

"BUT MY GREEK PROFESSOR SAID..."

(THESE GUYS DIDN'T.)

A few quotes to show that what they call "King-James-onlyism" is not just some "obscure heresy" limited to the uneducated...

Dr. D.A. Waite, ThD, PhD :

"...the King James Bible is the most accurate translation in the English language..."

Dr. Samuel Gipp, ThD :

"...the scholarship of the men who translated the King James Bible is literally unsurpassable by today's scholars... They were overall both academically qualified by their cumulative knowledge and spiritually qualified by their exemplary lives."

Dr. Carl Baugh, PhD :

"God has put his stamp of approval on [the King James translation]."

Dr. Kent Hovind, PhD :

"I think anyone who speaks English should read the King James."

Dr. Kirk DiVietro :

"...the plethora of Bible translations, each claiming to increase the readability...while sacrificing textual purity and accuracy of translation, has resulted in a watered-down, anemic Christianity..."

Dr. S. Franklin Logsdon, *author of the original NASV preface* :

"I must under God renounce every attachment to the New American Standard... I'm afraid I'm in trouble with the Lord... I wrote the format; I helped to interview some of the translators; I sat with the translators; I wrote the preface... I can't refute these arguments; it's wrong, it's terribly wrong; it is *frightfully* wrong... I can no longer ignore these criticisms I am hearing and I can't refute them... When questions began to reach me at first I was quite offended. However, in attempting to answer, I began to sense that something was not right about the NASV... The deletions are absolutely frightening... there are so many... Are we so naive that we do not suspect Satanic deception in all of this? ...I don't want anything to do with it... the finest leaders that we have today...haven't gone into it, just as I hadn't gone into it..."

That's how easily one can be deceived...

you can say the Authorized [King James] Version is absolutely correct...
If you [must] stand against everyone else, stand."

"As a member of the editorial committee in the production of the 'Amplified New Testament', we honestly and conscientiously felt it was a mark of intelligence to follow Westcott and Hort. Now, what you have in these books ['Which Bible?' & 'True or False' by Dr. D.O. Fuller] strikes terror to my heart. It proves, alarmingly, that being conscientiously wrong is a most dangerous state of being. God help us to be more cautious, lest we fall into the snares of the arch deceiver."

Gail Riplinger, MA, BA, MFA :

"Years ago...young ladies...would come in to my office at the university ... And I noticed that those who were using the modern translations seemed to be unstable emotionally; depressed, anxious... And it made me...think perhaps that's why psychology has moved into the church..."

Dr. Gerardus Bouw, PhD :

"The first myth [brought about by the corruption of Bible lexicons, etc.] is that only the 'original autographs' were inspired... Implicit in this view is the belief that God did not bother to preserve his words in pure form, though some say that the 'originals' can be reconstructed by scholarship. Obviously it does not occur to them that without the 'original autographs' to compare them to, there is no way to know whether or not the 'original' has been restored..."

"...we see the world's languages becoming *less* sophisticated in time, not more... Anyone who would take the trouble to find out just why the Authorized Bible used 'odd' phraseology at times would soon be amazed at how much detail, explicitness, and fine structure the English language has lost in the last 400 years. There is no language in the world which is naturally or evolutionarily improving... the sentence structures and parts of speech are fast losing distinctiveness."

"...I started a critical reading of the Bible, from cover to cover, searching for inconsistencies and any contradictions between an infinite God and the God of the Bible. Fortunately, God was watching out for me in that the only Bible I owned was an Authorized Version, the only English Bible free of such contradictions. Any other version and I would have been left with no alternative but agnosticism."

"...the only absolutely trustworthy information about the origin and purpose of all that exists and happens is given by God...in his infallible, preserved word, the Holy Bible, commonly called the King James Bible."

Dr. Ken Matto :

"This is a serious issue and no Christian can take the corruption of God's word lightly. The modern versions are under girded with Gnostic corruptions in their manuscripts, corrupted as far back as the 2nd century. This...is a major element in spiritual warfare and Christians can no longer stick their head in the sand... God cannot bless sin and He will not bless the use of any corrupted bible version. This is the reason that Christians are weak and confused in their Christian walk and why churches are weakened to the point of destruction. These versions are like a virus on a computer, it comes in stealthily and eventually affects the whole church..."

Dr. Peter Ruckman, ThM, PhD :

"The average Christian...can never get a clear picture of what goes on behind the closed doors in a Christian seminary or university in America... The educational goal is to destroy the belief in absolute authority coming from God and put, in its place, the relative authority of man, composed of the preferences and opinions of men who consider *themselves* fully equipped to be your guide instead of the Holy Bible itself... The fact that some of the professors are saved, while some are lost...is immaterial to the *results* of their scholarship; the results are... the nearly total destruction of Biblical Christianity in America... The crime rate doubles every other year, the divorce rate tripled in less than ten years... It isn't just pathetic, it's a loony bin... The key to understanding the Bible, or the Author of it (God), is a *believing heart and a humble mind*... higher formal Christian education is probably the greatest hindrance to understanding the Bible of anything a young man could get involved in, outside of satanism and black magic..."

"Greek is a dead language... The King James Bible has led at least 100 times more people to Christ than the original manuscripts ever did, and that's a masterpiece of understatement."

Dr. Terry Watkins, ThD :

"For a work of its volume and serious subject matter - the poetic splendor defies human logic... The King James Bible is the words of God... If you have a King James Bible, you have the word of God!"

Dr. Jack Hyles:

"God is the Author of the King James Bible...
The devil wants to get you away from the King James Bible and he doesn't care which way you go... All the other versions that... change the King James Bible are satanically inspired."

Dr. Thomas Holland :

"[The KJV is] the greatest English translation the world has ever known... Sadly, of late it has fallen under attack... Many have used faulty forensic reasoning in order to discredit...the Authorized Version..."

"...some express a certain amount of disdain for the Authorized Version with meaningless objections. They do not like this or that reading and therefore seek to find a flaw in this literary masterpiece... the difference has more to do with the manner of how words or phrases are understood and not the correctness of the translation itself."

"The translators were great scholars... Gustavus S. Paine noted that the king's translators were not superb writers doing scholarly work, but were superb scholars doing superb writing. Judged by their other extant works...the writing of what would become the Authorized Version should have been far beyond their abilities. Yet, they were able to reach beyond themselves." (See 2 Timothy 3:16 !!!)

"The KJV is not only a literary masterpiece; its representation of the original languages is phenomenal. It is not enough for a proper translation to correctly transmit the words from one language into another; it also must carry the *sense* of the original. Without question the Authorized Version has successfully accomplished this extremely difficult task. Professor Gerald Hammond of the University of Manchester, England, has correctly noted that the KJV translators 'have taken care to reproduce the syntactic details of the originals... often, the Authorized Version has the kind of transparency which makes it possible for the reader to see the original clearly. It lacks the narrow interpretative bias of modern versions, and is the stronger for it."

"Although its beauty has been compared to the writings of Shakespeare, it is vastly easier to read than Shakespeare, with equal influence upon our native tongue... The history and effect the KJV has had on our language not only speaks of its great literary value, but of the divine hand upon it..."

Dr. Edward Hills, ThD :

"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. 'We want a bible version in our own idiom,' they clamor. 'We want a bible that talks to us in the same way in which we talk to our friends over the telephone. We want an informal God, no better educated than ourselves, with a limited vocabulary and a taste for modern slang...' 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... Receive by faith the true text of God's holy word, which has been preserved...and now is found in...the King James Version..."

"Fables & Facts About The King James Bible" by Pastor James Melton:
[With additional comments added in brackets]

Over the past few decades, new Bible translations have been popping up like popcorn... people have fallen for smooth advertising schemes and have actually started believing that the modern versions are superior to the King James Bible. It's very sad that most Christians today have not taken time to study the subject thoroughly enough to see what is really happening...

[This tract's] purpose is to better educate Christians about the KJV by clearing up some of the fables that have been spread by the critics...

FABLE: "The original King James Bible included the Apocrypha in the Old Testament."

FACT: The King James translators knew the Apocrypha was not scripture, so they placed it BETWEEN the Old and New Testament as a HISTORICAL DOCUMENT, *not* as scripture.

[from "*Crowned with Glory*" by Dr. Thomas Holland:

"The KJV translators did not consider the Apocrypha inspired... the translators of the KJV did not give the Apocrypha the respect they had given the Holy Scriptures. Their relative disregard for these books... can be seen in the way they are presented in the first edition of 1611. In addition to placing the Apocrypha between the Testaments (rather than interspersing them with the canon as was Roman Catholic practice), the translators did not mention the Apocrypha at all on the title page, which simply reads, 'The Holy Bible, Conteyning the Old Testament, and the New.' The listing on the table of contents page refers to them only as 'The Bookes called Apocrypha' and segregates them, as in the text, from the Old and New Testaments. Additionally, both the Old and New Testaments have elaborate engravings placed before each Testament; the Apocrypha does not. The running heads that adorn the tops of the pages in the canon with summaries of the contents...are replaced in the Apocrypha by generic running heads that read only 'Apocrypha' throughout and do not summarize. Further, the translators of the KJV did not malign the canonical books of the Bible the way they did the Apocrypha. At 1 Esdras 5:5 the margin states, 'This place is corrupt,' an allusion found nowhere in either of the Testaments..."

FABLE: "The King James Bible was revised several times before 1800, so modern translations are just additional revisions of the original King James Bible of 1611."

FACT: The so-called "revisions" of the King James Bible prior to 1800 were to correct typographical errors, add notes, and omit the Apocrypha from between the Testaments. There were no changes in the actual TEXT of the King James Bible. The REAL changes (over 36,000 of them) didn't start until the modern revisionists came on the scene.

[Even the American Bible Society, in reports published in 1852 and 1858 (after 4 editions of the KJV), stated that the "English Bible as left by the translators has come down to us unaltered in respect to its text." See the books *KJV 1611: Myth of Revision* by David Reagan and *Differences in the King James Editions* by Dr. Peter Ruckman.]

FABLE: "The modern translations are more accurate because they have been translated from older and better manuscripts."

FACT: It is truly amazing how so many Christians have bought into this lie without ever checking to see WHAT these manuscripts are, WHERE they came from, and WHO wrote them...

The modern translations are based on the work of two nineteenth century Greek scholars from England—B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort. Westcott and Hort, who were deeply involved in the occult [and openly expressed disbelief in fundamental Christian doctrines and a dislike for those who do believe them; see *Heresies of Westcott and Hort* by D.A. Waite, a book with 125 direct quotations from 3 of Westcott's books and 2 of Hort's, showing they were not even saved, let alone "strong, noble conservatives."], hated the Textus Receptus Greek text, from which the King James Bible was translated, so they conjured up THEIR OWN Greek text. This Westcott and Hort Greek text was based primarily on two very corrupt fourth century Roman Catholic manuscripts: Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. These are usually the "older" and "better" manuscripts that we keep hearing so much about...

The Vaticanus...responsible for *over thirty-six thousand changes* that appear today in the new versions...contains the books of the Apocrypha [mixed in as if it was scripture]... it omits the pastoral epistles (1 Timothy through Titus) and the Book of Revelation, and it cuts off the Book of Hebrews at Hebrews 9:14 (a very convenient stopping point for the Catholic Church, since God forbids their priesthood in Hebrews 10!). The attacks on the word of God found in these manuscripts originated in Alexandria, Egypt with the deceitful work of such pagan Greek "scholars" as Origen and Clement of Alexandria. Then in 313 A.D. the Roman emperor Constantine ordered fifty copies of "the Bible" from Eusebius, the Bishop of Caesarea. Eusebius, being a devout student of Origen's work, chose to send him manuscripts filled with *Alexandrian corruption*, rather than sending him the true word of God in the Syrian text from Antioch, Syria. So the corrupt Alexandrian text (also called the "Egyptian" or "Hesychian" type text) found its way into the Vatican manuscript, then eventually into the Westcott and Hort Greek Text, and finally into the new "Bible" versions in your local "Christian" bookstore. Therefore, when you hear or read of someone "correcting" the King James Bible with "older" or "more authoritative" manuscripts, you are simply hearing someone trying to use a Roman Catholic text to overthrow the God-honored text of the Protestant Reformation and the great revivals. God has never honored this corrupt text and He never will. [see *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible? - The True History Of God's Words* by David Daniels & Jack Chick]

FABLE: "New translations are needed to correct the errors and contradictions in the KJV."

FACT: No one has ever proven that there are errors and contradictions in the KJV. Many "Christian" colleges and preachers have a nasty habit of pointing out APPARENT contradictions to their people, but these arguments have been disproven so many times that it is nothing less than disgusting to hear them still being used.

FABLE: "New Translations are needed to bring the archaic Old English language up to date. People have trouble understanding the language of the King James Bible."

FACT: The King James language is NOT hard to understand. [As Pastor David Grice once pointed out, "It's not hard; we're just LAZY."] Most of the so-called "archaic" words are explained by the context of the passage or by comparing the passage with other passages in the Bible where the same word is used. In fact, the Grade Level Indicator of the Flesch-Kincaid research company says the King James language is EASIER to understand than the new versions...

FABLE: "The King James Bible cannot be infallible because the translators were only men, and all men are sinners. The human element prevents the KJV from being infallible."

FACT: If this is true, then even the ORIGINAL AUTOGRAPHS in Hebrew and Greek were not infallible, because they too were penned by men! The fact of the matter is that the King James translators were only INSTRUMENTS of preservation (which is exactly what they called themselves in the Dedicatory to the A.V. 1611). God has always been the Divine Preserver of His word (Psalm 12:6-7), but He has used men as tools and instruments of preservation, just as He uses men to teach and preach His words. When men humbly yield themselves to the will of God, God can use them to accomplish His will (Romans 12:1-2), and this is precisely what happened between 1604 and 1611. [God can use imperfect men to make a perfect translation. Anytime the translators came close to making a mistake, God steered them in the right direction]

FABLE: "The King James translators added to the word of God, because the italicized words in the KJV were not in the originals."

FACT: The italics in the KJV prove that the translators were HONEST in their work. They set the words in italics so we'd know they were not in the manuscripts they were using.

Besides, no one has a copy of the original manuscripts today, so no one knows for certain that the italicized words aren't in them. In fact, there are many cases where we know that the italicized words are justified. For example, notice in Deuteronomy 8:3 that the word "*word*" is in italics. However, when Jesus quotes this verse in Matthew 4:4 he INCLUDES the italicized word! If the italicized word does not belong in the Bible, why did the Lord Jesus quote it?

[It's a hypocritical and disingenuous objection anyway, since ALL bible translations add words. It also comes from a misunderstanding of the difference between "Formal Equivalence" (KJV) and "Dynamic Equivalence" translation techniques. Formal translation does not mean you have to have a one to one ratio of Hebrew/Greek to English words. The KJV translators were well aware of the verses warning us not to add to the word of God. The simple overlooked solution is, *since it is often IMPOSSIBLE to perfectly translate the meaning from Hebrew or Greek into English without adding words*, in a sense, *GOD HIMSELF added them, not the KJV translators!* (2 Timothy 3:16 "All scripture is given by inspiration of God...") Thus, even if the Bible's command not to "add" refers to individual words in the translation process, the KJV translators did not violate it.

See [What About Those Italicized Words?](#) by Dr. Paul Heaton]

Friend, don't be deceived by the crafty critics of God's word.
LEARN THE FACTS!

Another common accusation used to imply that the existence of a perfect English Bible is a "cultic heresy" is that it is a "NEW" idea. Many quotes could be given to prove otherwise, but this one will suffice:

According to Oliver Perry Chitwood's *A History of Colonial America* (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1961 ed., pg.441, as early as the mid 1600s, the KJV was universally accepted in early America "as the word of God and no question was raised as to its infallibility."

See [Lively Oracles](#) by Dr. James Sightler