

# Cults & Counterfeits — KJV Onlyism

## Cults & Counterfeits — KJV Onlyism (Changes)

Guess the KJV doesn't want to acknowledge that Jesus is God:

Revelation 1:8 NASB "I am the Alpha and the Omega," **says the Lord God**, "who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty."

Revelation 1:8 KJV I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, **saith the Lord**, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

The Greek is: Rev 1:8 — [Ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ὠ, λέγει **Κύριος ὁ Θεός**, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ Παντοκράτωρ]

Kurios and Theos acknowledge Jesus as BOTH LORD and GOD. The TR tradition fails here and only acknowledges Jesus as Kurios "Lord". Guess the KJV writers didn't want to acknowledge Jesus as Lord and God...See how petty this level of argumentation is?

<https://carm.org/KIVO/omissions-in-the-kjv>

<http://www.reednelson.com/my-blog/69-questions-for-people-who-believe-the-king-james-is-the-only-accurate-translation>

"Altogether, nearly 100,000 changes have been made to the 1611 KJV. The vast bulk of these are rather minor (mostly spelling and punctuation changes), but in the least this fact shows how impossible it is today for any church or any Christian to claim, "We read only the original 1611 King James Version of the Holy Bible"! With all the revisions made to this translation over the centuries, printer's errors were bound to creep in. Even though the goal was to eradicate all mistakes, every printing of the KJV added more! For example, in 1611 the so-called 'Judas Bible' was printed: In Matt 26.36, the KJV says that Judas came with his disciples to a place called Gethsemane—even though Judas had already hanged himself in the previous chapter! The very first edition of the Authorized Version is the 'Basketball Bible' because it speaks of 'hoopes' instead of 'hookes' used in the construction of the Tabernacle. A 1716 edition has Jesus say in John 5.14 "sin on more" instead of "sin no more"! The next year, the famous 'Vinegar Bible' appeared; this name was attached to this printing because the chapter title to Luke 20 was "The Parable of the Vinegar" instead of the "Parable of the Vineyard." In 1792, Philip, rather than Peter, denied his Lord three times in Luke 22.34. Three years later the 'Murderer's Bible' was printed: It was called this because in Mark 7.27 Jesus reportedly told the Syro-Phoenician woman, "Let the children first be killed" instead of "Let the children first be filled"! In 1807 an Oxford edition has Heb 9.14 say, "Purge your conscience from good works" instead of "Purge your conscience from dead works." A printing of the KJV in 1964 said that women were to "adorn themselves in modern apparel" instead of "modest apparel" in 1 Tim 2.9. But none of these printing mistakes can equal the Bibles of 1653 or 1631. These are the two 'Evil Bibles' of the King James history, for they both left out the word 'not' at key junctures. The 1653 edition—known as the 'Unrighteous Bible'—said "the unrighteous shall inherit the kingdom of God" in 1 Cor 6.9. And the 1631 edition, the infamous 'Wicked Bible,' wrote the seventh of the ten commandments as "Thou shalt commit adultery"! The Wicked Bible was such an embarrassment to the Anglican Church that the archbishop ordered the Bibles to be burned, and he fined the printer, Robert Barker, 300 pounds—no small sum in those days. Barker, who had been the king's printer since the Authorized Version came out, died fourteen years later in debtor's prison. Not only have there been these occasional but bizarre printing mistakes, but several errors in the 1611 edition have never been changed. For example, in both Acts 7.45 and Heb 4.8 the name "Jesus" appears when Joshua is actually meant! Hebrews 4.8 in the Authorized Version says, "For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day." The passage is saying that although Joshua brought his people into the promised land, he could not give them the eternal rest that they needed. But by having "Jesus" here, the KJV is thus saying that Jesus was inadequate, that he was not able to save his people from their sins. In Greek, both 'Joshua' and 'Jesus' are written the same way—. The issue is not one of textual variant, but of inattention to the details of the interpretation of the text. Or consider Matt 23.24 the Authorized Version reads, "Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel." The Greek text here means to "strain out a gnat"—not "at a gnat." Jesus' point is the same as what he says in Luke 6.41—"Why do you see the speck in your neighbor's eye, but do not notice the log in your own eye?" The religious leaders focused on the tiny problems of others without taking care of the big issues in their own lives.<sup>15</sup> Now, please understand: I am not listing these errors to make fun of the KJB! But I also don't want anyone to have the illusion that it is a perfect translation. No translation is perfect—not the KJV, not the RSV, not the NIV, not the NET Bible."

—— Dr. Wallace (Daniel B. Wallace has taught Greek and New Testament courses on a graduate school level since 1979.

He has a Ph.D. from Dallas Theological Seminary, and is currently professor of New Testament Studies at his alma mater.)

### **Cults & Counterfeits — KJV Onlyism (Dominant Text)**

"Of course, as is well known, the Greek text used in 1611 was for the most part based on about half a dozen very late manuscripts (none earlier than the 12th century AD). These manuscripts were used by Erasmus in 1516 when he published the first Greek NT."

—— Daniel B. Wallace, *The Conspiracy Behind the New Bible Translations* (Article Published June 3rd, 2004: <https://bible.org/article/conspiracy-behind-newbible-translations>).

"The Byzantine text was the dominant Greek text from about the eighth century until the end of the nineteenth century. In 1881, however, two scholars named Westcott and Hort published a new Greek New Testament which relied more on other text families than on the Byzantine family. Their Greek text became the basis of the New Testament portion of modern Bible translations."

—— Rick Wade, *The Debate Over the King James Version*, (Article: <http://www.leaderu.com/orgs/probe/docs/kjvdebat.html>).

### **Cults & Counterfeits — KJV Onlyism (Early Church)**

"unambiguously cited every text-type except the Byzantine."

—— D.A. Carson, *The King James Version Debate: A Plea for Realism* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), 47.

"What, then, has motivated the vast majority of NT scholars to embrace the earliest MSS as better representing the original wording of the NT? In a word, evidence. WH's argument was solid. Interestingly, in WH's day only one NT papyrus fragment was known. Now, almost 100 have been discovered. These antedate the great uncials by as much as two hundred years! What is most significant about them is that not one is Byzantine. But if the Byzantine text was the original, why did it not show up in either patristic evidence or MS evidence until much later? In fact, for Paul's letters, the earliest Byzantine MSS belong to the ninth century. The earliest Alexandrian witnesses? Second century."

—— Daniel B. Wallace, *The Conspiracy Behind the New Bible Translations* (Article Published June 3rd, 2004: <https://bible.org/article/conspiracy-behind-newbible-translations>). "If the Byzantine text-type comes directly from the original writings, one would expect unambiguous quotations of it from the beginning. They also point out that there are no Byzantine manuscripts older than the fourth century, whereas there are copies of other text families older than that."

—— Rick Wade, *The Debate Over the King James Version*, (Article: <http://www.leaderu.com/orgs/probe/docs/kjvdebat.html>).

### **Cults & Counterfeits — KJV Onlyism (Modern Translations)**

"There are over 400,000 textual variants among NT MSS. But the differences between the Textus Receptus and texts based on the best Greek witnesses number about 5000—and most of these are untranslatable differences! In other words, over 98% of the time, the Textus Receptus and the standard critical editions agree. Those who vilify the modern translations and the Greek texts behind them have evidently never really investigated the data."

—— Daniel Wallace, *Why I Do Not Think the King James Bible Is the Best Translation Available Today*, (Article Published June 4th, 2004: <https://bible.org/article/why-i-do-not-think-king-james-bible-best-translationavailable-today>).

### **Cults & Counterfeits — KJV Onlyism (Text Types)**

"Each of these groups is called a text family or a text-type. There are four text families which are generally agreed upon by scholars. The manuscripts which were used to produce the Textus Receptus (and later the King James Version) were of the Byzantine family. The other three text families generally agreed upon by scholars are the Alexandrian, the Caesarean, and the Western."

—— Rick Wade, *The Debate Over the King James Version*, (Article: <http://www.leaderu.com/orgs/probe/docs/kjvdebat.html>).

When the KJV translators produced their work, it was based on essentially a dozen or so Greek NT manuscripts. Today, we have access to 5,839 of them.

### **Cults & Counterfeits — KJV Onlyism (West/Hort 3 Arguments)**

"How did WH dethrone the Textus Receptus and the Greek MSS that stood behind it? They accomplished their task with three arguments: (1) The Byzantine text (i.e., the group of Greek MSS behind the Textus Receptus) was not quoted

by any church father before AD 325, while the Alexandrian text was amply represented before that period. (2) The Byzantine text was shown to depend on two earlier traditions, the Alexandrian and Western, in several places. The early editors of the Byzantine text combined (or conflated) the wording of the Alexandrian and Western traditions on occasion, while nowhere could it be shown that the Alexandrian combined Western and Byzantine readings or that the Western combined readings of the Alexandrian and Byzantine. (3) The Byzantine text, upon closer examination, proved to be inferior in its wording, either by not conforming to the author's wording or moving in a predictable direction (such as by adding clarifying words)."

—— Daniel B. Wallace, *The Conspiracy Behind the New Bible Translations* (Article Published June 3rd, 2004: <https://bible.org/article/conspiracy-behind-newbible-translations>).