

4 Ways the King James Bible Is Superior

You Can Trust Your KJB

By D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.

sermonaudio.com

Bible Text: Psalm 11:3

Preached on: Sunday, April 8, 2001

Bible For Today Baptist Church

900 Park Avenue

Collingswood, New Jersey 08108

Website: http://www.biblefortoday.org/bft_church.htm

Online Sermons: www.sermonaudio.com/biblefortoday

...be with you, folks, and I am glad that we have visitors from my own church, Bible For Today Baptist Church in Collingswood, New Jersey, Al and Jill Severence. They have heard me twice already today. Now they want another one, see? So that is something. That says something, doesn't it? Came all the way distance, 44 miles. They are surprising me here.

We are going to talk about the defending the King James Bible tonight and there are four divisions we want to mention, just four things we want to say. I will take about 10 minutes to each division, 40 minutes and then for questions and answers afterward. We will go ahead with questions and answers.

The first division, superior King James Bible because of superior texts. That is the Hebrew text and the Greek text. The second division, superiority because of its superior translators. The third superiority of our King James Bible, superior technique of translation. And the fourth superiority is the superior theology. Those four keys. It is text, translators, technique and theology. And so these are some of the things we want to talk about.

First, the text, superior text. These other versions have perversions because they don't have the right Hebrew text such as the one that underlies our King James Bible and they don't have the Greek text that underlines our King James Bible and so the texts are different. The texts are wrong.

Now the Hebrew text is a different text. The Greek text that they use is the Nestle-Aland Greek text which is a bad one and the text our King James Bible is based upon is the text known as the received text or the Textus Receptus or the traditional text and that is the one we use.

Now as far as the Hebrew is concerned, there are two different kinds of Hebrew text. One is the one that underlies our King James Bible and the other is a text that is used by these other versions. And those texts, they are based... the Hebrew texts that they use has footnotes in it. It is called the Biblia Hebraica or the Hebrew Bible, either the Hebrew Bible of the man whose name, let's see, it is... I want to say Nestle-Aland, but the New

Testament. I can't think of the name of the one, but the other one is the Hebrew Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia is the modern one, 1967, 1977. The other one is Rudolph Kittle. That is the one I couldn't think of. That is the one I used at Dallas Theological Seminary. It is a false Hebrew text. Rudolph Kittle was an apostate. He believed in the JEPD document hypothesis. He didn't believe that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, the first five books of the Bible and so on. And that was the Hebrew text that on the footnotes... and the same way with this Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia Hebrew text that came out in 1967, 77. It has footnotes in the bottom of the page, some... well, some 20 or so footnotes on each page on the footnote and that means on the total if you add up all the pages they have about 20 to 30,000 changes they suggest in the Hebrew Old Testament text.

We use the text that underlies the King James Bible which is the text of... it is the ben Chaim text, not the ben Asher text, but ben Chaim, that is the rabbinic Bible of back in 1525, 1526 along in there and it is Daniel Bomberg's Hebrew Bible that is used. That is what the King James Bible translators used. They didn't change it. And, in fact, Rudolph Kittle in his Biblia Hebraica used the same text that underlies our King James Bible for the first two editions, 1906, 1912. All of the sudden, 1937 Rudolph Kittle, this German apostate changed his Hebrew text and he limited it not to the whole Hebrew manuscript tradition, but he limited it to just one manuscript, that is manuscript L or the Leningrad manuscript, because it is the oldest. Well, just because it is the oldest it is not necessarily the best. It is the oldest paper on which it is written. And he threw out all the different masoretic traditional texts and so there is differences in these other versions because of the Hebrew text and we believe that the King James Bible's Hebrew text is superior and that is the way they did it. See, that is a text.

Now if you don't have the proper text as a foundation, how are you going to get a proper translation? See? That is a very serious situation.

Now the same thing is true in the Greek text. Our King James Bible is based on what we call the Textus Receptus. This is this blue book over here. And the other Bibles, the new Bibles, the new versions—I don't call them Bibles—the new versions are based on this false text. This is Nestle-Aland text. It is sometimes called the Westcott and Hort text, sometimes United Bible Society text. But Westcott, bishop Westcott was a bishop of the Anglican Church, Church of England in the 1880s. And professor Hort was his cohort, you might say. Both of them worked together and changed this Textus Receptus on which our King James Bible is based. They cooked up a new one, a different one. And from 1880 or from 1881 to the present time this Greek text, false Greek text has been superior in most theological seminaries, Bible colleges, Bible institutes and churches, except some of us who stand for a different text, the text that underlies the King James Bible.

Now this text is different from this text. This is shorter. This false text is shorter than our Textus Receptus that underlies our King James Bible in 2886 words. This is 2886 words short of our text that underlies the King James Bible.

You know if something is that short, it is going to be different, see? And it sure is different. And not only is it different, but it is different in doctrine as well. We will see later on that the doctrine is involved 356 doctrinal differences between the two texts. Well, you can't have 356 doctrinal differences and not have some serious trouble. And those doctrinal differences, by the way, are all in errors. This is the error text and these texts that underlie our King James Bible is proper, true doctrine. And so that is what we will see.

But the texts are important. Now, the reason that they say that they only use this text here, the Nestle-Aland, the Westcott and Hort text is it is based on basically two Greek manuscripts called B and Aleph, the Vatican and the Sinai manuscripts. The Vatican and the Sinai manuscripts are fourth century manuscripts, fourth century AD, roughly. They are not dated, but that is what they assume. Fourth century AD is the oldest paper or whatever manuscript on which it is written. But what about the words?

You see, they are written on... not paper, but they are written on either vellum or some other material, but they were writing materials on which they are written are the oldest materials. Well, what about the words of the materials? That is the most important thing.

Our Textus Receptus, though the manuscripts from which this comes presently are newer, not as old as these, but the words of these manuscripts go all the way back to the apostle Paul and Peter and James and John and they are the true words. That is the difference. It is the words.

Now there are two reasons why these manuscripts have been preserved as old, B and Aleph, the Vatican and Sinai, just two manuscripts. One they are Egyptian and Egyptian climate was conducive to preservation of manuscripts. Number two, the second reason is that they were never used and that reason they were never used... well, you know if some thing is never used it is going to be preserved. If you use a Bible you tear it to shreds. You rip it up. You tear the pages. You wrinkle it and so on. You tear it. And you use new Bibles all the time. So these two reasons, this is why they are preserved.

Now why weren't they used? Why were the churches not using the Westcott and Hort, B and Aleph, Vatican, Sinai manuscripts on which all these new versions are based? They weren't used because the churches knew them to be fakes. If they had been used that would prove the churches had accepted them. But these came from Egypt.

Now there is no church in Egypt. There is never... Paul... the epistle of Paul to the church at Thessalonica? Yes. Colosse? Yes. Ephesus? Yes. But not Egypt. And so these scoundrels could change the Word of God at will and nobody would be the wiser. They have no authentic, original, manuscripts from which to compare them. And as far as the heresies in Egypt, they were abounding. They abounded with heresies. In fact, the Bruce Metzger of Princeton Seminary right here in New Jersey [?] Princeton says as far as the orthodox teaching—now he is a modernist apostate, Bruce Metzger—but he even admits that in Egypt he doesn't even know whether there is even any orthodox theology in these early centuries where these B and Aleph manuscripts arose. But the heresies abound.

These two manuscripts, B and Aleph, on which these Greek texts are founded, were made up, changes made up from the real manuscripts. They took the real McCoy, as we call it, the real McCoy, the real text, and altered it to fit their theology.

You know, they say that the *New York Times* is all the news that is fit to print. But if any of you know the leftist slant and the pro Communist slant of the *New York Times* it is a different situation. It is all the news that is print to fit. And so they took their theology, their Gnostic theology G N O S T I C, the Gnostic theology that they had in Egypt and they altered God's words to fit their falsities. Wherever they have the manuscripts. They didn't have all the manuscripts, we are glad for that, but for wherever they had them they altered it to fit their theology, their Gnostic theology. Very serious. And that is why it is so filled with theological error, because the Gnostics didn't believe in the deity of Christ, the bodily resurrection, the virgin birth, the coming again and all that, that he was the creator of the world. And so we have lots of error.

Now, as far as the manuscript, these manuscripts of the King James Bible are based on, the Textus Receptus, received Greek text, these manuscripts were accepted by the churches. They printed and reprinted and copied and recopied down through the centuries all the churches from the first century right on to the present. There is a continuity of acceptance of these... this called the traditional text, the received text. That is not the case with the Westcott and Hort, Nestle-Aland, text, United Bible Society text. They had acceptance in the first 100, 200, 300, 400 years because the churches didn't know any better and finally when they found out that these were fraudulent, that these were fake and phonies, they stopped copying these and they just went right out of existence so that right now the only manuscripts that go along with the false Greek text are B and Aleph and about 43 others.

In other words, 45 manuscripts that are now in existence that follow the false Greek text.

What about the King James Bible's text, the Textus Receptus, the traditional text? Over 5210 Greek manuscripts God has preserved for us that go along with the text that underlies our King James Bible. That is less than one percent for the fakes and over 99 percent for the true Greek text that underlies our King James Bible.

So don't you think it is kind of foolish for the so-called scholars and all the fundamentalists even that are accepting less than one percent of the evidence? The thing that the churches refuse to publish and reprint and reprint and recopy? Isn't it foolish to accept that less than one percent of the evidence and throw out the over 99 percent of the evidence that we have, 5255 total and this 5210. So that is more or less the background of manuscripts.

The King James Bible is superior because it is based upon superior Hebrew text and Greek text. The texts are superior.

But what about the translators? The translators, we believe, also are superior. The

translators of the King James Bible they were probably 46 or 50. Some of them died before it was finished. But these were men of the Church of England, the Anglican Church, as we say. And the history of the translators is found in two books. One is called *The Men Behind the King James Version* by Paine. The other is *Translators Reviled* by Alexander McLaren. And these two books are the basis of many things that we know about these King James translators.

Now we have in the translators superior, as far as their translation, abilities. They were spiritually able. They were spiritually competent. But also they had linguistic superiority to our men today.

Now let me just give you some examples of the men who translated our King James Bible. Here is, for instance, the superiority of Dr. Lancelot Andrews. Dr. Andrews was one of the chairmen of the Westminster group. Now they had to receive a bit later the different types of techniques that they used. They had six different companies. They had two in Westminster and two in Oxford and two in Cambridge, six different companies they called them. And Dr. Andrews was the head of the Westminster group, translated 12 books from Genesis to 2 Kings. This is company number one.

Well, what about Dr. Andrews? First of all, he was familiar with most of the modern languages of Europe. Secondly, Lancelot Andrews had a manual of private devotions. I don't know about people in the New American Standard Version whether they had manual for devotions or the New International Version or the New King James or some of these other modern versions and perversions. But his man had a manual of devotions. But it is different from the manuals that these fellows would have today, because his manual for private devotions was wholly in the Greek language.

Now I majored in classical Greek and Latin at the University of Michigan. I majored in the New Testament Greek in Dallas Theological Seminary. I would not pretend to write a manual for devotions in the Greek language even though the hours and hours I have had. You just don't do it. Why? Did these men know how to do it? Because in 1604 to 1611, those seven years when the Bible was being written and translated from Hebrew, proper Hebrew text [?] text, these men were superior in their knowledge.

They didn't have football games to draw them away. They didn't have hockey and basketball and all this other. They didn't have the television sets and all the games and silly things that we look at all the time and waste our time with. These men were students. And to have our present translators look down the end of their big, long noses, as it were, at the translators of the King James Bible, it is pathetic. It is absolutely pathetic. Never say that our translators didn't know what they were talking about.

Now we had a recent man that wrote me a letter or wrote some emails and he was downing these King James translators. He said they don't know anything. We know everything today.

Listen. We don't know half. Why do you think the scores are going down in our SAT

scores in the country all over the world? See? It is because it is becoming more stupid and more stupid. You see? I was a teacher at the Philadelphia school district for 19 years in conjunction with a Bible for Today ministry, but to put food on the table, I worked as a teacher. And believe you me I know the brainlessness of the students in Philadelphia. And I did my best to bring them up. And they were mean. They were ugly. They were off the wall. There was no discipline and I ... the principal didn't help at all. I did my best to bring that up. If I could bring them a little bit up, I was happy. But you couldn't do too much, because of the terrible [?].

These men were giants in what they did. In fact, it says of Dr. Lancelot Andrews such was his skill in all languages, especially the oriental that had he been present at the confusion of tongues at the tower of Babel, he might have served as interpreter general. All the languages. In fact, he knew and was conversant with 15 languages. Put that down to the present men.

And these men today, remember the *Gulliver's Travels*? Some of you, perhaps, have read that. Gulliver was traveling in the isle and the area of the country of Lilliput. And these Lilliput people were called Lilliputians. They were little pygmy kind of a thing and they got him with cords and they wrapped them around here and made him a prisoner. Well, I liken the King James translators to the giant Gulliver and all these other little type things as the Lilliputians, little tiny little elves walking around trying to translate the words of God when they didn't know how to do it properly. And that is what they have come up with in the New International Version, the New American Standard Version, the New King James Version and the other versions of our day.

What about the [?] Dr. William Bedwell? He was.. had fame in Arabic learning. And one of the scholars that knew all of the Arabic... see, Arabic was a cognate or a sister language to the Hebrew Old Testament and a cognate language helped because when you have what we call a hapax legomenon which is a word that is used only once in Hebrew, just one used word, these sister languages show what that word means. The cognates is this. The language [?] it means this in this other language and so that is the meaning in Hebrew and so it is important to know these sister languages.

He had Arabic learning. He had an Arabic lexicon of three volume. Dr. William Bedwell also had a Persian dictionary. Now I would venture to say that there were zero of our present modern translations and versions of today that know anything about the Persian, especially having a dictionary and so skilled. It is in the [?] Library in Oxford England even to this day.

They may have heard of Persian cats, Persian rugs, but the Persian language, see, these men cannot hold a candle, as we say, to our men who gave us our King James Bible. Never look down your nose at our King James translators.

Then back to Miles Smith. He was company three, the Oxford group. He had 12 translators. Dr. Smith went through the Latin and Greek fathers, the Church fathers

making annotations on all of them and he was acquainted with the rabbinical glosses. Hebrew, he had a [?]. He was certainly a skilled man, Dr. Miles Smith.

And then Dr. Henry Seville was another man. He was a tutor in Greek and mathematics for Queen Elizabeth. I would venture to say the queen would not have a dunce for a tutor. Would you agree with that? All the money that she had and all the gold and the silver and everything else and all the crowns. He was her tutor. He translated the histories of Cornelius Tacitus, published the same with notes. He translated many things, the [?] the writers of English history subsequent to Bede and so on, [?] of Euclid from the Greek language. And he was a tremendous scholar. He translated the complete work of John Chrysostom.

Let's go to another... these are just...they are five men. I could give you others, but five men. Here is the superiority of John Bois, B O I S. He was a giant of an intellect. You know, his father taught him at home. That is good to have home schooling. Nothing wrong with that. nothing wrong with that at all. In fact, when he was at the age of five, talk about a child prodigy, at the age of five he read the entire Bible in Hebrew, Old Testament Hebrew. Now five years old. Most of our younguns can't even read it in English. Let's face it. I have got a granddaughter that started pretty early and she was about five when she began to read, but very few, but in Hebrew. And by the age of six he could write Hebrew in a very elegant character and style.

Do you know any thing about the Hebrew alphabet? It is difficult to get those Hebrew letters and get them exactly, get them right.

And he used to study many, many hours. He had a teacher named Dr. Downs [?] lecture and Greek language. He read with 12 Greek authors and prose, the hardest that could be found. And he used to study. He was a young man that studied in the university library from 4 AM without intermission till eight in the evening, 16 hours straight, tremendous scholar. And he was one of the men. In fact, he was a writer also. John Bois at the end of his life had as many pages of documents in his writings as he had days of his living. And he lived 83 years and 11 days. That totals 30,306 days. That is how many pages he had written, a tremendous writer, a voluminous writer. And he was a tremendous giant in the Greek New Testament.

So much for the translators. Our King James Bible is superior as far as its text, Hebrew and Greek; superior as far as its translators. And it is superior as far as the translation technique. Technique is how you go about something.

It is important. You could have all the best manuscripts available, but if you don't have the proper method and technique of translating it is all for none effect. It is of no effect whatever. But they had a good technique. They had, first of all, a proper and superior team technique. The teams that they used have never been repeated, that particular way of doing it. They had six different teams, six different companies, as we said, two in Cambridge, two in Oxford and two in the other place... I can't think of the other place.

Cambridge, Oxford and... well, whatever. Cambridge, Oxford and, well, anyhow, there is another one. I will get to it.

And those teams, two in each of the places there in England they met. And they had an average of about seven translators per team or per company, seven translators per company. And the King James was very... was the one who told them to do this and the one who commissioned it. He didn't do any translating.

People say, "Well, King James was this and King James was that and King James was something else."

Westminster. I forgot that. Westminster, Oxford and Cambridge. Those were the three places.

King James simply laid down rules. He wasn't a translator. He laid down rules for this translation.

One of the Puritans of the Church of England came to King James and said, "Your majesty, if you would be pleased, could we have a translation?"

The present versions extant, that is the ones that existed at that time, he was talking about the Great Bible, the Bishop's Bible, the Geneva Bible and so on. The present versions extant not answering to the originals. In other words, the Greek originals and the Hebrew originals, not answering to the originals. In other words, not close enough. They were all right as far as they went, but John Ramos, this Puritan, was on this team of translators, wanted a closer than any of the others before. That is exactly what they produced.

And so the king made about 12 or 15 rules, but one of the rules as far as this team technique was that whenever these seven men got together... there were seven men on each team, six teams, roughly. Six times seven, 42 translators. This is an average. And what he said was that every man on that team, all seven of them had to translate themselves those Hebrew books or those Greek books.

Now the present way of doing it these days they have one or two Hebrew men, one or two Greek men. Then they have a bunch of people that say, big names. They say, "This is the best, the closest translation in all the world, see?"

But they didn't do any of the work. They didn't know how to do any of the work. And they weren't translated. They were just people who are PR men, public relations men.

Not so with the King James Bible. The team technique made it essential that every man on that team went to his study, translated from Hebrew to English or Greek to English, whatever book he was in, himself.

Now the whole thing, every word of our King James Bible because of the excellent team technique was gone over 14 times. So how do I get that? Well, there are seven men on

the average of each team. Each man came through with seven through that is seven times. Then they looked it all over and criticized each other's work, that is the eighth time.

And then the King of England said, "I want you to send you work to the other five companies."

Seven, plus one is eight, plus five companies, 13. Then at the end of the work the took two men from each of these companies to go over it another time, 14 times.

Now that method, that team technique has never been done before nor since. The NIV didn't do it. The New International... the New American Standard didn't do it. the New King James didn't do it that way. The team technique was excellent.

But there is also not only the team technique superiority, but the translation technique. The technique of translation is vital.

Our King James Bible translators used what we call the verbal equivalence technique, verbal meaning words, from the Hebrew words to the English, words, words. The second part of that technique was a formal equivalence. The forms of the words. The Hebrew word had a noun, bring it over in English it is a noun wherever possible. If it was a verb, bring it over as a verb. If it was an adjective, it was an adjective and so on. That is called formal or the form equivalence and that is what they practiced.

Not so with these new versions, not so with the NIV, New American Standard, the New King James. They used what they called dynamic equivalence. That is a world of difference between verbal or word equivalence and dynamic equivalence.

Now that is a big word. It sounds great, doesn't it? Nobody knows what it means if you just say it. I believe in dynamic equivalence. You don't know what I am talking about once I define the terms, see. But dynamic is something that moves. Equivalence is something that stays the same.

Try it some time. Try to move and stay the same at the same time. Try to sit down and stand up, see? Oxymoron. Yeah. It is like grape nuts, neither grapes nor nuts, huh? It is like Christian Science, neither Christian nor science. I mean this is the way it goes. This is dynamic equivalence.

Now their method of translation in these versions and perversions, contrary to our King James Bible method of techniques of translation does three things. Any time it wants it adds to the words of God. That is sin, outright sin. I wouldn't wan to be in the place if these fellows are Christians at the judgment seat of Christ facing the Savior and that sin of adding to the Word of God. The second thing that dynamic equivalency does it subtracts from the Word of God. That is sin. The third thing it does, it changes the words of God any time it wants.

Well, if that is the technique that they use, let me tell you, who needs the translators?

And who needs the text? If the fellows that are doing the job that are really, they are paraphrases, if they can do anything they want at any time that they want, now I in my book out there, that I guess I didn't even bring one along here, the *Defending the King James Bible*. I should have brought it out just to hold up, but I say that there are probably 75 adjective that I use to describe the dynamic equivalency, 75 adjectives all beginning with D.

There. Hold that up there. That is the book. That is *Defending the King James Bible*. All right. All 75 beginning with D. My wife said that is too many. I put them in anyhow. But she says, "Cut it down," so I cut it down to seven. You know, just to talk about. All 75 are in there, but number one: dynamic equivalency is diabolical. It is diabolical because it was used by the devil in the Garden of Eden. He added to God's Word. He subtracted and he changed.

It is deceptive because it pretends to be a translation when it is not.

It is determined because it wants run out of business the King James Bible. The NIV has tried to throw out this book. All the book stores in our land, most of them, are trying to throw out the King James Bible. Every time somebody comes to the bookstore, oh, you don't want that old Bible. Here is an NIV. Here is a New American Standard. Here is something else, see? They are coming out a dime a dozen, these new versions and perversions.

In the fourth place, it is dishonest, because it claims to be what it is not.

Fifth, it is deifying of man, because it puts man in the saddle. He is God. These perverters that are massacring God's words are gods themselves. They are saying what they can put in. If they want to drop out a word, they drop it out. Right? That is blasphemy. They want to add, they add. They want to change, the change. Deification of man.

Number six, it is disobedient, because God said don't do it.

And, seventh, it is disapproved by God.

Now I went and made a study of these versions, these versions that Bible believing Christians are using, the New American Standard, the New King James, the New International. I found in the New King James Version over 2000 examples of dynamic equivalence, adding, subtracting or changing God's Word, 2000.

Someone asked me that this morning after the service. What do I think of the New King James. I told him. I got the documentation that is available. You can have it and use it and see it.

The New American Standard Version I then studied that Genesis to Revelation, compared it not only with the King James, but with the Hebrew and the Greek underneath

the King James Bible. I found over 4000 examples of dynamic equivalency, adding, subtracting or changing.

And people say, “Oh, it is the closest thing in the world to all of things.”

It is just not the closest to the [?] it is adding, subtracting and changing 4000, 2000 with the New King James, 4000 plus in New American Standard.

The NIV. I spent three years and eight months on that one, 6653 examples. And then I stopped counting. My computer was filling up. We had an old TRS-80 and my time was filling up, so I quit.

But this is dynamic equivalency and these versions and perversions and our King James is true. And if you don't know Hebrew, if you don't know Greek, as most of us do not as our native language, and you want something so you know what God said in his Word, the King James Bible is it.

And if they make up some words that are difficult to understand, get yourself a defined King James Bible as the pastor has done and many of you in the church have. And you have the footnote and if there is a word you don't understand just look down at the bottom and there it is, see?

Rather than get one of these new versions or perversions just because you can understand this word and that word, but you can't trust them. You cannot trust these new versions. I trust the King James Bible accuracy upon any of the others that are [?] in the past that have come out or will come out in the future. And that is why we have come out with our defined King James Bible, uncommon words accurately defined in the footnotes.

So much for the technique, very, very important. Verbal equivalence, our King James Bible uses the actual words. Hebrew words and the Greek, excuse me, into English, Greek words into English. The formal equivalence, the forms of the words, verbs for verbs, adjectives for adjectives, pronouns for pronouns, nouns of nouns. Don't switch a noun into a pronoun as they do. That is one of their tricks. Don't change these things. The forms of the words God meant and intended to remain the same wherever possible.

I realize when you come from one language to another occasionally you have to switch here and there, but basically keep it in the same form. Then take away and do away with dynamic equivalency, adding to God's Word, subtracting and changing.

Well, let's take a look at the fourth superiority. The King James Bible is superior in four areas. It is superior because of superior texts of Hebrew and Greek. It is superior translators, superior technique of translation and superior theology.

Doctrine is very important. And, as I said before, I held it up earlier, Dr. Jack Norman has found in this 100 page study 356 doctrinal passages in the New Testament where the false Westcott and Hort text is off base and in doctrinal perversity, doctrinal errors, 356

of them. And you will find these in the New International Version because they follow this same Greek New Testament text. You find it in the New International Version, the new American Standard Version and you will find it in the footnotes, if you have a footnote edition of the New King James version, the footnotes down below. If you don't have a footnote edition then it is different, but if you have a footnote edition, all the other versions, this is a serious situation.

Now isn't it funny, isn't it humorous, isn't it strange? I think it is pathetic, but just isn't it interesting that in every one, every single one of the 356 doctrinal errors in the false Westcott and Hort Greek text, the Nestle-Aland Greek text, the United Bible study Greek text on which these versions or perversions are based, every one of these doctrinal passages are in error theologically? And the King James Textus Receptus is proper theology. The theology is very important.

In my book there, the *Defending the King James Bible*, I don't list all 356 of these doctrinal passages. I list 158. I list 158 doctrinal passages in that book chapter five where the doctrinal superiority of our King James Bible is found. What I do, I give you the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, the false Greek text and then I put on the thing the three or four versions that Bible believing Christians are using. And I see whether they accept the false reading or whether they reject it.

The New King James footnotes, [?] but the footnotes, the New American Standard, the New International and the New Berkeley. Those are the four versions that I compare in that 158.

I don't want to give you 158, but I will see if I can do my best to give you 23 examples if you have your Bibles or want to look at them.

But one example, for example is in 1 Corinthians chapter 15 and verse 47 where the Bible, the King James Bible says:

“The first man is of the earth, earthy.”¹

That is Adam, see?

“...the second man is the Lord from heaven.”²

That is the Lord Jesus Christ. And the Westcott and Hort, B and Aleph text, this false Greek text takes away the word “Lord” and, therefore, the NIV takes away the word “Lord” in that verse, so does the New American Standard, so does the New King James in the footnote, so does the New Berkeley and it simply reads, “The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is from heaven.” But he is not the Lord, but he is not the Lord from heaven. He is not God, the Son, the Son of God. The deity of Christ is questioned.

¹ 1 Corinthians 15:47.

² Ibid.

A second example is in 1 Timothy 3:16. Our Bible reads very clearly in the Greek text that underlies it, the Textus Receptus:

“And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh.”³

That is the incarnation of the second Savior. God is manifest in the flesh. And these new versions do not have God in there. Aleph there is no B or Vatican in there, but they take away God and change it to something else. The NIV follows. The New American Standard, the New King James in the footnotes, the new Berkeley. They just have, “Great is the mystery of godliness: he was manifest in the flesh or he appeared in a body,” but no God. God is not there. Well, what mystery is that to say he appeared in the flesh? All of us have appeared in the flesh, but we are not God.

The doctrine of the deity of Christ is in 1 Timothy 3:16. It was God, perfect God from all eternity, was made flesh and dwelt among us and was [?] by the [?]. That is a doctrinal error in these versions.

And then let’s go on to Matthew 1:25 where the Bible, our Bible clearly says:

“And knew her not [Joseph knew Mary not] till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS.”⁴

That is the Christmas story, we call it. But the B and Aleph text, the false Greek text, the B and Aleph, Vatican, Sinai or Westcott and Hort remove one word from that and that is “firstborn.”

Brought forth a son. That is all. And the NIV removes it, the New American Standard and the footnotes in the New King James. They just have “brought forth a son.” It could be the second born, third born, fourth born, fifth born, because Mary had many children.

What does that do to Isaiah 7:14?

“Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son.”⁵

See? It is the firstborn that these Gnostics of Egypt did not believe. So they removed just a little word. Isn’t that miraculous how that word got out, just accidental? No, it wasn’t accidental. These are doctrinal errors. They are not accidental, see? If it is accidental you would find words and sentences not making sense. It is just nonsense.

³ 1 Timothy 3:16.

⁴ Mathew 1:25.

⁵ Isaiah 7:14.

Every one of these doctrinal errors the Gnostics put in this false Greek text are.... they are right there. They make sense, but they are in doctrinal error, but they still make sense if you are reading the way they are. They are purposeful.

What about Matthew 18:11? I referred to that in my message this morning. The Lord Jesus said it.

“For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.”⁶

That is his mission. That is his goal. That is doctrine, isn't it? And these men, many of the people say, well, there is no doctrinal difference. All these verses are all the same. B and Aleph remove the entire verse. You won't find it in Matthew 18:11. It is not in the NIV. It is put in brackets in the New American Standard. They don't really want to put it in, but they bracket it. And the New King James footnotes it is taken out. But that is why he came, the mission of Christ. That is doctrine.

And Luke 9:56 is another one. The first part of that verse is also removed by B and Aleph, this Vatican, Sinai, false Greek text. And that first part of Luke 9:56 says:

“For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.”⁷

That is doctrine and that is gone from B and Aleph, because the Gnostics who doctored the Greek text did not believe that the Lord Jesus came to save men's lives. They didn't believe it. They thought he was just a man.

Well, there is another one, Luke 2:22, doctrinal errors, the doctrinal superiority of our King James Bible. Luke 2:22 talks about Mary and the days of her purification. It says:

“And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord.”⁸

The Lord Jesus was brought by Joseph and Mary and B and Aleph just change one Word, the pronoun “her.” Instead of “her” and the NIV changes it, the New American Standard, the New Berkeley and all these other modern versions that I am not even mentioning like the Revised Standard Version, the New Revised standard Version, the New English Version, all the others that modernists use, but the ones the fundamentalists are using, they change it. Instead of the days of her purification, to the days of their purification.

Now there are two errors in this, doctrinal errors in this red book here and in the versions that I have talked about. And the purity of the King James Bible is this. One error is the law of Moses did say nothing about purifying the father and the baby. The only purification is the mother [?]. That is the first thing. The second doctrinal error is they say the Lord Jesus Christ had to be purified. Therefore, he was a sinner. That is

⁶ Matthew 18:11.

⁷ Luke 9:56.

⁸ Luke 2:22.

Christology. That is false Christology, the doctrine of Christ. That is serious heresy. That is another one.

Let's look at John seven verse eight, another doctrinal error in these versions because of the false Greek text. I come up to 40 minutes. I will take a few extra minutes on this, pastor. Then I will turn it over for questions. Yeah, all right.

John seven verse eight where the Lord Jesus is speaking to his half brothers. He says:

“Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up yet unto this feast; for my time is not yet full come.”⁹

Well, what manuscript Aleph, the Sinai removes one word and so does the New American Standard. It removes just one word. You see, the next verse or two the Lord Jesus did go up to the feast. And the word that they removed is the word “yet.” Simple little word. It accidentally fell out between the cracks.

No, it wasn't accidentally. He says in the NASV, the New American Standard, “Go ye up to the feast. I go not up unto this feast. I go not up.” They forgot the “yet.” I go not up to this feast. A verse or two later he went up. What does this man the Lord Jesus Christ? It makes him a liar, doesn't it?

If that isn't doctrine, terrible, deplorable heresy against the Savior of the world.

Then another one, Ephesians chapter three verse nine where god says:

“And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things...”¹⁰

Our King James Bible says, “... who created all things by Jesus Christ.”¹¹

But those three little words are contrary to Gnostic doctrine and, therefore, they are wiped out of their Greek text. Therefore, they are wiped out of the New International Version and the New American Standard Version and the footnotes of the New King James and the New Berkeley and the other versions of our day. Is that not doctrine? They didn't believe that Jesus was the creator. But God the Father created all things though the instrumentality by Jesus Christ, very important [?].

Here is another one in 2 Corinthians four verse 14.

“Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you.”¹²

⁹ John 7:8.

¹⁰ Ephesians 3:9.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² 2 Corinthians 4:14.

He who raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus. Now that little preposition “by” is changed in manuscripts B and Aleph. It is changed in the New International. It is changed in the New American Standard, New King James in the footnotes, the New Berkeley and other versions. Do you know what it is changed to? Not raised up by Jesus, because the Lord Jesus, thus, has the power to raise us up, but simply raised up with Jesus, not by, but with.

That little bit of a change, see that little nuance? See that little tiny little fleck of difference? There is two theological errors in that. Number one, if he is raised up with Jesus, Jesus has not yet been raised. Am I right? If raised up with him, he is dead yet. He is still in the grave, see? Doctrinal error number one. Doctrinal error number two, raised up with Jesus but not by Jesus. That means the Lord Jesus has no power to raise anybody up.

Listen. You and I may be raised up with each other if we are saved, born again and the rapture when it takes place, but you are not going to be raised up by me or I am not going to be raised up by you either, see? But by Jesus. There is two doctrinal errors in this “with,” simple little things that maybe don’t catch your eye until you look at and study it and see the difference there is in doctrine.

Well, let’s move on to one or two more and then we will turn it over to questions. In John 3:15...

By the way, they have come out with a new New American Standard Version. It is new. It is brand new. I don’t know what you call it, a new, new? In 1995.

One of the ladies that was in my service this morning, I quoted Matthew 18:11. I said that is left out of the New American Standard, the New International and so on, the old New American Standard. She had a new New American Standard. She said, “Here, pastor. What is that verse again?”

Matthew 18:11. They have restored it, see.

I said, “They must have been reading some of our materials.”

Well, we have told them they had left it out and they brought it back for the fundamentalist.

And the second verse she brought up. I talked about Luke 9:56.

“For the Son of man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them.”¹³

They have restored that, see?

¹³ Luke 9:56.

But then I got some of these others, they didn't restore that. They didn't restore this. And do you know what that young lady said? I am going to throw this Bible away. That is horrible. That is serious error, doctrinal error. And she is not going to use that. She is back to the King James Bible.

See, they may have restored a little bit. See, they have to have some protective coloration, this New American Standard, this new [?]. They have got to restore a few things so that the fundamentalists and Bible believers aren't going to be too mad at them, see? And so they restored that, but they didn't restore this one, John 3:15.

She said, "What should it be?"

Well, it should be, according to the King James Bible:

"That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life."¹⁴

"And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up."¹⁵

But B and Aleph take away three words, so does the NIV, so does the New International, so does the New King James in the footnotes. The three words are "should not perish."

I said, "What does it say in there in yours?"

And she said, "Well, it says, 'Whosoever believes in him has eternal life.'"

No perishing, don't have to worry about hell because these Gnostics didn't believe it.

Now it is in 3:16, "should not perish," but it should be everywhere it is supposed to be, see? And it is taken out of here and hell is gone in John 3:15.

Well, let's see. There is one other, John 6:47. I asked her to look that one up. See? What she said they had this new... actually this is Tony, Antoinette. That is the one. See, our people know who that is. She had this New International, because she was going for some time over to the 10th Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia which uses the NIV, see? And so she bought herself a new NIV. It is a little pocket sized. It fits nice in her pocket.

And I said, "All right, Tony, look up at John 6:47."

And she said, "What should it be?"

Well, I said, "You read me what you have got."

She read:

¹⁴ John 3:15.

¹⁵ John 3:14.

“Verily, I say unto you, he that believes has everlasting life.”

What did I leave out? He that believes has everlasting life. What did I leave out?

Believe on me. Is important to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ to have everlasting life or do you simply believe in anything? Tooth fairy? Bugs Bunny? Huh? Rudolph the red nosed reindeer, Santa Claus? Just believe? No. In, on me. This is serious doctrinal heresy.

Well, one more and then we turn over to questions, pastor. Philippians chapter four verse 13. We all know that, I hope, by memory.

“I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.”¹⁶

But B and Aleph they did a little bit of hatchet work on that verse. What do you think they took out? Through Christ. They took out Christ. Without him the whole thing falls in like a house of cards. They say I can do all things through either he who strengthens or the one who strengthens, but they don't define who the one is. It could be the devil who strengthens us.

This false Gnostic text has insinuated itself in these new versions and perversions. And, by the way, these new versions are not ... and these new Greek texts, the Greek texts of Westcott and Hort false Greek texts are not only accepted by the Roman Catholic Church, not only accepted by the New Evangelical compromisers, not only by the apostate liberals, but all together too many fundamentalists accept the false Greek text.

I mean, Bob Jones University teaches this text in their school. I mean, Central Baptist Seminary teaches this text. I mean Lansdale, Calvary Baptist Seminary teaches this text. I mean, these are fundamentalist schools. Detroit Baptist Seminary teaches this text. We have got serious problems not only in all these other modernistic groups which you would expect, but others.

Pastor, we will turn it back over to you for question and answers, any of these things that come to mind. If anybody has a question, we would be glad to do it.

[off mic voice]

Yes, sir.

[off mic voice]

New Living Translation.

[off mic voice]

¹⁶ Philippians 4:13.

That is basically the New Living Bible... the Living Version, you know, the Living Version is recooked and re had. It is the same basic false doctrinal textual basis. Yeah. And the same technique. It is very loose, not accurate and so on.

[off mic voice]

Yes, sir.

[off mic voice]

The masoretic text. If it is the proper masoretic text. Masoretic means traditional. Masar is the Hebrew word of traditional, passed down from place to place. If it is the text of the masoretic text that is the ben Chaim edition, Daniel Bomberg edition, 1425, that is the proper masoretic text. If it is the Biblia Hebraica of either Rudolph Kittle or of the Stuggartensis, Stuttgart, Germany, that is the wrong Hebrew text. But it is still called masoretic. So you have to really define which masoretic text you he uses.

[off mic voice]

Yeah, I am not real certain either. I thought he used the Textus Receptus. I really don't know. I have it in my library, but I never really open it up to see if it...

[off mic voice]

I am not either. I will have to check on that.

[off mic voice]

No, no, the Young's literal translation. He has a literal translation. I thought it was [?], but I am not positive. But I can check into that and see what it is.

Yes, ma'am.

[off mic voice]

Oh, I am sorry.

[off mic voice]

Am I saying that there is no other Bible out there that is right but the King James Bible? That is exactly what I am trying to say in the best way I know how.

[off mic voice]

Who says? Ok. All right. Who says that? All right. Yeah, I could say that I say so, but listen. I have given you four reasons why it is the only one that we should we look at.

Number one, it is based upon the proper Hebrew and Greek texts. Secondly, it has got superior translators, superior to all these other modern ones. And, third, it has got the superior translation technique. Fourth, it has got superior theology. You can't beat those four superiorities, see. And all these other modern versions have inferior Hebrew and Greek text, inferior translators, inferior translators, inferior translation technique and inferior theology. So we can't trust in that.

I wish we could trust them, but if it isn't broken, don't fix it. This is not broken. The only thing we have done in our defined King James Bible is give some definition, accurate definition, by my son D. A. Waite, Jr. [?] words there used that people can understand what is in this, see?

[off mic voice]

By the way, to have this position that I have just mentioned is to be the recipient of all sorts of hatred from these other fundamentalists that want to have all these other versions, lots of hatred involved in this, see. And so if you take a stand for a King James Bible as we have through our Bible for Today ministry through the years since 1971, you will receive lots of heat. Be prepared for that. Smile when you receive the heat, but you will get it.

It doesn't help to smile, but I guess it does help to smile. It doesn't help them, but it helps us.

[off mic voice]

Any other questions?

Yes, sir.

[off mic voice]

Are those changes... that is why we have used in our defined King James Bible what we call the Cambridge edition. The Oxford edition is like the old Scofield reference Bible uses. They have got some changes in there. Even the Oxford [?] and some of these newer ones that are published by Moody Press and Tyndale Press and various other presses, see they have no copyright on the King James Bible in this country. They do in England. You can't change it in England, but here they don't have it. You can change anything you want.

So a lot of them change the spellings. For instance, Noe, N O E meaning Noah of the Old Testament, our King James Bible says Noe, because that is the Greek spelling. They changed it to Noah, see? Well, it is obviously Noah, but you see, you don't have to make those changes. They are all right. It is just as is. But there are some that do take the liberty thoroughly, thoroughly and so on and so forth. But the Cambridge University Press has

got the closest, the most accurate replica of our proper King James text that we have. So that is why we used it in our defined King James Bible.

Yes, sir.

[off mic voice]

Pardon me?

[off mic voice]

Do I agree that the Scofield notes are corrupt? Well, I suggest to that, as far as the notes that [?] dispensations, the covenants and so on, they may be fine. I don't agree with his gap theory, but [?] the Old Testament, I don't agree with certain things, but the center references in the old Scofield reference Bible... now the New Scofield is not the new... is not the King James. I don't go along with that at all. But in the center references of the old King James Bible, never accept them. They all... in fact, in the very preface... I think it is roman numeral VIII in the preface and I have used the Scofield reference Bible for years, you see? In the preface it says that there have been some difficulties in the textual, the Greek textual [?], but [?] and Lochman and Tichendorf and Tragellis and Westcott and Hort have cleared the whole thing out. In other words, he bought the [?] the false heresy, Scofield did, that the Westcott and Hort text is the proper text. And it is the improper text. Therefore, whenever he can, he says, "Change this, change that." Never accept the center reference of the old Scofield reference Bible.

For instance, in 1 Corinthians chapter 11 the communion service where it says:

"...this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me."¹⁷

The old Scofield reference in the footnotes says, "Take away broken. This is my body which is for you." See?

I tell you, when I was at Dallas Seminary for 21 years I didn't know any different. I was brought up and reared and raised in the actual Westcott and Hort Greek text and my Greek department at Dallas Seminary. They never told us there was another text in Greek. They never told us. That is not education. That is indoctrination. They never told us of Textus Receptus. So I didn't learn it, even though I majored in the subject.

And so I had the old Scofield reference Bible and in my first old Scofield I just crossed the word "broken" right out and all the other words they told me weren't I there. It is a terrible thing because I believed the guy was right. He was wrong, dead wrong. Never trust the old Scofield center references on text. He is always wrong. He is always Westcott and Hort.

There are other things there he made that, you know, was helpful and so forth. I am a

¹⁷ 1 Corinthians 11:24.

Dispensationalist and Premillennial and pretribulation rapture and [?] and there are lots of things that are helpful in the old Scofield, but certainly not his textual [?].

Yes, ma'am.

[off mic voice]

We have reprinted, our Dean Burgon Society has reprinted a Scrivener's Annotated Greek New Testament. That is the exact text that underlies the King James Bible. And Dr. Scrivener was on the English Revised Version committee of 1881. He was commissioned by the University of Cambridge to print a text exactly that underlies the King James Bible, but put in bold black letters, "Changes made by Westcott and Hort." And he did.

You know, we have reprinted it. You can buy it. it is available. I counted up all the places. Do you know how many places I found that changed? 5604 places. And then I counted in the footnotes how they changed it. I counted the words that they either added, subtracted or changed. Do you know how many words I counted up on the footnotes? 9970 Greek words in the footnotes that they added, subtracted or changed in these 5604 places.

And so here is the inconsistency. Here they preach at the Bob Jones chapel. They say, "Oh, we use the King Jesus," for these old fuddy duddy fundamentalists that will give money if they use the King James, but they won't give money if you use the NIV, see? But in the Greek department they say, "This is the way to go." Out with the Textus Receptus. In with the false Greek text that changes the New Testament that they are preaching in the chapel in 5604 places. Now if that isn't inconsistency, I don't know what is. But I have written to Bob Jones, III the president and told him so. I have got those available, too, in print.

Yeah, go ahead. Another one. I don't know where they are, but they are here somewhere.

[off mic voice]

This is the letter, open letter to Bob Jones, III. I called it Bob Jones University inconsistent position on the Textus Receptus and the King James Bible. [?] Bob Jones [?]

Yes, pastor.

[off mic voice]

I don't want to take too much time. Just shut me off when you are finished.

[off mic voice]

Yeah, that is right. They are all the same. Yeah, Aleph is Sinai. That is the Sinai manuscript. That is exactly right. And B is the Vatican manuscript, yeah.

[off mic voice]

Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. I just don't like to use those big words, so I use Sinai and...

[off mic voice]

All right, that is a good question. Is there such a thing as the Septuagint. There is such a thing, but the question is: When did it originate, see? All the fundamentalists that I know anything about and all the liberals and the modernists and the apostates and the Roman Catholic Church says that the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament was BC. I differ with that. I believe it is AD. There is not a single scrap of evidence that really proves the whole Old Testament was in Greek before Christ.

Now there are some portions of the Old Testament in Greek language, but not the whole amount. So the Septuagint we believe is... I believe it is the fifth column of Origen. Origen had a Hexapla, six different translations, side by side, column by column, and the fifth column was a Greek Old Testament. I believe that is the Septuagint and Origen was AD. He wasn't BC. He was in two or 300 AD, not way back in 300 BC. So there is such a thing.

By the way, the quality of that, number one, the Septuagint, the quality... there are very few manuscripts that are in there, very, very sparse, few manuscripts of the Septuagint, Greek Old Testament. Secondly, the manuscripts that they have are in very bad condition. Thirdly, the technique that they used to translate was very, very poor. It was a paraphrase technique. Some of the books are accurate. Some are close to the Hebrew, but many of them are just like the paraphrase perversion we call the Living Bible, the living verse. They are very, very loose.

[off mic voice]

I believe he was. And the difference is, do we want Origen which is here or the originals, Origen or the originals? And that is... go ahead.

[off mic voice]

Play on words, fine.

[off mic voice]

All right, are the Septuagint the Dead Sea Scrolls?

[off mic voice]

All right. The Dead Sea Scrolls are not synonymous with the Septuagint. The Septuagint is a Greek Old Testament translation, I think, by Origen, 300 or whatever is the [?] AD from the old Hebrew into Greek. The Dead Sea Scrolls are in the Hebrew language and the Dead Sea Scrolls were found in one of the caves and ... in Qumran, the Qumran caves. My wife and I went over to Jerusalem. My mom sent us over there in the 1980s, 81, 82. We went to the Qumran caves. We saw the different things. But what they are they have a whole manuscript of Isaiah. That is the only thing that is complete. The rest of it is just scattered pieces that they found in these caves of the Old Testament. But 98 to 99 percent of even the Dead Sea Scrolls is identical to the Hebrew text that underlies the King James Bible.

So that is the first thing. But where it is not identical we should throw it out? Why do we throw it out? Why do we throw these...? See, the reason that they want to use the Dead Sea Scrolls to offset and to change the Hebrew text is because they are older than the present manuscripts that we have, see? Not older words, but older paper on which it is written. And just anything older is better. That is why they said the oldest was the best here. Well, if oldest was best, but what about the heretics that actually changed it. That is... it would be best if the heretics hadn't changed it.

But so the Dead Sea Scrolls, since they are older, have two problems. They were probably used by the Essenes. They left and fled from the temple if whatever AD it was that when the came over. I don't know if it was 100 or 200, whatever AD they came over and fled from the temple and they took with them some of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Number one, were they accurate Hebrew Scriptures that they took with them? That is the first thing. They had an accurate copy in the temple at Jerusalem. Secondly, what were the technique and methods of copying these Scriptures even if there was accurate? Did they do it accurately and the proper technique, see? So I don't know.

So you can't trust them. And just one manuscript that they took and then they copied and copied as against the whole masoretic traditional Hebrew text, it is a very poor way of doing it. So that is why I am against any change. And that is one of the changes the NIV makes. Any time they want to they say, "Well, we... the Septuagint says this, therefore, change the Hebrew."

I am against it. Oh, the Dead Sea Scrolls says... oh change the Hebrew. I am against that also. See, any of these things.

Yeah.

[off mic voice]

[?] Now they have been reprinted and revived, you know, recently. But they are dead as far as we are concerned.