

Why You
Can Trust The
**KING JAMES
VERSION**
Of The Bible

By: Michael Lancato



Originally written in 1991
Updated in 2019

WHY YOU CAN TRUST THE KING JAMES VERSION OF THE BIBLE

PREFACE

CHAPTER 1: Why I Use The King James Version of the Bible

CHAPTER 2: First Things First

CHAPTER 3: Back To The Basics

CHAPTER 4: Which Text is Your Bible Based Upon?

CHAPTER 5: Is Older Better?

CHAPTER 6: Are The Differences Major Problems?

CHAPTER 7: Examples Of Problems In The NIV

CHAPTER 8: More Significant Problems With The NIV

CHAPTER 9: Shouldn't The King James Version Be Revised?

CHAPTER 10: What About The NEW King James Version?

CHAPTER 11: What About The MODERN King James Version?

CHAPTER 12: What About The "Thees" & "Thous" In The KJV?

CHAPTER 13: The Three Big Problems With The KJV.

CHAPTER 14: What About The Italicized Words?

SUMMARY

CHALLENGE

RECOMMENDED BOOK LIST

Preface:

I originally wrote this book when I was the pastor of a church at Higgins Lake, Michigan in 1991. I taught the truths found in this book to the adult Sunday School Class, to teach the average believer about the King James Version of the Bible.

Over the years, many people have asked me which Bible they should purchase, study, read, or bring to church. The subject matter of this booklet was therefore given to help assist these people about this very complex subject matter.

The average believer does not know Greek or Hebrew, nor the finer points of textual or higher criticism. Therefore, it has been my desire to simplify this material in an easy-to-understand format, and in a way that is geared toward the average believer.

I do not claim to be the final authority on this subject. Many people are much smarter on this subject than I am, and they have written far more extensively on the subject. I also do not claim that all the material in this booklet is original with me. I have compiled this material from many sources, including my studies in Bible College and afterwards.

Sincerely,

Michael Lancto

CHAPTER ONE:

Why I Use The King James Version Of The Bible

In the English language today, there are over 100 different translations of the Bible. Which ones are good and which ones are bad? Are there some that are somewhere in the middle? One thing is for sure, you are going to have to make some choices and narrow the numbers of Bibles down. Not only would it be unreasonable to purchase all 100 + English translations, but it would be unrealistic to expect someone to regularly cross compare in order to find out what God has really said.

Sometimes examples (word pictures) are helpful in demonstrating one's point. Therefore, they shall be used from time to time in this study to illustrate points of interest.

Imagine you went to a doctor. and he has diagnosed you with a serious problem. The doctor says. I have two medical journals here that will direct me in helping to solve your problem. Book "A" is a bit hard to understand, but it is very accurate and without conflicting problems. Book "B" is much easier to read but from time to time there are words missing and contradictions with other remedies of the same nature. The doctor asks you, "Which book do you want me to study in order to help you?" Any sensible person would say Book "A."

Since I am a minister trying to help people, I too wish to use the BEST tools available in order to BEST help those to whom I am trying to minister. As you will see from this study. this means that

I must use the Old King James Version (KJV) of the Bible, for it is my Book "A."

By the way, all believers are technically in the "ministry." See 2 Corinthians 5:18.

While I agree that many of the modern translations of the Bible (NIV, NASV, RSV, etc.) are easier to read, that reason does not make them better. Yet on this one point the overwhelming majority of people who choose a modern translation rest their case. These modern translations contain much of the Word of God, but sadly they also change and omit serious portions, as we shall see later in this study.

When it comes to the Bible, the revealed Will of God, we need ACCURACY not simplicity.

Especially in America, most believers will be without an excuse for understanding even the difficult words of the KJV. Today one can buy both a Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible and a Bible dictionary for the cost of a large pizza. Now in the 21st Century you can get <https://e-sword.net> for free, download the KJV for free to your cell phone and many online Bible Study resources for free.

With free access to the internet, anyone can discover the meaning of ANY word in the Bible or in the entire language. Remember also that the context of the passage will also be a very helpful asset in determining the meaning of difficult places.

Some choose a good KJV Study Bible and use the study helps as an aid without the need of an additional book to carry.

I will set out in this study to show WHY the KJV is the best English Bible. This does not mean that people cannot be saved or grow in Christ with an NIV, NASV, or other translation, they can. But we must all ask ourselves, which Bible is the BEST one in my language? Which Bible is correct when the various translations disagree? Are there differences involving major Bible doctrine and translating? Are all the English Bibles based on the same Greek and Hebrew manuscripts? Are there differences in the manuscripts?

Please follow along ... and we shall see together. You will make a choice if your Bible is important to you. This is a study in how to make that choice.

CHAPTER TWO: First Things First

How did God choose to preserve and pass on His Word from generation to generation? Through a sect of the PRIESTS (called Scribes), the Old Testament was passed on from one generation to the next.

The Scribes carefully and meticulously copied the Scriptures. It was an extremely serious task where precision was of utmost importance. These Scribes counted the words, the letters, and the sentences in each book. At the end of each book appeared these three numbers. After a scribe finished a book, he would be required to count and compare all three numbers.

The Scribes of the Masorites during the years of A.D. 600 - 950. did a tremendous service for us non-native Hebrews. They added "breath marks" to the "consonant only" words of the OT Hebrew. This Masoretic OT Text was accepted by Judaism and by the translators of the KJV.

So, who are the priests to preserve the NT? Good question!

"But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation. a peculiar people: that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light:" (1 Peter 2:9)

Who makes up this "royal priesthood?" True believers in Jesus Christ in His finished work for salvation. This cannot be the Roman Catholic Church, because they ADD their additional WORK SYSTEM CALLED "SACRAMENTS" thus trying to earn their way into heaven.

It has been the TRUE New Testament CHURCH who for the most part came out of Asia Minor that has preserved the NT for us today. More about this in the next chapter.

God's reputation is on the line here. "God, that cannot lie" Titus 1:2 has promised to PRESERVE HIS WORD!!

6 "The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. 7 Thou shalt keep them, a LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation forever." (Psalms 12)

Jesus told us how long His Word (Bible) was good for (preserved):

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." (Matthew 24:35)

Jesus was even more specific than the words. Jesus made reference to the two smallest elements of the Hebrew language (the "jot" and the "tittle".)

"For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." (Matthew 5: 18)

Questions: Do you have all the "words" (Matthew 24:35) that were recorded of Jesus in the Scriptures? Has someone left portions out? Didn't Jesus say they were important? Did "heaven and earth" pass away at the end of the 1800's or will it pass away in the future at the end of the millennial reign of Christ yet to come?

CHAPTER THREE: Back To The Basics

Some more helpful word pictures here come from sayings that most Americans can relate to, such as, "You are what you eat." Or, "It's only as good as the materials you use to build it."

When it comes to the Bible -- a translation can only be as good as the manuscripts from which they come. There are differences, and there are many books available today to document these differences in detail. My attempt here is just to summarize. A recommended book list at the end of this study will guide you into more specific research.

Let's briefly define a couple of terms. Think of "MANUSCRIPTS" as fragments of the Bible. Some are large (containing sometimes many Bible books), while others are small, containing one book or a portion.

Next comes the word "TEXT." A "TEXT" is a compilation of the various manuscripts into one book. This would usually be in reference to a "Hebrew Text" for the Old Testament (OT). and "Greek Text" for the New Testament (NT).

For the bulk of this study, we shall discuss the Greek Texts. There are **THREE** basic **SOURCES** of Greek manuscripts. Let's look at them.

1. **BYZANTINE** - This is also called the "Traditional Text." Of the more than 5,200 manuscripts now existing, the vast majority of manuscripts belong to this group. The name Byzantine is used as a geographical indicator of its source -- Asia Minor. This is the same area that 17 out of the 27 NT books were **ORIGINALLY** written!

These people of Asia Minor would be the **BEST** to determine what was contained in the original 27 books! In other words, the most **ACCURATE!** The Greek text based on these manuscripts is also called

the TEXTUS RECEPTUS (TR). These manuscripts are known to be more than 95 percent in agreement with each other. This leaves little room for variations.

2. ALEXANDRIAN - this name is used as a geographical indicator also -- Alexandria, Egypt. These manuscripts included Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus. Codex Vaticanus has been known since the 1400's but was rejected by the KJV translators. You can see by its name that it is the property of the Vatican and in the Pope's private library. Codex Sinaiticus was discovered by Tischendorf in the mid 1800's in a waste basket in St. Catherine's monastery on Mt. Sinai (also Roman Catholic). These two codexes are known to have over 3,000 differences between them in the four Gospels alone.

Alexandria was known for its classical scholarship, which was always to prefer the shortest reading in places in which the manuscripts differed. The Alexandrians were suspect to reject NT readings which seemed to them to present difficulties. This is the reason that the translations that are based on this TEXT have many omissions (NIV, NASV, RSV, and most of the others.)

By the way, the Alexandrian manuscripts (Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus) are reported to include the Apocrypha, which only the Roman Catholic Church accepts as Scripture.

The TEXT from this source of manuscripts is often called the CRITICAL TEXT, or NESTLE'S/ALAND TEXT, or WESCOTT and HORT TEXT, or UNITED BIBLE SOCIETY TEXT.

3. WESTERN - this name comes from the general direction that these copies traveled -- westward to ROME. The church of Rome equates many things equal to the Scriptures such as Tradition and Papal Authority. Thus, the TEXTS from this source are typically long in many places. From this source came what is known as the Latin Vulgate. In addition to the above-mentioned problem of additions to the text it would not be best to translate from a translation (the Latin Vulgate) but from the original languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek).

CHAPTER FOUR: Which Text Is Your Bible Based Upon?

1. King James Version (KJV) - Is based upon the Masoritic Hebrew Text and the Greek Textus Receptus (Byzantine Text).

2. Modern King James Version (MKJV) - Is based upon the Masoritic Hebrew Text and the Greek Textus Receptus (Byzantine Text). Archaic words are modernized. Grammar is updated to that of the 20th Century. But this is still in revision to correct some problems. (Third edition in print is due in late 1993 or 1994.)

3. New King James Version (NKJV) - Is not based upon the old Masoritic Hebrew Text but the new 1967/1977 Stuttgart edition of the Biblia Hebraica. The NKJV does use the Textus Receptus (Byzantine Text) for the NT. However, it is highly critical of the TR in its PREFACE to the readers. Therefore, these translators put the CRITICAL TEXT (Alexandrian Text) omissions and corrections in the margin.

Also, some other changes are made in light of other ENGLISH translations without any basis upon Greek Texts. (Ex. Changing the word for "whale" to "fish" in Matthew 12:40 without any Greek textual support.) Thus, the reader (not God) becomes the final authority. For it is the reader who determines which way God meant to say what He said. I disagree! God has always been DOGMA TIC. God commands obedience. For instance, God gave Ten Commandments, not Ten Suggestions. God often says, "Thus saith the Lord" not "you can have it this way or that way."

4. NIV, NASV, ASV, RSV. NEB, JB. MLB, etc. along with every other major English translation claims to be from an "eclectic" collection of manuscripts. Eclectic means varied (i.e. all available manuscripts).

What do these translators usually do when they come to a disagreement? -- and there are MANY! Overwhelmingly they practice the natural means of Textual Criticism which says that OLDER IS BETTER. Since they believe that the Critical text (with Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus) is older, they PREFER that one.

What you are NOT told is that the most eclectic text that is in AGREEMENT with itself is the TEXTUS RECEPTUS (Byzantine Text).

The translators of these versions use all the manuscripts available. Since the vast majority of manuscripts are from the Byzantine source -- this explains why there seems to be much agreement between the translations. However, it is in that 5% - 15% area of disagreement that brings these modern translations into trouble. Since they consider older to be better, they automatically prefer manuscripts like Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus over the many more manuscripts in the Byzantine source of manuscripts.

5. John Wycliffe Translation - was based on the Latin Vulgate out of the Western source of manuscripts. While his intentions were admirable. he did not use the best text for the NT.

Instead, William Tyndale followed John Wycliffe shortly thereafter and put the Bible into English using the Textus Receptus (Byzantine Text) for the basis of the NT. The KJV is at least 90 percent in agreement with Tyndale's Bible. The differences mainly are in spelling and grammar.

CHAPTER FIVE: Is Older Better?

I suppose I could attempt to use the word picture of selecting a suitable spouse, or automobile, or other things that show that older is not always better. But I know the other side would use antiques and other things to show that sometimes older is better. So, let's set this aside.

We are not talking about just any book ... this is God's book. with God's promise to preserve it. This is called PROVIDENTIAL PRESERVATION, as opposed to the NATURALISTIC system of preserving claimed by the Textual Critics.

The same God who created the world (Genesis 1; John 1) has also preserved it and has held it together until today (Colossians 1:17). Likewise, the same God who "inspired" the Scriptures (2 Timothy 3:16) is also able to preserve it (Psalm 12:6,7; Matthew 5:18; 24:35) until today. We still have a "more sure word of prophecy." (2 Pet 1:19)

Stop and think about the difference between the two most accepted sources of manuscripts (Byzantine vs. Alexandrian).

The original letters were sent primarily to the churches in the Byzantine area of Asia Minor. The church would use them and copy them over and over again. It is reasonable that both the original letters and the earliest copies were WORN OUT from their extended use. The copies handed down are not as old as others that were not used as much.

The main manuscripts of the Alexandrian source are Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus. Both were not widely accepted. Both have been preserved primarily in seclusion through the centuries. Therefore, it is reasonable to see why these might be older manuscripts, but this alone does not make them better.

Remember, it is the "words" that God promised to preserve, NOT the paper (or similar material) that the words were recorded upon.

CHAPTER SIX: Are The Differences Major Problems?

Let's say I publish a book about your parents. Through most of the book I write commendably of your parents. But in one place I falsely call your father a Satanist, in another place I erroneously say your father was illegitimate. and in another case, I falsely describe your father as committing a particular sin.

Question: Would this honestly bother you? Most people would say absolutely YES.

Legally, if you were in court and said something contradictory or untrue. that is called perjury. It doesn't matter that all the rest of your statements were acceptable and true.

Yet. these are the precise problems that we have with the modern translations. Continue with this study, and we'll see some examples.

CHAPTER SEVEN: Examples Of Problems In The NIV

I have chosen the NIV as my example for a modern translation primarily due to a recent small survey that I took which seemed to indicate that this version is the popular version of choice today. Since the other modern translations also rely heavily on the same source of manuscripts (Alexandrian/Critical Text), they should be similar.

1. Is Lucifer the Morning Star?

KJV "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!" (Isaiah 14: 12)

NIV "How you have fallen from heaven O morning star, son of the dawn! You have been cast down to the earth, you who once laid low the nations!" (Isaiah 14:12)

This is the only verse in the Bible that tells us the name of Satan before he fell. God called this angel Lucifer describing him as a "light bearer" reflecting the Light of God.

"Morning star" is a title reserved for Jesus Christ! Look at Revelation 22: 16

"I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star." (Rev. 22: 16) KJV

Yes. even the NIV retains this reference to "Morning Star" as belonging to Jesus. You cannot claim that it is Lucifer's claim as "morning star" in Isa. 14: 12, because it is God that is the speaker in Isa.14: 12 -- not Lucifer.

For Jesus to claim this title in the last chapter of the Bible, if it first belonged to Lucifer in Isaiah 14: 12, then this would be the equivalent of calling Jesus a Satanist. This is blasphemy!

2. Was Joseph Jesus' natural father?

KJV "And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him." (Luke 2:33)

NIV "The child's father and mother marvelled at what was said about him." (Luke 2:33)

The proper name for Joseph in Greek is a completely different word than what is found in the Alexandrian/Critical text. The Greek word for "father" here is pater. The Greek lexicon says this means "generator or male ancestor; natural father." This could NOT be said for Joseph, for Joseph had nothing to do with the birth of Jesus.

Furthermore, Joseph and Mary were not married when Jesus was conceived, so Jesus would have been illegitimate if the NIV is correct here. Instead, the NIV must be wrong!

Some have asked, "can't the word 'father' include being a 'STEP-father?'" The answer is NO, according to the definition of the word. There is a specific generic word that does include either "natural fathers" and "step fathers." It is the word PARENT and it is used without problem (in the same context) in Luke 2:41

"Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the passover." (Luke 2:41) KJV

Also notice what happens when Mary claims Joseph as Jesus' father (pater) a few verses later in front of the religious leaders in Jerusalem ...

"And when they saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing." (Luke 2:48) KJV

What happens? -- Jesus immediately and respectfully corrects Mary and declares that his real Father (pater) is not seeking or sorrowing, but rather has sent Him for this work.

"And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" (Luke 2:49) KJV

3. Was Jesus a sinner?

KJV "But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: ... " (Matthew 5:22)

NIV "But I tell you that anyone who is angry with his brother will be subject to judgment..." Matthew 5:22

Did you notice that the KJV includes the phrase "without a cause" while the NIV omits this phrase?

Question: Was Jesus ever angry? Answer: Yes.

"And when he [Jesus] had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts, he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it out: and his hand was restored whole as the other." (Mark 3:5) KJV [Note: NIV uses the word "angry" here also.]

Question: Was (is or shall) Jesus be in danger of any judgment?
Answer: NO!

Question: Did Jesus sin by being angry in Mark 3:5? Answer: NO! God has a holy anger at sin. This means that Jesus' anger was WITH a cause. Certainly, the Bible also declares that Jesus "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." (Hebrews 4: 15) KJV

By the way. the Bible even commands us to "be ye angry and sin not" (Eph 4:26). According to the NIV in Mat 5:22 you would also be "subject to judgment." The NIV cannot be right in both Matthew 5:22 and Ephesians 4:26 ... one of them is wrong ... and it's the NIV version of Mat 5:22 that is wrong.

Note: There are many more examples of problems in the modern translations, not in comparison to the KJV, but in comparison to

themselves ... as we have seen above. Keep in mind that the old KJV does not have a problem with these contradictory passages. Thus, you can TRUST the old KJV for its accuracy!

CHAPTER EIGHT: More Significant Problems With The NIV

1. Preservation of "words" or people?

KJV 6 "The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. 7 Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever."
(Psalms 12)

NIV 6 "And the words of the LORD are flawless, like silver refined in a furnace of clay, purified seven times. 7 O LORD, you will keep us safe and protect us from such people forever." (Psalm 12)

The NIV changes this doctrine of the preservation of God's "words" (them) to people ("us").

2. Redemption and the forgiveness of sin without "the blood?"

KJV "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins:" (Colossians 1:14)

NIV "in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins."

An important cross reference here is ... "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood: and without shedding of blood is no remission." (Hebrews 9:22) KJV

3. Should anyone be baptized without a profession in Christ?

KJV "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." (Acts 8:37)

NIV -- THIS VERSE IS OMITTED!! You go from vs.36 right to vs.38! Is vs.37 important? Well, it's this man's profession in Jesus that He is the Christ (Anointed One)! It is a rock-solid verse on the deity of Jesus Christ.

The NIV only includes vs.37 as a small footnote and brings the authenticity of this verse into question by saying it is based upon "some late manuscripts." (See #4 below for more information on this claim.)

4. Did Jesus forgive the woman caught in adultery?

This passage is found in John 7:53 - 8:11. It is the only account of this taking place in the Gospels. Yet the NIV draws serious doubt as to whether these verses really belong in the Bible. Not only does the NIV have a bold line preceding and following this passage (marking it off), but it's footnote claims, "The earliest and most reliable manuscripts do not have John 7:53 - 8: 11."

What the NIV does not say is that "The earliest and most reliable (OPINION) manuscripts" are the Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. These are only THOUGHT to be "reliable" because they are "earlier" which is CIRCULAR reasoning.

5. Should Mark 16:9-20 be in the Bible?

KJV says yes. NIV includes the verses but questions their decision in the footnote by saying, "The two most reliable early manuscripts do not have Mark 16:9-20." (See #4 above for more information on these manuscripts.)

6. Should I John 5:7 be in the Bible?

This is probably the strongest verse on the Trinity in the Bible.

KJV "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." (I John 5:7)

NIV OMITTS 1 John 5:7 along with every other modern translation.

(However, the MKJV and NKJV include 1 John 5:7.)

7. See also Mark 1:2: Luke 23:42: Matthew 1:25: Matthew 12:40:
Luke 4:4; I Timothy 3: 16: Revelations 22: 14.

The differences between the KJV and the NIV. NASV. etc. can both be found in the English and in the TEXTS supporting them.

CHAPTER NINE: Shouldn't The King James Version Be Revised?

One thing should be made clear. There should be NO problem with a revising (or new edition) of the old KJV. First of all, the 1611 KJV has been revised FIVE times and the one printed today is the 1769 edition not the 1611.

Secondly, these revisions in the KJV are FAR different from that of the modern translations which change words and often leave words and phrases totally out. The KJV revisions were primarily for type-setting mistakes, misspellings, and grammar changes.

Thirdly, the King James Version was the greatest influence in standardizing the English language. It was a primary text book. This helps us to understand the reason for the early revisions.

Fourthly, the translators of the old KJV were brilliant scholars in the area of languages. Many of these men were learning the languages of Hebrew and Greek at the early ages of 5 and 6. Many of them were fluent in these languages along with several others by their early teens.

Fifthly, the previous point does not mean that another revision (or edition) cannot be done, only that the greatest of care and precision be given to such a task. This is especially true when it comes to the manuscripts behind the Bible NT (Byzantine/Textus Receptus).

If a new revision (or edition) is to bear the KJV emblem, then it must be based upon and hold high regards for the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament and the Byzantine Text of the New Testament.

CHAPTER TEN: What About The NEW King James Version?

The New King James Version (NKJV) certainly set out to do an admirable thing: claiming to be a sixth revision of the Old King James Version (KJV) updating the spelling, archaic words, and grammar. It was sad as the NKJV committee turned midstream in the process. Great preachers had to resign from the support of this work because of the drift from the original purpose.

What was done differently with the NKJV that would not make it our best, most accurate, and trustworthy translation of the Bible in the English language?

1. The PREFACE in the NEW KJV tells a great deal and is a major key to understanding how this translation was approached and what kind of translation we have in the NKJV.
2. On pg. iii of this Preface the OLD KJV is highly praised. It is called "A Living Legacy," "that monumental version," "the mainspring of the religion, language, and legal foundations of our civilization." The Old KJV translators were "enlivened by the conviction that the manuscripts were providentially handed down and were a trustworthy record of the inspired Word of God. The King James translators were committed to producing an English Bible that would be a precise translation, and by no means a paraphrase or a broadly approximate rendering. On the one hand, the scholars were almost as familiar with the original languages of the Bible as with their native English. On the other hand, their reverence for the divine Author and His Word assured a translation of the Scriptures in which only a principle of utmost accuracy could be accepted."

It would be difficult to find a more admirable description of how the OLD KJV came into being. These would be very big shoes for the men on the committee of the NEW KJV to follow. Instead, the NKJV committee chose to use a different OT text and regretfully claimed to use the same NT text -- that the old KJV used.

3. On pg. v of this Preface we find that the NKJV does NOT use the Masoretic Text for the OT as the OLD KJV translators did, but rather "the 1967/1977 Stuttgart Edition of the Biblia Hebraica." They would use four other OT texts for comparison (a) "Bomberg edition of 1524-25" (in agreement with the Masoretic Text -- good!) (b) The "Septuagint" (translation of Hebrew into Greek --(questionable.) (c) "The Latin Vulgate "(this is from the Western source of manuscripts - ROME -- not good!) (d) "The resources of relevant manuscripts from the Dead Sea Scrolls" -- (worse!)

The Septuagint is questionable because of the process of creating a translation from a translation rather than from the original language.

If the Dead Sea Scrolls are Scriptures, one would have to believe that God allowed the church to be without "every word of God" that man should live by (Luke 4:4) for 1900 years!

4. On pg. vi of this Preface there is this startling, biased, opinionated, undocumented elevation of the OTHER sources of manuscripts to the level of credibility of the NT Greek text behind the Old KJV: "It is now widely held that the Byzantine Text that largely supports the Textus Receptus has as much right as the Alexandrian or any other tradition to be weighed in determining the text of the New Testament."

Widely held by whom? They do not say! It is only an opinion, and an opinion that is not documented. This biased opinion is further seen on the same page when it is later claimed, "Very few scholars still favor the Textus Receptus as such, and then often for its historical prestige as the text of Luther, Calvin, Tyndale, and the King James Version."

How can they claim "very few scholars?" Who are these scholars? How many scholars were considered? What does one have to do or be in order to be a "scholar?" This is an opinionated tactic that is being used here to discredit those who disagree with the opinion of the NKJV translators.

Speaking as one person who still favors the Textus Receptus, I do not hold to the TR for some warm feeling of "historical prestige" but

rather because of the "precise translation" and "utmost accuracy" that the TR provides as the NKJV Preface previously stated on pg. iii.

5. On pg. vi of this Preface it was quite surprising to find the following admission after reading of the equality of Greek texts in the early portion of #4 above: "...it is most important to emphasize that fully eighty-five percent of the New Testament text is the same in the Textus Receptus, the Alexandrian Text and the Majority Text."

This is an admission to a FIFTEEN percent difference! Who is going to decide what to do with this 15 percent? Read on.

6. On pg. vi of this Preface the NKJV translators surprisingly decide to use the Byzantine Textus Receptus as the underlying Greek text of the NT after all the above effort to discredit it. To counteract the TR in places of difference, the NKJV Preface explains that the NKJV committee would "... indicate major Critical and Majority Text variant readings in the center reference column."

What does this mean? While the NKJV is claiming to base the NT on the TR, whenever the other sources of manuscripts disagree -- that disagreement will be placed in the notes (center ref. column or footnotes depending on the typesetting style).

This requires the READER to become the final authority as you read the NKJV. In many places it will say one thing in the text and something contradictory in the notes. The reader then must decide which is correct.

But God is not a multiple-choice revealer of truth! God does not say, Do you want it this way or that way? Instead, we find repeatedly God dogmatically saying, "Thus saith the Lord ..." We find God giving man Ten Commandments not Ten Suggestions.

So, for a definitive, clear, precise, accurate, dogmatic English translation of the Bible: do not turn to the New KJV, but rather turn to the OLD KJV -- you can TRUST IT!

CHAPTER ELEVEN: What About The MODERN King James Version?

The Modern King James Version (MKJV) is the work of Jay P. Green, Sr. under the name of The Sovereign Grace Trust Fund 1274 Meadowbrook Drive, Lafayette, Indiana 47905 Telephone: (317) 447-7197.

The seven-page Preface of this translation will also prove to be enlightening as to the understanding of how this translation was approached, and what kind of translation we have in the MKJV.

1. It should first be noted that the MKJV is the work of one man, not a committee. I telephoned verified this. When I asked the MKJV is the work of one man, Mr. Green in October 1993, and he, Mr. Green, of his qualifications to translate he stated, "I am the best Bible translator in America today." So, I asked. "How do I know that? Where did you get your training?" Mr. Green's response was. "I learned the basics in Bible College and have learned the rest on my own. My works in print will demonstrate my ability. All one has to do is find the Lexicon definition of the word and plug it in." I heartily disagree with Mr. Green. Context, culture, and cross referencing are at least three areas that also must be carefully considered for accuracy's sake.

2. The MKJV is in its Third Edition (as of October 1993). I have a copy of the First Edition in print that was released in May 1991. I also have a copy of the Third edition (1993) in the computer format. Mr. Green claims that improvements and corrections have been made necessitating the newer editions. The Third Edition is not yet available in print as of this writing. However. the problems I encountered in evaluating the first edition were not corrected in the computerized third edition.

3. Mr. Green's Preface is filled with many admirable descriptions of the Old KJV and its effect. He describes the Old KJV as "the very matrix from which has come a civilization blessed with more abundance, more individual freedom to worship, more intellectual development, more time to read and meditate on God's word, more of all the blessings which tend to draw men toward God."

While this is all very good and true, throughout Mr. Green's preface, he falls short of referring to the OLD KJV as "accurate" or "precise" as we found in the NEW KJV Preface.

4. On the fourth page of Mr. Green's Preface, he makes reference to "the relatively few mistranslations" in the Old KJV. Where are these "mistranslations?" He does not say in his Preface even though there is a section in the Preface subtitled "What is changed in the Modern King James Version." There are also no notes on the pages of the Old and New Testaments that would indicate during your reading of the MKJV that an apparent mistranslation in the Old KJV has been corrected.

The argument that Mr. Green makes on the third page of his Preface against the various other modern translations must therefore be applied also to himself, based on this claim of "the relatively few mistranslations" in the Old KJV. Mr. Green wrote, "... it may be seen that such translators do not believe in the 'priesthood of the believers,' but in the priesthood of translators."

Mr. Green makes the distinction between (a) Words that have changed in meaning and (b) mistranslations. (If Mr. Green meant that (a) was a description of (b) there would not be a problem here, but Mr. Green has not so stated this.)

5. On the seventh page of Mr. Green's Preface, he wrote, "In our day the Elizabethan English of the old AV/KJV is nearly a foreign language." Couple this statement with an earlier one Mr. Green made on the second page of his Preface: "... even its (the Old KJV) most avid proponents admit [it] is full of archaic language, quaint words, words that have changed meaning, and which has what is counted today as 'bad' grammar."

If you had never seen an Old KJV and then read the above statements, you would most likely think that the Old KJV could not be understood by the average English-speaking person. Yet such assessment would be totally UNTRUE.

I have never considered the Old KJV to be "nearly a foreign language." Rather, I find the Old KJV to have some difficult words that I need to find out their true meanings -- just like I find myself doing as I read MODERN books of many kinds that are written in MODERN English. Once one discovers the meaning to difficult words it is a rewarding discovery that will continue to be of benefit.

This does not mean that I (and others) cherish difficult reading so we should all be subjected to the archaisms and difficult words of the Old KJV for difficulty's sake. But I have added these comments due to the opinions found in Mr. Green's Preface along this line that lean toward exaggeration in order to substantiate his efforts.

6. Mr. Green needs to be commended for an overall monumental task of revising the entire Bible. Overall, it is my early assessment that it is closer to the Old KJV than the NKJV, primarily because of the questionable notes in the NKJV.

7. Mr. Green needs to be commended for looking to the "priesthood of believers" for the acceptance of his work, rather than the worldly approach of hype and glossy advertising by publishers.

It does seem like the publishers of today are primarily interested in their profits -- due to their constant infiltrating of our culture with newer "translations" every year.

8. Mr. Green needs to be commended his Preface subtitled "What have we lost in these new versions."

CHAPTER TWELVE: What About The "Thees" & "Thous" In The KJV?

"Thee" and "thou" are second person singular and plural pronouns. In modern English we primarily use the word "you" for the second person singular and plural pronoun.

All of the modern translations (including the NKJV and MKJV) change "thee" and "thou" to the modern "you." The question is, Is this change really necessary? Could it be that there is a reason why "thee" and "thou" was used instead of the word "you?"

First of all, it may surprise some to learn that the word "you" was very commonly used in the Old KJV. In the NT the word "you" is found 1244 times. Compare that with the number of times the word "thee" appears in the NT (483 times), and the word "thou" appears in the NT (857 times), for a combined total of 1340 occurrences. Therefore, the word "you" appears in the NT almost as many times as both "thee" and "thou" combined!

Secondly, it appears that it is quite possible the words "thee" and "thou" were used because of their special (sometimes majestic) implication. After all isn't the Bible a special and majestic Book, while at the same time including more ordinary factual and historical information? This might account for both the use of the words "thee" and "thou" along with the word "you" for the second personal singular and plural pronoun.

For an example of this, let us look at one verse out of each of the first three chapters of Matthew.

"But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost." (Matthew 1:20)

"And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people, Israel." (Matthew 2:6)

"But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" (Matthew 3: 14)

Now be honest ... did you have any trouble understanding what was being said in these verses? We do find that these are special majestic passages involving the virgin birth of Jesus Christ and the baptism of Jesus Christ.

This does not mean that there are not exceptions to this understanding. Rather it does help us to understand why the words "thee" and "thou" are often used.

Thirdly ... how difficult is it to know that "thee" and "thou" are either the second person singular or plural. It is not grammatically wrong, neither is it really that difficult.

Is anyone asking that we change our songs too, because they cannot be understood? How about songs like, "How Great Thou Art" or "Thou Art Worthy"? Do you know of whom these songs are about?

CHAPTER THIRTEEN: The Three Big Problems With The KJV

If you were a doctor, and you only read your medical books just before surgery you wouldn't perform very well. It's also likely that much of the technical language would seem difficult for you. Yet this seems to be what is happening with an even more serious situation -- the eternal Words of Life, the Bible!

The same thing could be said for the auto mechanic who only occasionally looks at a manual, and for the most part the only time he explores the manual of his trade is when he occasionally attends a meeting for mechanics and someone reads the book to him. Few would wonder why this mechanic struggles to understand the problems and difficulties with auto mechanics.

The number one problem with the KJV is that not enough people are reading the KJV. This is coupled together with problem number two, that some who do read the KJV do not read it often enough! This is coupled with problem number three, of those reading the KJV, not enough are obeying what they read.

Both the doctor and the auto mechanic above will learn their business by studying the books of their trade. The words that seem difficult to the occasionally curious onlooker are more like second nature to the doctor or mechanic who reads the same books every day.

If you the reader will read the KJV of the Bible on a regular basis. and study the difficult portions, you will find not only the accuracy of the Word of God but you will see the transforming power of it. Before you realize it ... those once difficult words and terms will seem like second nature to you as well. So don't delay. Begin your daily reading and studying of the KJV of the Bible TODAY!

CHAPTER FOURTEEN: What About The Italicized Words?

Another good reason for choosing the KJV is because of the translators' honesty as seen by the italicized words in the KJV.

The trouble with translating is that sometimes a word in one language may require additional words in another language for a fluid and clear understanding of what is being said. These words that the KJV translators have inserted are the italicized words.

The NKJV and the MKJV also make use of the italicizing of these words. However, Mr. Green's MKJV claims that he had "been sometimes more strict than the KJV translators." This would result in MORE italicized words. This might also explain for the poor choice that Mr. Green made when it came to 1 John 5:7 and he chose to italicize the entire verse, thus questioning whether this verse should be in the Bible if there is no manuscript support.

But there is manuscript support for 1 John 5:7 which says,

1 John 5:7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. (KJV)

This is called the "Johanne comma" and is found in Greek Manuscript Codex Ravianus and also in what is called No. 61. It is also quoted by Cyprian more that 60 years before Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. It is also cited by a Spanish Bishop in A.D. 380. Hills' book, "Believing Bible Study" p. 190 references African Christians from 430-534 that cite this passage numerous times.

Cults and other unbelievers have built doctrines based upon an italicized word(s). It is an honest and helpful tool to know which words have actual textual support and which words aide us in understanding the Bible in our language and thus are the Word of God.

SUMMARY:

This work was not intended to be an exhaustive study of the subject on the TRUSTWORTHINESS of the Old King James Version. Yet I do believe there is enough information in these few chapters to show why the only English Translation of the Bible (as of this writing) that truly can be TRUSTED for its ACCURACY is the OLD KING JAMES VERSION!

The KJV may not be the easiest to read. It may require some study on your part in places. But after reading the KJV from cover to cover, I can tell you that percentage-wise the archaisms and extremely difficult places are far fewer than the critics of the KJV would have you believe.

So, if you don't already have a copy of <https://e-sword.net> or other free Bible Resources, then obtain them today and make good use of them on a regular basis.

CHALLENGE:

It would be a challenge to revise the Old KJV to simply update the archaic words and modernize the grammar. It would be near impossible to prove why such an effort would be wrong. Rather I find it would be most helpful.

So far, it appears that the Modern King James Version is the closest attempt so far to date in making this effort. However the erroneous translation of the word "Easter" to "Passover" in Acts 12:4 is but one example of why the MKJV should not be accepted as MOST ACCURATE.

I can see no reason why a comprehensive effort could not be made along this line to modernize the archaic words and grammar in English. Or is this ability to translate the Bible restricted ONLY to languages other than English? I think not.

But until then, you can TRUST the Old KJV as the best English translation of the Bible. There are many good KJV study Bibles being sold today that will in the footnotes -- not attempt to correct the Bible. but offer a help in understanding difficult places! At this time in history, only the Old KJV can honestly claim to be the totally infallible and inerrant Word of God in English. Yes, there are difficult portions, but there are also reasonable solutions.

RECOMMENDED BOOK LIST:

1. Defending the King James Bible by: Rev. D.A. Waite, Thd., PhD.
Published by Bible For Today, Inc. 900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, NJ 08108. 307 pages.
2. Evaluating Versions of the New Testament by: Everett W. Fowler.
Published by Strait Street Inc. 444 West Cedarville Rd. Cedarville, IL 61013. 72 pages.
3. Let's Weigh the Evidence by: Barry Burton. Published by Chick Publications PO Box 662 Chino. CA 91710 95 pages.
4. New Age Bible Versions by: G.A. Riplinger. For a copy write: Bible Believer's Bookstore 1252 East Aurora Rd. Macedonia, OH 44056 or call (216) 467-0419 or call (216) 467-1611. 690 pages. \$15 each or 30% off with a purchase of five or more.
5. Why I Believe The Old King James Bible by: Bruce Lackey Write to: Mrs. Bruce Lackey 3020 Northway Lane Chattanooga, TN 37406 105 pages. Book: \$5 3 Cassette Album: \$8.
6. How We Received Our Bible - by: Dino Pedrone; Open Door Church 600 Miller St. Chambersburg, PA 17201 12 pages.

For More Information – email: Michael.a.Lancto@gmail.com