, Christians could have instant use and knowledge of the Word.

However, there are many things about the making of the Septuagint that are clearly false, such as that the seventy interpreters all miraculously made the same translation to each other in isolation, or that they were infallible.

As for the errors of the Septuagint, the Apostles themselves were guided by the Spirit as to the truth, and secondly, Christians collectively were able to increase in the truth, so that eventually better translations were made and used. Howbeit, it is clear no Jew could ever accuse a Christian of doctoring the Old Testament to suit his religion, because the Christians used this Jewish translation at the beginning of the New Testament Church.

It is also important to understand that the translators of the King James Bible found some Hebrew words rare, hard or disputable in meaning, and therefore relied upon the Septuagint to clarify the meaning of a Hebrew word. Thus, without providential placement of the Septuagint, the King James Bible would not be accurate. It is therefore unhistorical and anti-1611 translators to deny or reject the Septuagint.

3. DID THE APOSTLES USE THE KING JAMES BIBLE?

Since the King James Bible appeared about 1611 years after Christ, it is entirely illogical to claim that the Apostles were using the King James Bible. It can be argued that they were using a text that matches with the King James Bible. This is because the King James Bible is the faithful, correct and perfect portrayal of the very words that were inspired. But the appearance of the King James Bible was at its set time, when certain events had occurred by the providence of God, such as the Reformation, the degree of knowledge in England, the state of the English language and so on. “THAT which was from the beginning ... That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you” (1 John 1:1a, 3a).

4. IS THE TRADITIONAL OR MAJORITY TEXT ULTIMATELY DEFENDABLE?

Among King James Bible people there has been a confusion of terms. Firstly, a vast body of substantially agreeing witnesses to the New Testament text can be found. This family of manuscripts and other evidence can be called the Antioch, Byzantine, Traditional or Majority Text family.

However, at the Reformation, the makers of single representative texts, which may be called Textus Receptus Editions, did not rely totally on the Traditional Text family. They also considered the Western (Vulgate) readings and the readings from the Alexandrian or Minority Text family. Now the Roman Catholics were concerned with producing standard editions of the Western Text family, and years later, modernists created critical editions based on the Minority Text family. The Textus Receptus Editions portrayed a “gathered text” (i.e. gathered from the truthful witnesses in history) that emphasised or favoured the Traditional Text family. Minor differences could be found in the various editions of the Textus Receptus, but the gathered group of these editions has also been

generally called “The Textus Receptus”. In fact, that is what is the usual meaning of Textus Receptus, Received Text or TR.

To be “TR Only” with respect to the Greek text is illogical, since there is no final representative of the Greek Received Text. The correct view is that the English Bible is an independent form of the Textus Receptus, and further, that it is the final form of the Received Text.

There have been attempts by King James Bible users to create a new edition of the Textus Receptus that is based entirely on detailed and limited study of the Traditional Text, which have been designed to “correct” the King James Bible. However, carrying this out would be contrary to the King James Bible doctrine because the King James Bible *is* the final gathered text and thus deviates from the Textus Receptus and the Traditional Text Family in those places where they are in error. As a consequence, the critical edition, known as the Majority Text, and other such works are really peripheral to the King James Bible only movement, and would tend to reject aspects of the doctrine, as well as remove certain verses such as 1 John 5:7.

5. IS THE VULGATE ERRONEOUS?

The Latin text of the Bible, while containing errors, also has in places preserved truth which had little preserved witness in the Greek. Erasmus, the great editor of the Textus Receptus, at times used the Latin to confirm and supply readings. Thus, the translators of the King James Bible, in believing that God had preserved His Word, included words that had been witnessed to by Roman Catholics for centuries. It should be noted that the use of the Latin text was only where the witness of history could clearly show the Roman Catholics to be correct, such as where the transitional Church Fathers agreed in witness to the correct text (i.e. those readings which were in the originals anyway).

6. WHERE WAS THE WORD OF GOD BEFORE 1611?

Christians cannot deny that the Word of God was available in many languages, and that the true readings were scattered throughout the manuscripts from the New Testament times to the Reformation. The Protestant English Bibles were gatherings of the Word. It was being purified in each successive Bible: “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.” (Psalm 12:6, 7). People knew there were mistakes or impurities in those versions. That is why King James ordered the making of a final Bible, which would be, as the translators wrote, “one more exact Translation of the holy Scriptures into the *English Tongue*.”

The King James Bible is the volume of the book where the pure Word was presented without textual or translation errors. “Seek ye out of the book of the LORD, and read: no one of these shall fail, none shall want her mate: for my mouth it hath commanded, and his spirit it hath gathered them.” (Isaiah 34:16).

7. IS THE KING JAMES BIBLE TEXT EXACT?

Many people are confused about the “text” because they think that it exists in the original languages. In fact, the word “Original” describes the first Autograph that the inspired penman wrote in the Bible. The words or text in this document were perfect. However, the word “original” also applies to the language it was written and copied in. Thus, the many copies of the original languages. It was from these that the gathered texts were made, called the Received Text.

For the Old Testament, the Received Text was represented in printings of the rabbinical Hebrew. For the New Testament, the Received Text was represented in the printings of the Textus Receptus

Greek.

Out of all the variant words, one text needed to be established, which answered directly to the same text which the Original author wrote when inspired.

The gathering of the words in the original languages was furthered in the making of Protestant Translations, which brought together the whole Bible more accurately than ever, and particularly so in English. Thus, the final set of words appeared in one full Bible in English in the Authorized Version. "Every word of God *is* pure: he *is* a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." (Proverbs 30:5, 6).

The text of the King James Bible, that is, its exact set of original words (presented in English in the Pure Cambridge Edition) has not been altered at all, and should not be altered. At times, attempts have been made at altering the King James Bible by altering the underlying texts, but the King James Bible really must be viewed as the final form of the very words of God.

8. IS THE KING JAMES BIBLE TRANSLATION EXACT?

Many King James Bible supporters have been weaker in dealing with the translation than the text. Yet, the most important work of the men of 1611 was not the portraying of the right text, but that they portrayed it correctly in English. This is the translation of the Bible.

When reading the King James Bible, people are reading in English what God said in other languages. This does not make it less than the Word of God, because the English conveys the exact meaning. The King James Bible is a sense for sense translation. This means that there is not an exact match of the words of one language to English, but that the very meaning of those words are portrayed in English. The importance of words is that they have meaning. Therefore, for the English Bible to contain the words of God, it must contain in English the very meaning or message of God.

"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. ... But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." (1 Peter 1:23, 25). The Gospel going to the nations did not stay in the original languages. How then could nations hear and be converted. Yet Christ commanded that His very words be observed by nations. This could only mean that Gentiles could see Christ's words in their own languages.

It is an oft-repeated error that it is impossible to take from one language, and to convey the message and meaning exactly in another. In fact, the King James Bible has to completely correct, or else it is not the word of truth. The Holy Ghost, in His providence, has supplied words and meanings into English for the very sake of the perfect Word. So, "baptise", which was not English, became an English word, so that the exact concept could be portrayed that God intended. And so likewise have the Roman Catholics been used to do this many times. Furthermore, the great translator, William Tyndale, on not finding certain English words, had to invent them with specific meanings, so as to have the English people understand exactly the concepts of God.

Thus, the Biblical English of the King James Bible is entirely correct, and does not need to be altered, nor has it been altered since 1611.

9. WHAT ABOUT FORMAL AND DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCY?

The King James Bible must be viewed as an exact sense for sense translation. This is why it may at times follow the word order of the original, or the amount of words of the original, while at times

may seem to be an interpretation of the original.

In fact, the translators did their work as if the prophets and apostles were writing in English themselves. Therefore, they did not always uniformly translate the same original word to the same English word at every place. Neither did they spare in supplying additional English words to bring out the sense of the original when the same would not be exact in English without them.

Formal equivalency would mean a literalistic translation, while dynamic equivalency would mean interpretative translation. The King James Bible translators were neither formal nor dynamic equivalent translators. They were exact, correct and perfect interpreters in their translation.

10. WERE THE 1611 TRANSLATORS INSPIRED OR INFALLIBLE?

The fact that the translators produced a Bible text that answers exactly to the Originals, and that they translated exactly the sense of the originals does not mean that they themselves were inspired, or that the text selection process was inspired, or that the translation and interpretation process was inspired. Only the Original was inspired, and those words were copied, often faithfully, throughout the generations, being supplied to the translators by God's providence.

The translators got it right by spiritual means to be sure, but this was the outworking of God's providence, which was manifested in natural and human circumstances. For example, the general climate of learning of the Reformation had culminated to a point where the consensus of the translators (the entire work was based on consensus) could manifest in them being able to have all the necessary available evidence and to be able to have the wisdom to select and portray what was true.

It is said that because the translators sometimes presented variant readings in the margin of the Bible that they believed some readings were uncertain. However, the translators, in choosing which reading to present in their text, and providing opportunity to study which readings were certain by this means, were not presenting an uncertain or inaccurate Word, but one which could be checked and found to be correct. Indeed, they believed that they were presenting the very Word of God, and the general historical opinion of English-speaking Protestantism has accepted this.

11. IS THERE A PERFECT BIBLE FOR EVERY LANGUAGE?

In regards to the original Greek, the Word of God was available in that language, but never perfectly altogether in one manuscript or volume. Likewise, the Word of God has been available in many languages, but there has never been one text anywhere that was exactly correct, nor one translation that was exactly correct, and there certainly has not been a fully purified Word that has existed in any place, except one. The only Bible which has the exact correct text is the King James Bible. The only Bible that has the exact correct translation is the King James Bible. And the only Bible that has been fully purified, and really could be fully purified, was the King James Bible. This means that it is possible for there to be flawless representations of the King James Bible even extending to the elimination of typographical errors and so on.

The same level of preparation of the English language cannot be found in any other language. It is interesting that the meaning of concepts is most clear in English. For example, while one word in Greek may have different meanings, such as the same word being used for both Passover and Easter, it is only in English where either "Passover" or "Easter" is used at its appropriate place. Furthermore, many languages are unable to accurately portray the word "shibboleth", because while they may have the "sh" sound, they do not have the sound for "th" in their language. "Then said they unto him, Say now Shibboleth: and he said Sibboleth: for he could not frame to pronounce *it*

right.” (Judges 12:6a). Right pronunciation applies to every sound in that word. Most importantly, since English is now the most widespread language, being the global language, it is fitting that God’s Word come to the world in the last days in English.

12. DOES THE KING JAMES BIBLE CORRECT THE ORIGINALS?

The King James Bible is based on and is the exact representation of the Original Autographs in English. It cannot be, in this sense, any further revelation or an improvement. However, unlike the times of the Original Autographs, the King James Bible brings all the separate books together into one volume. While testaments and canons already existed, the King James Bible was the first and final completely perfect form of the full Word of God in the Earth.

As concerning the particular original “gathered” editions that the King James Bible was based upon, it is clear that its text is another and final form of the Received Text.

As concerning the English language, it is the most fit to portray both Hebrew and Greek, which are different to each other. English, for this and other reasons, has been God’s providentially appointed language of choice to use to give the Word of God in its final form.

The King James Bible is not superior to the originally inspired word, but as a version, it is superior to any particular manuscripts or version that underlies or is ancestor to it.

13. WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MARGINAL READINGS?

The marginal readings fall into three main categories. The first is explanatory notes. The second is variant readings which appear in some original language manuscripts, either as the text or as the other reading there. The third is other possible translations into English.

Since only the text in the King James Bible is correct, the words in the margin are merely helps, impure, fallible and often wrong. The translators of 1611 were not treating the Word of God as if God had given two different inspirations or two different ways of saying the same thing. The translators were not choosing between two or more equal possibilities, and even at places where there was a great probability for either reading or translation to be correct, they chose only one to be the actual text of their version, allowing others to be placed in the margin, so that the translators could be checked by the general consensus of Christendom. There is not one case in any place where they got it wrong, and the acceptance of millions of Christians over the years substantiates this. Whether there has been dissent in modern times is beside the point since modernists now go against the clear witness of history when they take an anti-King James Bible position. John 17:17b was not referring to variant readings when it said, “thy word is truth.”

14. WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ITALICS?

The italics are used in two main ways. The first is in supplying words to text which seem to have less witness or credibility in the source languages. The second is in supplying words in English to give the exact sense of the original words, showing that it may take more English words to say the same thing as was written in Hebrew or Greek.

The rules covering the use of the italics are not simplistic, in that the King James Bible has been accused of supposedly wrongly italicising some words, or not italicising others. However, within the Authorized Version it is always possible to show that the words in italics are correct, and are not merely human inventions. Deuteronomy 8:3b states, “man doth not live by bread only, but by every *word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of the LORD doth man live.” In this verse “word” is in italics,

yet the New Testament portrays this word as part of the text, “But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.” (Matthew 4:4).

An italic word does not mean a doubtful word or a 1611 invented word, what it means is that the translators were being honest, showing which words were of other origins, though being no less than the Word of God since without them the proper meaning of what God wanted to say would not be represented in English. God’s providential approval upon the italics is evident.

15. WHAT ABOUT THE KING JAMES BIBLE’S GRAMMAR?

Some have attempted to make supposedly uniform the grammar of the King James Bible, so that, for example, words beginning with “h” are always preceded by the word “a” or the word “an” (such as “a house” or “an house”). However, the English Bible uses both words in front of words beginning with the letter “h”. These types of differences exist, including in use of words “thy” or “thine”, and the spelling of words such as “vail” or “veil”, are all to do with exactness of sound or meaning. The grammar of the King James Bible is not inconsistent at all, but in fact is highly complex. It is not normal English, but Biblical English.

In every place, the rhythmic pattern of stress, or the combination of sounds, calls for one word or another. This also explains why the same word can be translated differently at various places, outside reference to meaning. This includes explaining why Old Testament quotations are somehow altered in the New Testament, or that the same quotation can be rendered differently at different places.

Furthermore, the whole Bible is one conceptual pattern, which goes down to the very words. To modern ears, some statements may sound back to front in the King James Bible, but when examined, it is in keeping with exact grammar of Biblical English, rhythm or metre, and the conceptual structure of the Word of God.

It is therefore foolish to think to alter, simplify or modernise the King James Bible, whether in the spelling, the sound or in the grammatical structure. “But the word of the LORD was unto them precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, *and* there a little” (Isaiah 28:13a). Rather, men should study the Bible to understand its meaning in the way God has communicated.

16. IS THE KING JAMES BIBLE REALLY “AUTHORIZED”?

It is possible to see that God has authorised the King James Bible in view of divine providence. However, the “Authorized Version” gets its name from the fact that King James the First of England ordered the translation to take place in 1604. The absence of further official records to this end after this time does not negate the authorisation, especially since it is commonly reported that various documents have been destroyed or lost in fires in London.

It is clear that some King James Bible supporters, in their aversion to Anglican doctrine or monarchical doctrine have attempted to downplay King James’, or the Anglican or the governmental role in the making or promotion of the King James Bible. However, such a view is inconsistent with the facts, including that the King James Bible was “Appointed to be read in Churches”, it is much better to view these things in light of God’s providence. Whatever the faults of individuals or Church systems, they were used of God to bring forth the truth. In fact, the basis of true Christianity today can almost fully be attributed to the moderate Puritan element within the Anglican Church.

Later events in any government system or denomination due to compromise cannot be held against godly men which at one time operated in those systems. In fact, the Roman Catholic institution was once the recipient of the book of Romans!

17. ARE MODERN VERSIONS FULLY ERRONEOUS?

“Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Woe unto *them that are* wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!” (Isaiah 5:20, 21). Modern versions are dangerous and full of errors, but inasmuch as they agree with the King James Bible, they are the Word of God.

The makers of modern versions may think that they are sincere, and may be deceived concerning the spirit of error which underlies modern versions. Since the very nature of modern versions is evil, the Spirit of God would be giving witness to some extent to the makers of them, whether by conscience or some other providence, so that they might not lie against the truth.

18. IS THE AUTHORIZED VERSION REALLY THE MOST READABLE?

Various tests showing whether or not the King James Bible is more readable is a misguided argument, since this does not deal with comprehension. While the King James Bible may abound with more simple and old Saxonate words, this does not guarantee that the said Bible is more readable or comprehensible. In fact, being the Word of God, there must be a degree of strangeness to it for modern ears. “This is an hard saying; who can hear it?” (John 6:60b). “the words of the wise, and their dark sayings.” (Proverbs 1:6b).

“Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know *them*, because they are spiritually discerned.” (1 Corinthians 2:13, 14).

The Bible, particularly the King James Bible, requires the Spirit of God to act as its interpreter. This is not saying that it is hard for the Holy Ghost to get it through to people, but without Him, the Word is, even for the most worldly learned, hard to understand.

19. HAS THE KING JAMES BIBLE CHANGED SINCE 1611?

The King James Bible has changed since 1611, but the actual text and the translation have not. Some King James Bible advocates have said that there are no differences between 1611 and the present King James Bible. However, there are differences. Some have relegated all the differences to mere typographical errors of the first 1611 Edition, however, this does not explain all the changes. Some of the changes are due to the standardisation of the English language, and some are to do with regularisation (for example, work on the italics).

Some King James Bible defenders have claimed that there are low numbers of such differences, perhaps no more than 400. However, at least 2000 differences of these kinds can be found, most of which are very minor. The truth is that not one difference between 1611 and the present makes the King James Bible into another version or translation.

20. WHICH EDITION IS THE RIGHT ONE?

The anti-King James Bible people have not usually been given good answers as concerning which

edition of the King James Bible is correct.

Some have said that any edition is acceptable. However, some editions of the King James Bible are known to be “early”, and therefore have a variety of spelling, perhaps blackletter typeface, and less progress in the standardisation of the English language. Some editions are in no way “usual”, such as Webster’s of 1828, the American Bible Society’s of the 1850s, or Scrivener’s of 1873. And then there are modern editions and versions which are further removed from usual King James Bibles. To use any edition is to give place to confusion, “Let all things be done decently and in order.” (1 Corinthians 14:40).

Since the Word is exact, there should be only one set representative, “Thy word *is* very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it.” (Psalm 119:140). It is an extreme error to count all variations within the King James Bible as concurrently correct.

More usually, the 1769 Edition is held up as the standard, since it is the basis of ordinary King James Bibles today. However, this view must further be refined, so that it sees that the 1769 Edition has in fact been improved upon or purified, so that there is a particular edition coming out of 1769 which represents the King James Bible perfectly.

Generally, the Cambridge Edition has been identified as being superior to any other edition of the King James Bible. However, there has been a woeful lack of knowledge concerning the Cambridge Edition. Some may state that they stand for the “1769 Cambridge”, of which they really mean, the Cambridge tradition which improved upon the 1769 Edition. In fact, Cambridge-printed King James Bibles have gone through several phases since 1769. First is that Cambridge utilised the improved 1769 text with better spellings from the 1830s. Second is that a purification revision took place circa 1900, resulting in the Pure Cambridge Edition. Third is that an edit took place around the 1970s, resulting in the Concord Edition. Besides these, Scrivener’s Edition from 1873 has been upheld by some, and a recent erroneous edit by David Norton is lauded by the world.

Sadly, there has been much doubt as to whether there is even a correct or perfect edition. However, all the arguments for the King James Bible may equally well apply to one edition of it as a particular representative.

The correct and particular representative of the King James Bible is the Pure Cambridge Edition, which was printed circa 1900 to the 1960s by Cambridge, and to a later date by Collins. There are a large number of evidences and providences which are consistent with the Pure Cambridge Edition being correct. See the Conclusion for further reading.

21. WHAT ABOUT ARAMAIC?

It is a common error to say that portions of the Old Testament were written in Aramaic. In fact, the proper word should be “Syriack”. Some claim that a language called “Aramaic” was being used in the New Testament. However, the Bible never speaks of this. Some of Christ’s words were in Hebrew, and there are other references to Hebrew in the New Testament.

The language which properly can be called “Aramaic” came into Palestine after the Romans destroyed Jerusalem. That “Aramaic” arose from people from Syria and so on becoming inhabitants in the land. Despite this, Hebrew was still retained by the Mesoretic school, and the “Aramaic” may have only been the specific language of certain Jewish mystical writers.

22. IS KING JAMES BIBLE ONLYISM A RECENT DOCTRINE?

The term “King James Only” was coined as a derisive term by the ardent anti-King James Bible scholar James White in 1995. Others have claimed that the doctrine was invented in 1930 by a Seventh Day Adventist.

The pro-King James Bible view usually links itself with Dean Burgon’s 1882 comments in support of the Authorized Version, and back to the “King James Bible only” guidelines of the Bible societies in the 1830s. However, King James Bible supporters and users can be found considerably earlier, such as in the 1650s with Oliver Cromwell and the moderate Puritans, who quoted from the King James Bible in ordinary speech, and said that it was the best version in the world.

What has happened since the time of King James is that the doctrine has become more articulated over the years. Interestingly, as darkness has increased, so has the revelation increased. Whether cultists have held pro-King James Bible views is irrelevant because there is the consensus of those traditional Protestant believers whose doctrine remains to this day, advocating that the King James Bible is superior to modern versions.

CONCLUSION

There are various weaknesses and errors manifest among the supporters of the King James Bible. A great burden is inaccuracy and unfactual statements. Some supporters of the King James Bible resort to emotive arguments rather than reliance on self-evident truths. There should be no need to selectively quote source material since the truth is self-authenticating. The Holy Ghost is present, and His ministry is to superintend over the increase of knowledge of the King James Bible: “Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth” (John 16:13a).

As a believer yields to the Spirit, he is going to go from being “an eloquent man, *and* mighty in the scriptures” to having “expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly.” (See Acts 18:24–28). A Spirit-filled King James Bible only doctrine receives the perfect Word. “Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.” (1 Corinthians 2:12). Such a person will undoubtedly exalt the pure Word.

For further reading, see the Victory Faith Centre booklets, “The Authorized King James Bible Connection”, “The Pure Cambridge Edition: The Final King James Bible” and “God’s Chosen Edition of the King James Bible.”