

NKJV Criticisms 01

5 Ilkley Grove
Guisborough TS14 8LL
January 7th 2008

Dear John and Donna

Re: 'Textual Criticism'

2021-2022 Updates. Some edits have been made to the letter and some references updated

Figures 1-3 are at the end of this work, followed by **References**

2022 Insert. The correspondence continues following the insert.

See **References** for the sites used in this writer's works for:

1385, 1395 Wycliffe and 16th century Bibles; Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Great, Geneva, Bishops'¹

JR = Jesuit Rheims New Testament 1582²

DR = Catholic Douay-Rheims Version, Challoner's Revision 1749-1752³

ASV = American Standard Version⁴

RV = English Revised Version, 1885⁵

ESV = 2016 English Standard Version⁶

NASVs = 1977, 1995 New American Standard Versions⁷

NIV = 1984, 2011 Editions New International Version⁸

NKJV = New King James Version⁹

NKJV f.n. = New King James Version footnote

NRSV = New Revised Standard Version¹⁰

JB, NJB = Catholic Jerusalem, New Jerusalem Bibles, respectively¹¹

NWT = Jehovah's Witness Watchtower 1984, 2013 New World Translation¹²

CEV = Contemporary English Version¹³

HCSB = Holman Christian Standard Bible¹⁴

See **References** for the sites¹⁵ used for:

Berry-Stephanus = George Ricker Berry's Interlinear Edition of Stephanus' 1550 Edition of the Received Greek New Testament Text

Ne = Nestle's 21st Edition Greek-English Interlinear New Testament

M = The Farstad-Hodges Greek-English Interlinear Edition of the 'Majority' Text

Thank you for our recent phone conversation – most encouraging – and for the copies of correspondence from Peter Amué.

I'm happy to work through this material because it will no doubt prove to be a valuable study all round. In the light of Mr Amué's third letter, in which he has unilaterally terminated the correspondence, you may wish simply to retain this study for reference as needed.

It goes without saying of course but if you feel that your Discipleship Group or any of your friends would also benefit from this study, please feel free to pass it on, especially insofar as your Discipleship Group is prepared to consent ***“to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness”*** 1 Timothy 6:3b.

I'll address Mr Amué's first two letters in this post and his third letter - the copy of which I received on Saturday, December 1st, thank you - in a subsequent post. If, as I suspect, he has sidestepped much of what you have drawn to his attention, Titus 3:10, 11 comes to mind.

“A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject; Knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself.”

You're clearly not obliged to communicate with him again, according to the scripture but as indicated, framing a response to his criticisms of the Holy Bible is useful, nevertheless.

General Observations

First, some general observations from his first two letters:

KJV Only?

Mr Amué accuses you of being *a KJV only advocate*. Since he is clearly a 'scholarship only advocate,' that is at best 'pots and kettles.' However, Donna and you are not 'KJV only advocates.' Each of you is, like me, a KJV *finally authoritative* advocate. We believe the AV1611 to be the pure word of God in English, without admixture or error and the final authority in all matters of faith and practice.

I believe, therefore, that we are as justified in appealing to the AV1611 as necessary in order to answer the accusations that Mr Amué levels against it as he is in appealing to 'scholarship' in order to make those accusations in the first place. It is well-nigh certain (especially in view of his third letter) that he will not (or would not) accept any of our responses, even if he could not actually counter any of them. As the old saying goes¹⁶ *A man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still.*

And as King Solomon observes ***“Though thou shouldest bray a fool in a mortar among wheat with a pestle, yet will not his foolishness depart from him”*** Proverbs 27:22.

Or as Paul says in 1 Corinthians 14:38 ***“But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant.”*** In response, Mr Amué would probably accuse you and I of being 'willfully ignorant' as and where we reject 'scholarship,' so-called but I believe that our stance on the AV1611 is vindicated by the testimonies of history and ministry, including that of the mission field.

Consider the following.

Revival versus No Revival

The late Dr David Otis Fuller was a tremendous encouragement with respect to the final authority of the King James Bible and wrote several letters to me before he went to be with the Lord on February 21st 1989. In one letter, dated September 25th 1985, he said *So many Christians are being blinded in the glare of scholarship...Satan hates the KJV and he will raise unshirted hell to try and deceive Christians...NO OTHER VERSION HAS EVER TRIGGERED A MIGHTY REVIVAL OR EVEN A SMALL ONE.*

That is a key observation. P. G. Johnstone¹⁷ wrote of Great Britain in 1978, somewhat prophetically. *The political and economic tensions have become so great that the disintegration of the whole country is not impossible. In similar national crises in the past, God has graciously sent revival, as in the time of Wesley. There has been a national revival every century for the past 800 years, but the revival for this century is overdue. Pray for it.*

The 20th century came and went. The revival never happened, in spite of the availability of the modern versions *including* the NKJV that Mr Amué appears to favour*. Yet the revivals in the previous centuries all stemmed from the ministry of the AV1611 and its faithful precursors, such as the Geneva Bible, of which more later, when Mr Amué's comments on this version are addressed. If Mr Amué alludes to the Wycliffe Bible as Vulgate-based, i.e. not of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible pedigree but having a significant part in these early revivals, it can be shown that Wycliffe had access not only to the Old Latin¹⁸ but also to Hebrew manuscripts for the Old Testament¹⁹. Wycliffe's editors, John Purvey and Nicholas of Hereford, introduced changes under duress to Wycliffe's Bible in conformity with Vulgate but this version in its uncorrupted form is rightly considered to be one of the AV1611's faithful precursors.

*In this country, the NKJV was originally the RAV²⁰, Revised Authorized Version, which was supposed to replace the AV1611. The RAV went bankrupt within a few years and now can only be obtained as its American counterpart, the NKJV. Why did God allow this to happen, if the RAV was supposedly such an advance on the 'old' King James Version?

Rev M. J. Roberts²¹, editor of *The Banner of Truth Magazine* and minister of Greyfriars Free Church in Inverness made this telling statement. His words are just as applicable to the present time.

The Bible is a lost book in Britain today. It has little influence on national life any more...We have to admit that we are not seeing souls converted in great numbers. It does not matter where you go. Go to Wales, to Scotland, or to England here. Few are being converted in these days. Where are the days when the Bible was being blessed to the conversion of thousands and ten thousands?...The problem is here. This book is not being read so as to bring light to bear upon men's lives. Therefore the tragedy is that men are not being converted to Christ. Could any curse in this life be greater? Could any judgment be more awful than this?

That is the judgment that has befallen our nation *in spite of* the availability of the modern versions – *including* the NKJV. The NKJV has now been in circulation for forty years²². What revivals has it brought about in this country in that time, if it is so superior to the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible?

Answer, none.

By contrast the sodomites continue to be a menace to Bible belief and Christian witness in the UK²³.

It is reassuring therefore concerning the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible that the words of evangelist Billy Sunday²⁴ ring down the decades, especially ***“for the present distress”*** 1 Corinthians 7:26:

When the Bible (AV1611) says one thing and scholarship says another, scholarship can go plumb to the Devil!

Despite his highly unorthodox attitude and 'offensive' manner *Until Billy Graham, no American evangelist preached to so many millions, or saw as many conversions—an estimated 300,000*²⁵.

How many souls has the ministry of the NKJV saved, I wonder? Note this evaluation of THE KJV, my underlinings:

In all these instances the Bible means the translation authorised by King James the First...to this day the common human Britisher or citizen of the United States of North America accepts and worships it as a single book by a single author, the book being the Book of Books and the author being God – George Bernard Shaw²⁶, lifelong atheist.

How is it that the NKJV has never replaced the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible in that respect?

Yet another distinguished witness, William Lyon Phelps²⁷, Lampson Professor of English Literature at Yale University, said this.

We Anglo-Saxons have a better Bible than the French or Germans or the Italians or the Spanish; our English translation is even better than the original Hebrew and Greek. There is only one way to explain this; I have no theory to account for the so-called “inspiration of the Bible,” but I am confident that the Authorized Version was inspired.

Now as the English-speaking people have the best Bible in the world, and as it is the most beautiful monument ever erected with the English alphabet, we ought to make the most of it, for it is an incomparably rich inheritance, free to all who can read. This means that we ought invariably in the church and on public occasions to use the Authorized Version; all others are inferior. And, except for special purposes, it should be used exclusively in private reading. Why make constant companions of the second best, when the best is available?

Contemporary historian David Starkey²⁸ has said this about the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

Quotes David Starkey - Presenter: *Nevertheless, the King James Version of the Bible became the book which, more than any other, shaped the English language and formed the English mind.*

The nation is losing its mind because most UK churches **“have set at nought”** Proverbs 1:25 *the King James Version of the Bible*, dismissing it **“as a strange thing”** Hosea 8:12. See M. J. Roberts’ evaluation.

Why has the NKJV never even approached, let alone equaled or surpassed Dr Starkey’s evaluation of *the King James Version of the Bible*, if, as Mr Amué believes, it is superior to the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible? Note the following analysis.

Though not a bible believer himself, journalist and essayist H. L. Mencken²⁹, 1880-1956, is said to be regarded as one of the most influential American writers and prose stylists of the first half of the 20th century.

He said this³⁰ about the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

“It is the most beautiful of all the translations of the Bible; indeed, it is probably the most beautiful piece of writing in all the literature. Many attempts have been made to purge it of its errors and obscurities...many learned but misguided men have sought to produce translations that should be mathematically accurate, and in the plain speech of everyday. But the Authorized Version has never yielded to any of them, for it is palpably and overwhelmingly better than they are...”

Somehow, God has never honoured any attempts **“to purge it of its errors and obscurities”** in four centuries. How does Mr Amué explain this testimony of history?

“In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established” 2 Corinthians 13:1b.

I have cited six for the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and they are independent of each other. All else can be resolved **“before the judgment seat of Christ”** Romans 14:10, 2 Corinthians 5:10.

“Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them” Matthew 7:20.

At a more local level, what kind of Discipleship Group has Mr Amué overseen by means of the NKJV and how faithfully are its members serving the Lord, in comparison to your group³¹ that is faithful to the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible?

Nothing in Mr Amué's correspondence indicates that he has such a Discipleship Group. If the NKJV is as superior to the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible as Mr Amué insists that it is, this silence on his part is indeed strange.

Multiple Authorities

Like many 'scholarship onlyists,' Mr Amué reveals that he has multiple specific authorities for what is or is not 'scripture,' insofar as he is prepared to use any of these to 'correct' the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, as necessary. These authorities are as follows, although not in strict order in which they occur in Mr Amué's correspondence.

1. The NKJV, where with respect at least to 11 passages of scripture totaling 13 verses; Genesis 22:8; Ecclesiastes 5:8, 12:11; Isaiah 9:3; Ezekiel 23:6; Romans 1:18; 2 Corinthians 2:17; Colossians 3:1-3; 1 Thessalonians 5:22, 1 Timothy 6:10, 20, Mr Amué insists that *I find no fault with the NKJV as translating them from the original languages*, i.e. the NKJV is supposedly as good as if not better than the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible for these verses, which will be addressed subsequently.

The NKJV, according to Mr Amué, is definitely superior to the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible in 8 out of these 9 verses; Isaiah 9:3, Matthew 10:8, Mark 2:15, John 1:3, 18, Acts 3:15 (actually, Acts 3:13 but also by implication, Acts 3:26), 12:4, 2 Corinthians 5:17, both versions evidently being wrong in John 1:18. The NKJV is also apparently superior wherever it reads "*hades*" instead of "*hell*." All these additional verses will also be addressed subsequently.

2. The original languages themselves
3. *The original text of the Bible*. No such 'Bible' ever existed³², consisting of the entire *original text* of the scriptures, combining the original documents into one set of original documents.
4. *The Greek* – begging the question, which Greek? But let that pass for now
5. *A good lexicon*, though not a 'finally authoritative' one, like Brown/Driver/Briggs and Thayer's
6. *All Greek lexicons*, where they differ from the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible
7. *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, indicated by the initials TDNT
8. The Geneva Bible, where it allegedly agrees with the NKJV against the AV1611
9. Charles Haddon Spurgeon, where he disagrees with the AV1611 Text
10. The RV and other translations; Tyndale, Webster, Matthew's, Bishop's (actually Bishops'), Young's plus bibles in other languages
11. Dean Burgon and *The Revision Revised*³³, with respect to where *the Textus Receptus needs revising* (evidently where it still agrees with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, against the supposed 'Majority' of manuscripts) where the good Dean picks up on *the spurious clause* [*"raise the dead,"* (*νεκρους εγειρετε*, S. Matthew x. 8)] *retained by our Revisionists; because it is found in those corrupt witnesses – K B C D, and the Latin copies*, which clause Mr Amué has also picked up on, as not part of the scriptures, supposedly extracted from Jerome's Vulgate, first letter, page 2, last paragraph.
12. The 'Majority' of Greek New Testament manuscripts, evidently
13. *The original text* of the Hebrew Old Testament as distinct from the Masoretic Text, which evidently departs from it in at least 18 verses; Genesis 18:22; Numbers 11:15, 12:12; 1 Samuel 3:13; 2 Samuel 16:12, 20:1; 1 Kings 12:16; 2 Chronicles 10:16; Job 7:20, 32:3; Psalm 106:20; Jeremiah 2:11; Lamentations 3:20; Ezekiel 8:17; Hosea 4:7; Habakkuk 1:12; Zechariah 2:12;

Malachi 1:12. This authority is similar to Item 3 but by inspection, they may not be one and the same.

14. *The autographs*. These may be the same as Items 3, 12 but Mr Amué's correspondence is unclear in this respect.
15. The ancient Greek and Syrian manuscripts, i.e. copies of *the autographs*
16. The Masoretic Text and the Received Text – also known as the *Textus Receptus*
17. All bibles based on the foregoing texts. These are *perfect*, can be *trusted* and *are the WORD OF GOD* - except, of course, the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible
18. *Your Greek Bible* (I'm guessing that you have one, John ☺ and it seems that so is Mr Amué), especially where it departs from the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible

Allowing for overlap, which might reduce the 18 'authorities' cited to perhaps a minimum of 10, even that total of 'authorities' against the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible in two brief letters occupying less than 4 sides of A4 is not bad going. Especially when you consider that the arch-bible critic James White wrote a book of 286 pages in length³⁴ and identified no more than 10 'authorities' against the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible³⁵ even in that comparatively weighty tome.

I note from Mr Amué's third letter his insistence that *My final authority is the Masoretic and Received Texts, both that are inspired and preserved by God*. That statement stands in contradiction to points 10-12 but if allowed to stand, it begs the question, if all bibles based on *the Masoretic and Received Texts* are *perfect* and can be *trusted* and *are the WORD OF GOD* (except, of course, the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible), why cannot any of these bibles be the *final authority*, especially for anyone unable to understand Hebrew and Greek without an interlinear translator, whose translation *then* becomes the *final authority*?

If Mr Amué were to insist that he is referring specifically to *MY final authority*, that is a contradiction in terms. He himself has then become his own *final authority* and has become one of those of whom the Lord warned **"Son of man, these men have set up their idols in their heart, and put the stumblingblock of their iniquity before their face"** Ezekiel 14:3. **"The stumblingblock of their iniquity"** may be associated with **"man's wisdom"** 1 Corinthians 2:13, by which, as Jeremiah rebuked the bible rejecters of his day, **"ye have perverted the words of the living God, of the LORD of hosts our God"** Jeremiah 23:36. I'll come back to this theme when Mr Amué's third letter is addressed.

"Perfect Bibles" – except for the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible

As indicated, Mr Amué states in his second letter, page 1, points 3, 5 that *all those Bibles, in any language, based on the Masoretic and Received Texts, are perfect Bibles [that] can be trusted* and emphasizes that, page 2, *ALL BIBLES based on the Masoretic and Received Texts are the WORD OF GOD*.

Even though *the Masorites made changes to the original text* according to Mr Amué's first letter, page 2, para 3, *the Received Text (aka Textus Receptus)* second letter, page 1, point 1 *needs revising* first letter, page 2, para 2 and is not *direct from the autographs* first letter, page 2, para 3?

Mr Amué is presenting a confusing picture. Whatever 'spirit' is guiding him, it is not the Spirit of God, **"For God is not the author of confusion"** 1 Corinthians 14:33.

The 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, though also based³⁶ on *the Masoretic and Received Texts* is, of course, as indicated, excepted from the list of *perfect Bibles*. Specifically, according to Mr Amué, the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is definitely deficient in the following 9 verses; Isaiah 9:3, Matthew 10:8, Mark 2:15, John 1:3, 18, Acts 3:15 (actually, Acts 3:13 but also by implication, Acts 3:26), 12:4, 2 Corinthians 5:17.

The 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is also apparently deficient in 10 verses³⁷ where it reads **"hell"** for *hades*; Matthew 11:23, 16:18; Luke 10:15, 16:23; Acts 2:27, 31; Revelation 1:18, 6:8, 20:13, 14.

And in a further 12 verses where it reads **“hell”** for *gehenna* or *geena*; Matthew 5:22, 29, 30, 10:28, 18:9, 23:15, 33; Mark 9:43, 45, 47; Luke 12:5, James 3:6 and in one verse, 2 Peter 2:4, where it reads **“hell”** for *tartarus* or *tartaroo*.

For as Mr Amué assures the reader, second letter, page 1, final paragraph, *I clearly said* [first letter, page 1, para 2] *“The only people we are sure to be in gehenna are the devil and his angels.” The rich man is in hades. Check out your Greek Bible and see the word used there. The AV confuses its readers by using one word for three different Greek words. 1. Γέννα – the place for the ungodly when they face everlasting punishment. 2. Ἀδην – a limited place where ALL the dead wait for the final resurrection. 3. Τάρταρω – the deepest abyss of hades where the fallen angels are kept (2 Peter 2:4).*

Note in passing that Mr Amué gives no indication of precisely whom the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible actually confused *by using one word for three different Greek words*. No bible critic ever seems to be able to identify anyone who was ever ‘confused’ by the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

However, a total of 9+10+13 = 32 verses have so far been specified where the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is ‘inferior,’ according to Mr Amué.

By implication, Mr Amué would most likely criticize the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible for being deficient in a further 31 verses³⁸ where it reads **“hell”** for *sheol* in the Old Testament; Deuteronomy 32:22; 2 Samuel 22:6; Job 11:8, 22:6; Psalm 9:17, 16:10, 18:5, 55:15, 86:13, 116:3, 139:8; Proverbs 5:5, 7:27, 9:18, 15:11, 24, 23:14, 27:20; Isaiah 5:14, 14:9, 15, 28:15, 18, 57:9; Ezekiel 31:16, 17, 32:21, 27; Amos 9:2; Jonah 2:2; Habakkuk 2:5.

That is a final total of 63 verses where the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is ‘inferior,’ according to Mr Amué, who could no doubt add many more.

Given that *the autographs* – which I guess at the end of the day is Mr Amué’s *Primus inter pares*³⁹ (Latin) or *First among equals* of his 10 to 18 ‘authorities’ - no longer exist*, which is no doubt why he falls back on *the Masoretic and Received Texts* as his *final authority* in his third letter, the following questions therefore remain.

*See pp 68-70 of this work for a statement on *the autographs*. All is not what bible critics like Mr Amué would have bible believers believe.

First, can Mr Amué actually assure us that *ALL BIBLES based on the Masoretic and Received Texts that are perfect Bibles and are the WORD OF GOD* (with the exception of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible) are correct in all the foregoing 63 verses, where the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is not?

Note that a minimum of 11 languages must be addressed in order to answer this question, according to Mr Amué’s second letter, page 1, point 3; Aramaic, Bengali, Chinese, Croatian, Dutch, French, German, Spanish, Hindi, Russian, English. The Trinitarian Bible Society could no doubt identify many more. Mr Amué must be able to read all these languages directly in order to provide such an assurance, otherwise he is reliant on the work of a translator, or translators as the *final authority* as indeed are we, that work being the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

Can Mr Amué therefore assure us that he is proficient enough in all of these languages to make a realistic judgment? Such an assurance is germane to his foregoing assertions.

Second, is the NKJV the pure word of God in English, without admixture or error* and the *final* authority in all matters of faith and practice, insofar as it is *based on the Masoretic and Received Texts*?

*Except for using the term *only begotten* in John 1:18, which term Mr Amué would apparently happily change to *unique or only*. No doubt us ordinary bible believers can have absolute confidence in Mr Amué’s translational erudition.

If the answer to the second question is ‘no’ – and this seems likely considering Mr Amué’s criticism of John 1:18 in the NKJV - what then, between two covers, *is* the pure word of God in English, without admixture or error and the *final* authority in all matters of faith and practice? For simplicity,

consideration is here limited to English as the most readily understood language of those that Mr Amué has mentioned.

These questions are not answered unequivocally in Mr Amué's correspondence, given the reservations that he himself expresses about *the Masoretic and Received Texts*. See the foregoing.

However, they are vital questions with respect to what follows and Mr Amué should have addressed them, insofar as he does appear to believe that *the WORD OF GOD* actually exists today.

It is interesting, therefore, with respect to what follows, that, according to any Bible in any language, English is the language of the end times. Even the Beast with "**the mouth of a lion**" Revelation 13:2 has to speak English, the lion being a type of England⁴⁰ "**like a lion**" Daniel 7:4 in "**the time of the end**" Daniel 8:17, 11:35, 40, 12:4, 9. Mr Amué probably wouldn't accept either of those points but he would be hard put to refute these observations from the mission field.

Missionary Effectiveness

Mr Amué may feel that the constraint 'between two covers' is unreasonable and may perceive that he has addressed this issue by means of his reference to Bibles in various languages, second letter, page 1, point 3.

However, Mr Amué makes no mention of personal experience on the mission field and therefore the following comments are apposite.

Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger⁴¹ states.

It is scandalous for rich Americans to have ten versions of the bible [or other rich Westerners with access to 10 or more bible 'authorities'], instead of just one. Four million dollars was invested in the New King James Version; subsequent to that; several million dollars was spent on advertising campaigns. Many tribes and peoples around the world have no King James Bible type bibles at all; the Albanian bible was destroyed during the communist regime. Many of the tribes in New Guinea do not have a bible in their language. But, these countries have no money to pay the publishers. The publishers are not interested in giving these people bibles; they are just interested in making bibles that can produce a profit for their operation.

Dr Peter S. Ruckman⁴² states, his emphases.

*If God wanted to reach the **whole** world in the Tribulation, through Jewish evangelists (Rev. 7: Paul, Jonah and Jeremiah were types) He would use the English-speaking Jews. He wouldn't touch "the original Greek" with a ten-foot bamboo pole. The "second language" that ninety percent of the countries on this globe choose, if they can choose one, is ENGLISH, as the AV (1611).*

***On the mission field** - ! What do we find on the mission field? I will tell you. I am not an expert. I have only been on eight foreign mission fields, but I do have forty-one young men that I personally trained, who are on seventeen different fields, and they preach regularly on the street in eight different languages. That will be Russian, Spanish, Greek, French, German, Italian, Chinese and Ilongo (a Filipino dialect) [note that several languages that Mr Amué listed are mentioned here]...*

***In India**, a converted Hindu or Moslem cannot join Jacob Chelli's church (he has established more than forty Baptist churches in India) until he agrees to the position taken by Dr Edward F. Hills on the King James Bible as stated in *The King James Version Defended*.*

When I taught 950 Indian pastors (six hours a day for five days), I used nothing but a King James Bible. I never made reference to one Greek word in ANY Greek manuscript, although I have always had access to all of the information found in the textual studies of Kenyon, Miller, Hoskier, Scrivener, Wilkinson, Pickering, Hills, Burgon, and Robertson. That would be about 300,000 notes on Greek words and letters, for it would include all of the critical apparatus in Nestle's Greek Testament published between 1898 and 1998.

In Romania the Romanians told Brother Landolt (one of our missionaries), “Your Bible is better than our Bible.” They volunteered this after studying under him three months. In that time he made NO attempt to convert them from their translations to his.

In the Ukraine, my interpreter (Major Taras – a PhD formerly in the Russian Army) said, “Your Bible is better than ours.” He said this after translating fifteen services for me on the street, in church buildings, and in KGB prisons.

In the Philippines, the native pastors criticized me for even suggesting that the AV be translated into the eighty-plus dialects of the Philippine Islands. “Why divide the Body of Christ when ENGLISH will be the language we will have to learn to get along with the Chinese and Japanese businessmen who are taking over our country? And it is the language THEY will have to learn, rather than learn eighty-plus dialects!”

Rudiger Hemmer, a native German, pasturing a German-speaking church tells me that Luther needs revising over and over again in the Old Testament where his translation fails to match up to King James’ readings. That is a native German who was raised on the SECOND BEST translation the world has ever read: Luther’s Heilige Schrift [the Holy Scripture].

Note Professor William Lyon Phelps’s remarks earlier.

Mr Amué needs to get the big picture with respect to ‘world vision’ according to the term I was taught many years ago and with respect to the most effective strategy for addressing world vision. The 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is the basis for that strategy, like no other, in these “*last days*” of “*perilous times*” before the Lord’s Return, 2 Timothy 3:1.

As the Lord said to His disciples,

“I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work” John 9:4.

The Lord will accomplish His work in the time that is left only through His Book. “**Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel**” Matthew 23:24, who seek to overthrow the authority of that Book by means of multiple pseudo-‘authorities’ according to “**the imagination of their own heart**” Jeremiah 9:14 are engaged in a criminal waste of the Lord’s time and money – see Sister Riplinger’s comment - and, as indicated, will give account for it at “**the judgment seat of Christ**” Romans 14:10, 2 Corinthians 5:10.

Such are strongly advised to marshal their arguments carefully.

I turn now to Mr Amué’s specific criticisms of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

“hell,” gehenna, hades, tartarus

gehenna, hades, tartarus – What’s the Difference?

Mr Amué says that *The only people we are sure to be in gehenna are the Devil and his angels.*

And he expands on this notion in his second letter, page 1, last paragraph – *The AV confuses its readers by using one word for three different Greek words. 1. Γέννα – the place for the ungodly when they face everlasting punishment. 2. Αδην – a limited place where ALL the dead wait for the final resurrection. 3. Ταρταρω – the deepest abyss of hades where the fallen angels are kept (2 Peter 2:4).*

How confusion arises from using *one* word that is familiar in English instead of *three* that are *not* is unclear but Mr Amué should appreciate that the term *people* is overwhelmingly applied only to human beings in scripture, not spiritual beings, so his opening words are in themselves incorrect.

Passing on to his main point, if he wants to focus on ‘the Greek,’ where does Mr Amué think the Pharisees are now – *according to the Lord Jesus Christ?*

Did Mr Amué not read Matthew 23:14?

“Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows’ houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.”

Did Mr Amu  not read Matthew 23:33?

“Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?”

The word for **“hell”** in Matthew 23:33 is *gehenna*. Observe that the scripture provides no answer to that question. The Lord provided no way out for the unsaved Pharisees. With the exception of the Apostle Paul, Acts 9, if he was present in the group that the Lord rebuked, they *all* received **“the greater damnation.”** They did not go merely to *the place for the ungodly when they face* [as a potential fate] *everlasting punishment*. They went to everlasting punishment, **“even as Sodom and Gomorrha...suffering the vengeance of eternal fire”** Jude 7. That is, they went to **“hell”** (Greek *gehenna*). When the Lord referred to those who ‘faced’ *everlasting punishment*, He was referring to living individuals of whom He said, **“shall be in danger of hell fire”** Matthew 5:22. The Pharisees of Matthew 23 are no longer **“in danger of hell fire,”** they are *in* **“hell fire.”**

In other words, confinement in **“hell”** (Greek *gehenna*) cannot be restricted *now* to *the Devil and his angels*, who in any event are not there now, as will be seen.

That term *gehenna* had some relevance when koine Greek was a spoken and written language as a depiction of hell in the 1st century AD when the Valley of Hinnom to the south of Jerusalem, to which *gehenna* also refers, was an open-air incinerator according to one reference⁴³. That incinerator no longer exists as such and has not existed for centuries.

The King’s men therefore correctly translated the word *gehenna* as **“hell”** interchangeably with *hades*. It is the literal **“belly of hell...in the heart of the earth,”** Jonah 2:2, Matthew 12:40, that is of relevance today. The historical rubbish dump outside ancient Jerusalem, where of course the fires *have* been quenched, as distinct from **“Where...the fire is not quenched”** Mark 9:44, 46, 48, no longer bears any relevance for today’s bible believer even as an illustration and therefore neither does any distinction in English between the words *gehenna* and *hades*.

That *gehenna* and *hades* should be translated interchangeably as **“hell”** may easily be demonstrated.

Compare Mark 9:43, 44, where **“hell”** is *gehenna* or *geena* and Luke 16:22b, 23, where **“hell”** is *hades*.

“And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched” Mark 9:43, 44.

“The rich man also died, and was buried; And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame” Luke 16:22b-24.

Does anyone seriously suppose that the rich man could tell the difference between *gehenna* and *hades*?

Furthermore, explicit use of the words *gehenna*, *hades* and *tartarus* in an English bible incurs a serious problem with respect to the quality of translation.

Dr. Ruckman⁴⁴ states, his emphases, *It is objected that “Hell” (for “hades” and “gehenna”) is improper. To correct this “error,” the new bibles read “hades” for “Hell” in (ten) places, and the guileless Christian is told this is a better “translation.” But hades is not a translation; it is a TRANSLITERATION. By the use of this transliteration, the word “HELL” has been all but taken out of the Bible, much to the delight of Christ-rejecting, self-righteous “Christians.” If the revisers had been honest men would they not have transliterated “Heaven” as well and called it “Ouranos” instead of “Heaven?” Again, if they wanted to put the Bible “in the language of 20th century people,” why did they not invent a NEW word for “hades”? HADES IS NOT AN ENGLISH WORD.*

gehenna and *tartarus* are likewise *transliterations* and, like *hades*, cannot be superior to an actual *translation*.

David Daniels⁴⁵ states *All but two of the English Bibles, from at least 1380 onward...translate gehenna into the understandable word "hell" ...This list includes the 1380 Wycliffe, the 1534 and 1535 Tyndale, the Cranmer (Great) Bible of 1539 and 1540, the Geneva Bibles of 1557, 1560 and 1599, the Bishops' Bible of 1568 and 1602, even the Jesuit Rheims New Testament of 1582, and almost all Bibles from 1881 to the present. Except for Young's Literal and the [Catholic] New American Bibles, they all say "hell" ...not gehenna.*

David Daniels notes that the transliteration of *gehenna* appears *first in the perverted Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate (400s AD)*. The online⁴⁶ version of the Vulgate has this transliteration in Matthew 5:22, 29, 30 and the other New Testament verses where *gehenna* appears, translated as **"hell"** in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. But even the NKJV, which Mr Amué seems to prefer, translates *gehenna* as **"hell"** everywhere that the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible does so.

In the light of the overwhelming testimony in favour of **"hell,"** what is Mr Amué's 'authority' for insisting that *gehenna* should remain untranslated where it appears in Greek texts? He certainly provides no explanation of why a *transliteration* can possibly be superior to a *translation* and it is therefore Mr Amué who has confused the reader in this respect, not the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

The devil is not in hell

But Mr Amué appears to insist further that the Devil and his angels are in **"hell"** (Greek *gehenna*) *now*. This is certainly not so. Satan is active on earth *now* in the Church Age, as Paul reveals in 1 Thessalonians 2:18 ***"Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again; but Satan hindered us"*** and in 1 Timothy 5:15 ***"For some are already turned aside after Satan."***

And Satan *will* be active on earth during the time of ***"great tribulation"*** Revelation 7:14, as Paul reveals in 2 Thessalonians 2:9 about ***"that man of sin...the son of perdition"*** 2 Thessalonians 2:3 ***"Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders."*** The expression ***"the working of Satan"*** reveals Satan's direct involvement with ***"that man of sin...the son of perdition"*** during the tribulation. The Devil cannot therefore be confined in **"hell"** (Greek *gehenna*) facing eternal punishment.

John reinforces this conclusion, with a description of events that are *yet future*, according to Revelation 1:1, because they are ***"things which must shortly come to pass"*** – and the time is getting very short.

"And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him" Revelation 12:9.

Observe that this casting out will be from *heaven*, Revelation 12:1-8 because ***"neither was their place found any more in heaven."*** No reference is found here to **"hell"** (Greek *gehenna*).

Note that the Devil still has angels allied to him, who are also therefore *not* in **"hell"** (Greek *gehenna*) facing eternal punishment but will be on earth during the tribulation.

It should be remembered in passing that others of their number have also been on earth *after* the flood of Noah's time, when ***"God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell [Greek tartarus], and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment. And spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly"*** 2 Peter 2:4, 5.

And as Jude states ***"And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day"*** Jude 6, because ***"the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose"*** Genesis 6:2.

But observe that ***“There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown”*** Genesis 6:4.

These ***“sons of God”*** were angels, not humans as such, because they were present at the original creation when God ***“laid the foundations of the earth...the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy”*** Job 38:4, 7.

And Genesis 6:4 shows that not all of the Devil’s angels were eliminated by the judgment of 2 Peter 2:4 and Jude 6, as the expression ***“and also after that”*** strongly suggests. They were certainly present on earth to wreak havoc during the judgments on Egypt described in Exodus 7-12.

“He cast upon them the fierceness of his anger, wrath, and indignation, and trouble, by sending evil angels among them” Psalm 78:49.

Nothing in scripture indicates that these evil angels have since been confined in ***“hell”*** (Greek *gehenna*). Moreover, ***“the angel of the bottomless pit...”*** Revelation 9:11 is to be *released* when the pit is *opened*. ***“And the fifth angel sounded, and I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth: and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit. And he opened the bottomless pit; and there arose a smoke out of the pit...And there came out of the smoke locusts upon the earth...And they had a king over them, which is the angel of the bottomless pit”*** Revelation 9:1-3, 11. ***“the angel of the bottomless pit”*** is therefore obviously not going to be confined indefinitely in ***“hell”*** (Greek *gehenna*) as Mr Amué tries to imply, with respect to the Devil and his angels supposedly facing (not enduring) *everlasting punishment* now.

In addition, ***“the four angels which are bound in the great river Euphrates”*** Revelation 9:14 are to be released during the tribulation ***“to slay the third part of men”*** Revelation 9:15. They are obviously not in ***“hell”*** (Greek *gehenna*) now but they must be Satan’s servants, because they lead diabolical cavalry where ***“the heads of the horses were as the heads of lions; and out of their mouths issued fire and smoke and brimstone...For their power is in their mouth, and in their tails: for their tails were like unto serpents, and had heads, and with them they do hurt”*** Revelation 9:17, 19.

But Mr Amué’s apparent insistence that *The only people we are sure to be in gehenna are the Devil and his angels* raises another question.

Why are the Devil’s angels to be punished in ***“hell”*** (Greek *gehenna*), which is described as ***“everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels”*** Matthew 25:41 – another verse that indicates that ***“the devil and his angels”*** are *not* there yet, e.g. compare Matthew 25:41 with John 14:2, 3, ***“the sons of God”*** by the new birth, John 1:12, 3:3 are *not* in their prepared place yet – when ***“the angels that sinned”*** are in ***“hell”*** (Greek *tartarus*), which, Mr Amué insists is in *hades* and is therefore, according to him, a separate region of ***“the nether parts of the earth...the pit”*** Ezekiel 32:18?

Why incarcerate different groups of *sinning angels* in separate parts of ***“hell”***?

The only explanation is that the words *gehenna*, *hades* and *tartarus* are, in fact, synonymous. They all refer to ***“hell,”*** just as the King’s men rightly intended that they should. Like *gehenna*, the term *tartarus* may have had some 1st century significance but that significance no longer applies in the King’s English.

hades and gehenna versus “the lake of fire”

If in his statement that to the effect that *hades* is *a limited place where ALL the dead wait for the final resurrection* Mr Amué literally means that *ALL the dead* are in *hades*, he is incorrect if he includes (though he does not say so) as part of *hades* the place of the pre-resurrection righteous dead, or Old Testament saints, known as ***“Abraham’s bosom”*** Luke 16:22, a place of ***“captivity”*** but obviously not punishment, as Paul explains in Ephesians 4:8-10, with respect to the Lord’s death, resurrection and ascension, Luke 24, especially verses 50, 51.

“Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.)”

See comments in next section and subsequently under ***“Abraham’s bosom” and “a great gulf fixed.”***

Returning to the immediate topic, Mr Amu e’s perception of *gehenna* as *the place for the ungodly when they face everlasting punishment* seems in some respects to refer to ***“the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death”*** Revelation 21:8b but his correspondence is somewhat unclear in this respect. In any event, *gehenna* cannot refer to ***“the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death”*** because ***“the second death”*** will not come to pass in the universe for approximately another 1,000 years, whereas ***“hell”*** (Greek *gehenna*) is in operation now, according to James 3:6. Note the present tense.

“And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity: so is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature; and it is set on fire of hell.”

James must be referring to something in existence *now*, not something that is yet future.

Scriptural Descriptions of hell

Clarence Larkin⁴⁷ has provided perhaps the most detailed analysis of ***“the nether parts of the earth...the pit”*** that has ever been published. His analysis includes an illustrative map entitled *The Spirit World*. He identifies two regions of punishment ***“in the heart of the earth”*** Matthew 12:40, his underlinings. These are Hell – *The Abode of the Souls of the “Wicked Dead”* and (Mr Amu e would probably love this) tartarus – *Prison of the “Fallen Angels,”* 2 Peter 2:4, Jude 6. Clarence Larkin also illustrates on his map Paradise – *The Abode of the souls of the “Righteous Dead” until Christ’s Resurrection. It is now empty.*

Dr Ruckman⁴⁸ states, his emphases.

*Hell is a prison and is called such in Revelation 20:7. It has **chains** (Jude 6; Rev. 20:1). It has **bars** (Jonah 2:2, 6) and **gates** (Matt. 16:18) that require **keys** to open (Rev. 1:18, 20:1).*

*If you examine the charts in Clarence Larkin’s The Spirit World...you will see that Hell is divided into **three compartments** in the Old Testament. In the Old Testament, the whole thing is called Sheol (Hebrew), the place of the departed spirits. One side is called hades (Greek) in the New Testament, and that is Hell, the abode of the damned described by Christ in Luke 16, which will someday be cast into the Lake of Fire (Rev. 20:14).*

*Across from Hell, separated by **“a great gulf”** Luke 16:26), is what Christ called **“Abraham’s bosom”** and **“paradise”** Luke 23:43). This is where the Old Testament saints went when they died. Since nobody had their sins taken away (Heb. 10:4), the saints could not go to Heaven, so they went to a **temporary place** until Christ died on the cross. After the Church is raptured and the Law is reinstated as a part of salvation (Rev. 12:17, 14:12), the Tribulation saints will once **again** be sent to a temporary place until Christ takes them to Heaven in a post-Tribulation rapture (Rev. 6:9-11; Matt. 24:29-31).*

*Then below these two is a part of Hell called tartarus in Greek (ταρταρωσας) (2 Pet. 2:4). It is equated with **“the bottomless pit”** of Revelation 20:1. It is where **“the angels which kept not their first estate”** (Jude 6) are chained.*

*Now, let’s put all of this together. I will give you, first, that about which I am **fairly** sure.*

When Christ died, His body was put into the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea. His spirit (His human spirit, not the Holy Spirit) returned to God (Eccl. 12:7; Luke 23:46). But the Holy Spirit stayed with His soul and took Him down to Hell (Psa. 139:8; Acts 2:27, 31)...

Christ preached in “Hell” to the angels that sinned in Genesis 6, and from what the Scriptures say in 2 Peter 2:4 and Jude 6, I gather that He preached condemnation to them...

Then He left both Hell and tartarus, taking the key to Hell with Him (Rev. 1:18) and went to Paradise. There Jesus preached **“the gospel”** to the Old Testament saints...

When He arose, He conquered death (Acts 2:24; 2 Tim. 1:10) and took its **key** as well (Rev. 1:18). He then emptied Paradise and took it to Heaven (2 Cor. 12:4) when **“he led captivity captive”** (Eph. 4:8).

Dr Ruckman⁴⁹ has this additional comment, with respect to Revelation 9:1, his emphases.

“And the fifth angel sounded, and I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth: and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit.”

A bottomless pit is a very simple arrangement. The Bible speaks of the devil being brought down to the “sides of the pit” as though there was a particular pit that had **no bottom** (Isa. 14:15). There is a pit which you could dig that would have no bottom to it; this pit would be shaped like a doughnut – hollow inside. The Bible would indicate that in the heart of this earth there is such a pit. (You will find it drawn out for you on geographic and geological maps, showing the core of the earth!)...**a pit which has no “bottom” to it; it is literally all “sides.”** See **Figure 2 Earth’s Interior – from the Nevada Seismological Lab**

Neither Clarence Larkin nor Dr Ruckman attempt to draw a distinction between *gehenna* and *hades*. For reasons cited already, I believe that the distinction that Mr Amué draws is artificial, especially insofar as he does not support it with any scripture, or indeed, any commentator. Note again that in his reference to *hades* as a limited place where ALL the dead wait for the final resurrection he does not distinguish between the pre-resurrection righteous dead, such as Lazarus, who at death **“was carried by the angels into Abraham’s bosom”** Luke 16:22 and the unrighteous dead, such as **“the rich man...in hell”** (Greek *hades*) Luke 16:22, 23. I have therefore included the commentators’ explanation for **“paradise”** Luke 23:43 (as it was then **“in the heart of the earth”**) or **“Abraham’s bosom.”**

Picture of hell

Figure 1 Earth and “The Nether Parts of the Earth” shows a possible cross section of **“the nether parts of the earth”** Ezekiel 31:18. Note that it differs somewhat from Clarence Larkin’s and Dr Ruckman’s description, although not in essentials. See pp 72-73 of this work

The figure includes a simplified arrangement of **“the pillars of the earth”** because these are mentioned in 1 Samuel 2:8.

“The pillars of the earth are the LORD’S, and he hath set the world upon them.”

Dr Gerardus Bouw⁵⁰ states of 1 Samuel 2:8, his emphases.

*This verse indicates that the earth has pillars and that the world (that which pertains to man) is set upon them, not having any pillars of its own. Note that this verse does not require that the **earth** [i.e. earth] be placed on pillars, only that the **world** is placed thereon...*

That the pillars are under pressure is clear, for they support the surface of the earth (where the world is) according to Hannah’s song. If the earth is spherical in shape, then the earth’s pillars must be located between the earth’s surface and the core. In particular, the pillars of the earth could simply be vertically-orientated crystalline rock.

Figure 3 of Dr Bouw’s work entitled *The biblical model of the earth* reveals a cross-section of the earth similar to that of **Figure 1** in this work and indeed which forms the basis for that figure. The *pillars* are given as straight lines connecting the core of the earth with the mantle, which Dr Bouw describes as a *shell of crystalline rock inside the earth*. See **Figure 2** in this work, where the inner core in the figure corresponds to *the core* to which Dr Bouw refers.

Dr Bouw’s Figure 3 describes *the core* as **“the foundations of the earth”** according to Jeremiah 31:37.

“Thus saith the LORD; If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the LORD.”

Figure 1 therefore shows a scriptural picture of *“the nether parts of the earth”* Ezekiel 31:18, including both spiritual and geological elements. Somewhere on the earth’s surface is an opening to *“the bottomless pit,”* according to Revelation 9:1.

“And the fifth angel sounded, and I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth; and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit.”

Smoke issues from *“the bottomless pit”* when it is opened and it is therefore adjacent to a fiery part of *“the nether parts of the earth.”*

“And he opened the bottomless pit; and there arose a smoke out of the pit, as the smoke of a great furnace; and the sun and the air were darkened by reason of the smoke of the pit” Revelation 9:2.

How does this interior part of the earth come to be on fire?

I believe that like *“Tophet...ordained of old...the pile thereof is fire and much wood [like “the Assyrian...a cedar in Lebanon”* Ezekiel 31:3]; the breath of the LORD, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it” Isaiah 30:33. The *“stream of brimstone”* is clearly fluid, or molten – see later. Note *“the Assyrian”* in the context, Isaiah 30:31, historically Sennacherib, a type of the Devil as Dr Ruckman has shown⁵¹.

For a further description of *“the bottomless pit”* Isaiah 14:15 shows by means of the Lord’s condemnation of Lucifer that *“the bottomless pit”* has *“sides”* in which *“graves are set”* according to Ezekiel 32:22, 23, probably denoting the infernal burial place in *“hell”* of *“Sennacherib King of Assyria”* Isaiah 37:21, descended from Asshur, who founded Nineveh, Genesis 10:11.

Concerning Lucifer *“Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit”* Isaiah 14:15.

And concerning Asshur *“Asshur is there and all her company: his graves are about him: all of them slain, fallen by the sword: Whose graves are set in the sides of the pit, and her company is round about her grave: all of them slain, fallen by the sword, which caused terror in the land of the living”* Ezekiel 32:23.

It follows – see **Figure 1** – that *“the bottomless pit”* is most likely a spherical annulus, which would have *“sides”* but no *bottom* below the mantle beneath the earth’s crust. See **Figure 2** (which does not show *“the pillars of the earth”* because that is a scriptural term but no doubt with geological reality, as Dr Bouw shows) and Dr Bouw’s analysis. It appears that *“the pillars of the earth”* 1 Samuel 2:8 extend across *“the bottomless pit.”* **Figure 2** indicates that the interior of *“the bottomless pit”* is fiery liquid, molten iron and sulphur, see again Isaiah 30:33, but that the inner core is solid iron – although rent with fissures, see **Figure 1** and comments on *“the lowest hell”* that follow. So *“the pillars of the earth”* must be of a sufficiently robust substance – Dr Bouw indicates crystalline rock – to withstand the temperatures stated, which are excessively high with respect to the known melting point of iron on the earth’s surface – approximately 1500 Celsius⁵² – and because *“the nether parts of the earth”* exist at extreme pressure, as stated in the note accompanying **Figure 2**. A solid inner core could match **Figure 1**’s depiction of *“hell”* if it contained fissures filled with fiery molten iron and sulphur reaching into its interior.

Throughout this region, therefore, *“the breath of the LORD, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it”* Isaiah 30:33.

See the following spiritual interpretation of **Figures 1** and **2**’s depiction of *“hell.”*

Although it is also possible that the pillars may partly be iron, if the core to which they are adjacent is also composed of iron. The full details have to be acknowledged as unknown but *“the pillars of the earth”* must exist because the scripture explicitly states that they do.

Note also that Psalm 75:3 states, *“The earth and all the inhabitants thereof are dissolved: I bear up the pillars of it. Selah.”* Psalm 75:3 is no doubt a Second Advent reference according to Psalm 97:5 *“The hills melted like wax at the presence of the LORD, at the presence of the Lord of the whole earth.”*

But if application is made to geology, it indicates that God has so designed and constructed **“the pillars of the earth”** that they can withstand even the earth’s dissolution, e.g. the molten core of **Figure 2**. Dissolution of **“all the inhabitants”** may refer both to those **“Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power”** 2 Thessalonians 1:9 and any, including Old and New Testament saints that **“go the way of all the earth”** 1 Kings 2:2a **“For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not”** Ecclesiastes 7:20 because **“Drought and heat consume the snow waters: so doth the grave those which have sinned”** Job 24:19.

“the righteous hath hope in his death” Proverbs 14:32 of course **“For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens”** 2 Corinthians 5:1.

Note that a core of the earth filled with fiery molten iron and sulphur as **Figure 2** shows would satisfy the observable characteristics of active volcanoes. Such a condition for the earth’s core according to **Figure 2** would match **Figure 1**’s depiction of **“the bottomless pit”** without necessarily violating any scripture, insofar as what may be opaque physically may not be in the spiritual realm. See discussion under **“Abraham’s bosom”** and **“a great gulf fixed.”**

Of the major elements existing in **“the nether parts of the earth,”** observe that both iron and sulphur have *bad* connotations in scripture. Note again Isaiah 30:33 and the following scriptures.

“And that the whole land thereof is brimstone, and salt, and burning, that it is not sown, nor beareth, nor any grass groweth therein, like the overthrow of Sodom, and Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim, which the LORD overthrew in his anger, and in his wrath” Deuteronomy 29:23. That verse could well be a picture of hell – and, speaking practically, the end of the so-called LGBTQ+ movement⁵³.

“Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire” Jude 7. Like the Pharisees in Matthew 23:33 **“Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?”**

“But the LORD hath taken you, and brought you forth out of the iron furnace, even out of Egypt, to be unto him a people of inheritance, as ye are this day” Deuteronomy 4:20, Egypt being a type of the world⁵⁴, out of which the Lord calls His Son and His people.

“Out of Egypt have I called my son” Matthew 2:15.

“Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty” 2 Corinthians 6:17-18.

The references to iron and sulphur, i.e. brimstone, are fairly typical with respect to their negative connotations for these elements.

“hell” and **“the lowest hell”**

“the sides of the pit” appear to correspond to the surface of **“hell”** because when Satan, or Lucifer, typified by **“Pharaoh and all his multitude”** Ezekiel 32:32, which would include **“his angels”** of Revelation 12:9 are **“brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit,”** the Lord says:

“The strong among the mighty shall speak to him out of the midst of hell with them that help him: they are gone down, they lie uncircumcised, slain by the sword” Ezekiel 32:21.

Clearly, **“hell”** consists of descending levels, including **“the midst of hell”** - very likely a reference to the interior of **“hell”** inside the inner iron core of **Figure 1**- and **“the lowest hell”** – see below (!).

As a practical point, note in passing that Ezekiel 32, which refers to other mighty warriors and/or kingdoms consigned to **“hell,”** e.g. Elam, Meshech, Tubal, Edom, Zidon, indicates that **“hell”** is the ultimate destination for *all* mortal terrorists, that is, those **“which caused terror in the land of the living”** Ezekiel 32:23.

Returning to **Figure 1**, it depicts “*hell*” as the fire and brimstone-soaked fissured iron centre of “*the nether parts of the earth*” literally “*in the heart of the earth*” Matthew 12:40 but the scripture speaks in two verses of “*the lowest hell*,” a region in hell possibly deeper even than “*the midst of hell*” and ultimately at its very centre – and that of the earth.

“For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell, and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains” Deuteronomy 32:22.

“For great is thy mercy toward me: and thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell” Psalm 86:13.

Figure 1 therefore depicts this “*lowest hell*” with a fissure running down to it from “*the sides of the pit*,” which would be feasible with a solid, though fissured, iron inner core, according to **Figure 2**, which is nevertheless adjacent to the core of **Figure 2** and therefore bathed with and soaked in molten iron and sulphur.

Where, remember, “*the breath of the LORD, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it*” Isaiah 30:33.

And where, with respect to the visible spectrum, the flames are *black*.

“A land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness” Job 10:22.

Dr Ruckman⁵⁵ writes, commenting on this verse, *What Job unwittingly describes here is the “outer darkness” of Matthew 22:13 and 2 Peter 2:17. Notice how the description matches the destination of the Antichrist (Job 15:22, 23, 30, and 34), even though both he and the false prophet are in a “Lake of Fire” after Armageddon (Rev. 19:20). However, recently [late 1970s]...the foot-dragging scientists have found stars where the fire is so hot that the flames are BLACK.*

In other words the flames are beyond the ultra-violet end of the visible spectrum, a truly terrifying spectacle of “*hell*.”

Note that neither Deuteronomy 32:22 nor Psalm 86:13 indicates that any angels are confined in “*the lowest hell*” but while Psalm 86:13 is no doubt a Messianic reference, it nevertheless shows that a *human* soul could also be condemned there.

Note again as Dr Ruckman states that a part of Hell called *tartarus* in Greek (ταρταρωσας) (2 Pet. 2:4...is equated with “*the bottomless pit*” of Revelation 20:1. It is where “*the angels which kept not their first estate*” (Jude 6) are chained.

This statement would match **Figure 1** if *tartarus* is equivalent to “*the sides of the pit*” i.e. the *surface* of “*hell*” but *extending* to “*the midst of hell*” and even to “*lowest hell*” without violating scripture – or contradicting Dr Ruckman’s analysis.

However, Mr Amué’s statement that *tartarus* is *the deepest abyss of hades where the fallen angels are kept* (2 Peter 2:4) is too narrow to satisfy all the relevant scriptures, especially Psalm 86:13. The scripture does not directly equate *tartarus* with “*the lowest hell*” although it could extend there.

But in any event, these particulars about “*the nether parts of the earth*” are found from the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible *in English*, not from *three different Greek words* as Mr Amué insists, or indeed from any number of *different Greek words*.

“Abraham’s bosom” and “a great gulf fixed”

As Dr Ruckman has explained – see his comments on 2 Peter 2:4, 5 - the pre-resurrection righteous dead, such as Lazarus, Luke 16:20, went to a part of “*the nether parts of the earth*” called “*Abraham’s bosom*” Luke 16:22 and “*paradise*” Luke 23:43, the inhabitants of which the LORD has now relocated in “*the third heaven*” 2 Corinthians 12:2-4, “*When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive*” Ephesians 4:8.

“*Abraham’s bosom*” is called⁵⁶ that *because it is in the bosom of the earth*. As **Figure 1** depicts, it must be on the opposite side of “*the bottomless pit*” from “*hell*” and “*the sides of the pits*” where “*graves are set*” as in Ezekiel 32:23, separated by “*a great gulf fixed*” Luke 16:26.

This would place “*Abraham’s bosom*” on the interior face of what is geologically the mantle, as **Figure 2** shows. Although, according to **Figure 2** “*a great gulf fixed*” is geologically filled with fiery molten iron and sulphur and therefore physically opaque, it must be transparent to spiritual beings, including the human souls of both saved and lost individuals.

“*And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom*” Luke 16:23.

“*But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence*” Luke 16:25-26. Note the plurals. The lost soul in hell is nevertheless *alone* amid unclean spirits “*a brother to dragons, and a companion to owls*” Job 30:29 and context Job 30:26-31.

God must at least temporarily have granted sufficient visibility for this dialogue to have taken place, even in “*A land of darkness, as darkness itself...where the light is as darkness*” Job 10:22. Such a concession is feasible, scripturally.

“*Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to thee*” Psalm 139:12.

To the extent that the fiery molten iron and sulphur that fills **Figure 2**’s core and the volume of “*the bottomless pit*” gives rise to or is the physical manifestation of “*hell...the fire that never shall be quenched*” Mark 9:43 where a lost human soul can be “*tormented in this flame*” Luke 16:24, it follows that a pre-resurrection saved soul is providentially shielded from its effects, just as even the physical body of an Old Testament saint could be.

“*He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God...And the princes, governors, and captains, and the king’s counsellors, being gathered together, saw these men, upon whose bodies the fire had no power, nor was an hair of their head singed, neither were their coats changed, nor the smell of fire had passed on them*” Daniel 3:25, 27.

Note also a strange passage in Isaiah 33:14-16 that possibly presages the description of “*Abraham’s bosom*” as outlined.

“*The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings? He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil. He shall dwell on high: his place of defence shall be the munitions of rocks: bread shall be given him; his waters shall be sure.*”

An Old Testament saint “*shall dwell on high*” because as indicated the LORD “*led captivity captive*” Ephesians 4:8 but even while Lazarus was in “*Abraham’s bosom*” it was true that “*his waters shall be sure*” at least according to the rich man’s cry in Luke 16:24.

“*And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame.*”

Observe that (like the LORD Jesus Christ on the cross, John 19:28), the rich man receives neither mercy nor water. No prayer from hell for mercy to a lost soul is heeded. Paul’s admonition should always be remembered and urged upon the unsaved.

“*Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation*” 2 Corinthians 6:2b.

Note that the description of “*Abraham’s bosom*” closely matches the premonitions of “*the sinners in Zion*” who, it should also be noted, are aware of the faith-works system of salvation that applied in the Old Testament era and will apply again in the time of “*Jacob’s trouble*” Jeremiah 30:7, i.e. the Tribulation of Daniel’s 70th week, Daniel 9:25-27. See Dr Ruckman’s works⁵⁷ for a detailed study of faith-works based salvation. For now, note these verses, first for Old Testament salvation.

“LORD, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart” Psalm 15:1-2 and the remainder of this Psalm. Note the correspondence with Isaiah 33:14-16.

For tribulation salvation, note that **“But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved”** Matthew 24:13.

It appears from Abraham’s statement in Luke 16:26 that human souls, either saved or lost, cannot cross “*a great gulf fixed*” and by implication cannot ascend or descend “*the pillars of the earth,*” which of course may have no tangible presence in the spiritual realm. But “*hell*” nevertheless, as Dr Ruckman⁵⁸ has highlighted, *has chains* (Jude 6; Rev. 20:1). *It has bars* (Jonah 2:2, 6) and *gates* (Matt. 16:18) that require keys to open (Rev. 1:18, 20:1).

The “*bars*” and the “*gates*” of “*hell*” may be in place to prevent the lost souls in “*hell*” from even interacting with one another, like a conventional prison on earth. See again Job 30:26-31.

This means that “*hell*” consists of *solitary confinement* “*in torments*” Luke 16:23 until the judgement of the “*great white throne*” in approximately 3000 AD, after which “*death and hell were cast into the lake of fire...the second death*” Revelation 20:11, 14. “*The lake of fire*” is also the final destination of the lost souls held on remand now in solitary confinement “*in torments*” and “*unto the judgment of the great day*” Jude 6. Their ultimate fate is as follows, showing that “*the fire that never shall be quenched*” Mark 9:43 that they suffer now as lost souls will extend throughout eternity.

“And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire” Revelation 20:15.

“chains of darkness” and “everlasting chains”

It is notable that only supernatural beings are actually chained in “*hell*” according to the scriptures. The rich man is “*in hell*” and “*in torments*” and “*tormented in this flame*” Luke 16:23, 24 but he is not said to be “*reserved in everlasting chains*” even though he may be confined behind “*bars*” Jonah 2:6. However, angels are chained in “*hell.*”

“For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment” 2 Peter 2:4.

“And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day” Jude 6.

So it is possible that *angels*, even “*angels that sinned*” can cross “*a great gulf fixed.*” By inspection of the following verses, angels clearly have no problem traveling through “*the nether parts of the earth*” to and from Abraham’s bosom and they can carry, escort, or convey the saved human souls mentioned.

“And the king said unto her, Be not afraid: for what sawest thou? And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods ascending out of the earth. And he said unto her, What form is he of? And she said, An old man cometh up; and he is covered with a mantle. And Saul perceived that it was Samuel, and he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself” 1 Samuel 28:13, 14.

“And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham’s bosom” Luke 16:22a.

And an angel can even venture down “*to hell, to the sides of the pit.*”

“Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit” Isaiah 14:15.

Some supernatural being, or angel, must do the bringing down, the binding, the incarceration and the loosing.

“And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season” Revelation 20:1-3.

“And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison” Revelation 20:7.

An angel must be able, in the LORD’s strength, to imprison Satan in ***“the sides of the pit”*** and also to venture there afterwards and release Satan so that the Devil may temporarily ***“be loosed out of his prison.”***

If angels, even ***“angels that sinned,”*** have this capacity to traverse ***“the nether parts of the earth”*** and therefore to cross even ***“a great gulf fixed,”*** then it follows that they must be ***“reserved in everlasting chains”*** to prevent them from escaping. This additional security measure is clearly at least as important as the location of *tartarus*, which is nevertheless still ***“hell”*** – see **Figure 1** – and therefore rightly translated as such by the King’s men.

But the ***“angels that sinned”*** will not escape ***“the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death”*** Revelation 21:8b. Neither will any lost soul in ***“hell”*** now. Their punishment then will be as it is now - ***“everlasting fire”*** Matthew 25:41. As indicated, they suffer everlasting punishment *now*. They are not merely in *the place for the ungodly when they face everlasting punishment* where such punishment is a future prospect, as Mr Amué has tried to imply.

Island of Alcatraz – an Earthly Illustration of hell?

The island of Alcatraz⁵⁹ in the middle of San Francisco Bay may be an earthly illustration of ***“hell”*** as situated in ***“the heart of the earth”*** Matthew 12:40.

It was a federal prison with *gates* and *bars* and different levels of confinement – though not chains.

The island is surrounded by a medium, i.e. the sea, which could not normally be crossed by either inmates or visitors from the bay shore under their own power – although two or possibly three escapees may have been successful.

However, as indicated, no lost soul will ever escape from ***“hell”*** or from ***“the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death”*** Revelation 21:8b.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I trust that the foregoing study will serve to answer Mr Amué’s objections to the word ***“hell”*** as found in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, at least from a bible-believing perspective, because as I stated earlier, nothing this side of ***“the judgment seat of Christ”*** Romans 14:10, 2 Corinthians 5:10 will alter Mr Amué’s ‘scholarship-only’ perspective.

The same holds true for all the other criticisms that he levels against the Holy Bible in his correspondence but they should be addressed, nevertheless, in order to demonstrate that bible believers ***“by the grace of God”*** 1 Corinthians 15:10 can answer bible critics at *every* point with respect to ***“the book of the LORD”*** Isaiah 34:16 and therefore with respect to ***“all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him”*** Jude 15.

Like those of Mr Amué.



Alcatraz Island

NKJV Changes, “Easter,” “Son” versus “S(s)ervant” and other Supposed KJV ‘Errors’

NKJV Changes

I allude here to Mr Amué’s criticisms of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible to which he refers in the third paragraph of his first letter.

Mr Amué states, *The most famous claim is that the NKJV has 100,000 changes made to it. Changes to what I ask?*

Dr William Grady⁶⁰ provides the answer, his emphases.

*Commenting on their eclectic translation procedures, [the NKJV editors] stated, “A special feature of the New King James Version is its conformity to the **thought flow** of the 1611 Bible.”*

*This unscholarly and unreliable practice [eclectic translation procedures] which supposedly equipped the translator to perceive the “thought flow” (whatever **that** is) of the King James Bible, is known as “dynamic equivalence.” Basically this means that the scholar can take whatever license he desires. **Conservative estimates of the total translation changes in the NKJV are generally put at over 100,000!***

Dr Grady proceeds to illustrate many of these changes by comparing the texts of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible with that of the NKJV, including 36 specific passages in the Song of Solomon, where the NKJV repeatedly reads with the RSV and/or the NASV, Alexandrian versions which Mr Amué declares to be *corrupt*, first letter, page 3, last paragraph.

And where the NKJV, in company with the RSV and/or the NASV, reads distinctly differently from the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, e.g. Song of Solomon 1:7 “**that turneth aside**” versus “*who veils herself,*” 1:11 “**borders of gold**” versus “*ornaments of gold,*” 4:1 “**within thy locks**” versus “*behind your veil.*”

In sum, the answer to Mr Amué’s question is that the changes in the NKJV are translational changes with respect to the Text of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and these changes are such that, even though Mr Amué may agree with them, the net result is that the NKJV is *not* a ‘King James’ version, new, old or otherwise⁶¹.

“Easter” and “the days of unleavened bread”

Mr Amué then insists that *the KJV has got changes to it*, apparently with regards to the original text of the Bible [unspecified] although he does not explicitly say so. However, he continues with, *Look at Acts 12:4. The KJV translates πασχα as Easter. The Greek says pascha – Passover.*

In February 2002, I wrote to Michael Penfold⁶², then of Penfold Book & Bible House, Bicester, Oxfordshire, with respect to his leaflet *Is the King James Version Perfect?* Michael Penfold doesn’t think it is and he raised the same objection to Acts 12:4 in his leaflet that Mr Amué has. My response to Michael Penfold about Acts 12:4, which he never explicitly took issue with, is as follows.

*The AV1611 translators correctly rendered “pascha” as “Easter” in Acts 12:4. The context is a statement of **intent**, with respect to Herod, who was not a Jew. The verse therefore shows that the devotees of Easter are heathen kings allied to Rome, who persecute Christians. Acts 12:4 is thus “**a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart**” Hebrews 4:12, of any one among the megalomaniac priest-kings in possession, ironically, of the Chair of Saint Peter⁶³.*

See this reference⁶⁴. I also make reference⁶⁵ to Dr Sam Gipp’s support for “Easter” as it stands in Acts 12:4 in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. He writes, his emphases.

*The days of unleavened bread are NEVER referred to as the Passover. (It must be remembered that the angel of the LORD passed over Egypt on **one** night, **not** seven nights in a row...)*

*Verse 3 shows that Peter was arrested during the days of unleavened bread (April 15-21). The Bible says: “**Then** were the days of unleavened bread.” The Passover (April 14th) had **already come and gone**. Herod could not possibly have been referring to the Passover in his statement concerning*

*Easter. The next Passover was a **year away!** But the pagan holiday of Easter was just **a few days away.** Remember! Herod was a pagan Roman who worshipped the “queen of heaven.” He was **NOT** a Jew. He had no reason to keep the Jewish Passover.*

Note that the bible critic, James White, of Alpha and Omega Ministries, has sought to refute the foregoing analysis⁶⁶. White insists that, his emphases, *Herod Agrippa, according to the Jewish historian Josephus, was a conspicuous observer of Jewish customs and rituals, and since he was attempting to please the Jews (Acts 12:3), it is obvious that Luke is referring to the Jewish Passover, not a pagan celebration...the term “the Passover” is used of the **entire** celebration, including the days of unleavened bread after the actual sacrifice of the Passover.*

James White then alludes to John 2:13, 23, 6:4 and 11:55 to reinforce that supposition, with reference to the term *the feast of the Jews* although the term only occurs once, in John 6:4, as “**a feast of the Jews.**” But John 2:23 refers to “**the passover, in the feast day,**” which is clearly contrary to White’s supposition.

Only in the millennial reign of the LORD Jesus Christ do the Jews hold a passover feast that lasts seven days.

“In the first month, in the fourteenth day of the month, ye shall have *the passover, a feast of seven days; unleavened bread shall be eaten*” Ezekiel 45:21.

White uses a non-biblical source, Josephus, to justify attacking the word “**Easter**” in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible because *Herod Agrippa...was a conspicuous observer of Jewish customs and rituals*. The scripture does not consider this detail to be of any significance in its record of Herod’s actions in Acts 12:1-4, which included the murder of the Apostle James, which in turn “**pleased the Jews**” Acts 12:2. However, if a Gentile king’s acquaintance with *Jewish customs and rituals* is of significance, the scripture faithfully records it. Witness Paul’s defence before Agrippa.

“Especially because I know thee to be *expert in all customs and questions which are among the Jews: wherefore I beseech thee to hear me patiently*” Acts 26:3.

The bible believer may therefore ignore any observance on the part of Herod Agrippa with respect to *Jewish customs and rituals* for the simple reason that the bible does - in any translation, even those that bible critics like James White and Peter Amu   seem to ‘prefer.’

I have addressed White’s attacks on the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible in a separate study, which will be available next year*. *It is now available. Note this extract⁶⁷.

*Turning to Acts 12:3-5, as Dr. Gipp indicates, the key sentence is “**Then were the days of unleavened bread**”...this must have been after Nisan 14th, which has a special designation in scripture as “**the first day of the feast of unleavened bread**” Matthew 26:17. The earliest therefore that Herod could have arrested Peter would have been Nisan 15th “**at even**”. However, if it was Herod’s intention to bring Peter forth after the passover, for which there was no apparent reason as Dr. Gipp shows, there would not have been any reason to keep him in prison after the morning of Nisan 15th, when the passover feast ended. Yet Herod had already “**pleased the Jews**” by the murder of James, Acts 12:1-3 and Acts 12:5 states that “**Peter was therefore kept in prison.**” The only reasonable explanation, as discussed by Dr. Gipp, is that the plan was to exhibit Peter after **EASTER**, possibly to “celebrate” a heathen “victory” over the apostles’ doctrine which had “**filled Jerusalem**” Acts 5:28. This would be getting the most “mileage” out of his efforts to “**vex certain of the church**” in pleasing both Jews and Romans and would not have been the first time that the enemies of the LORD had rejoiced in such a “victory” Judges 16:23-25, 1 Samuel 31:8-13. Significantly there was severe retribution in each of these cases, Judges 16:29-30, 2 Samuel 5:17-25, Acts 12:23. “**God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap**” Galatians 6:7. Retribution was delayed in the case of the LORD Jesus Christ, in answer to His prayer. See Luke 22:63-66, 23:11, 33-34.*

There will of course come a day when God will punish the whole world for its rejection of His Son and all its abounding iniquity, Matthew 24:12, Luke 10:16.

“Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate: and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it...I will punish the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity” Isaiah 13:9, 11.

Note that Herod was not alone in *his efforts to “vex certain of the church” in pleasing both Jews and Romans*. Porcius Festus was ***“willing to do the Jews a pleasure”*** Acts 25:9 but careful to observe ***“the manner of the Romans...that he which is accused have the accusers face to face”*** Acts 25:16 while nevertheless seeking to vex Paul with the false accusation ***“much learning doth make thee mad”*** Acts 26:24.

“the preparation for the passover”

Note also that Nisan 14th is ***“the preparation of the passover.”***

“And it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour: and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King!” John 19:14.

The ***“supper”*** Luke 22:20 that the Lord ate with the disciples was part of this preparation.

“Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?” Matthew 26:17.

The disciples ***“made ready the passover”*** verse 19 but the passover lamb was not slain until later that day. Exodus 12:6-8 stipulates that the Jews were to ***“kill it in the evening”*** and ***“eat the flesh in that night”*** extending into Nisan 15th and in verse 10 ***“ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning”*** i.e. of Nisan 15th. This timing is clear because the Lord Jesus Christ, ***“the lamb of God”*** John 1:29, died when evening was drawing on.

“And it was about the sixth hour, and there was a darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour” Luke 23:44. The Lord dies in verse 46 because ***“he gave up the ghost.”***

The passover lamb was yet to be eaten. Note again John 19:14 and the following reference.

“Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the Passover” John 18:28. See again Exodus 12:6-8, 10.

Dr. Ruckman⁶⁸ states *According to the calculations of Ainsworth, Christ is slain within one hour of the regular time for killing the Passover lamb, and many converted Rabbis identify the cry of John 19:30 with the descent of the priest’s knife into the neck of the Paschal Lamb.*

All these references support ***“Easter”*** in Acts 12:4 because none of them support ***“the days of unleavened bread”*** which extend beyond Nisan 15th and until Nisan 21st – see the following remarks – as being part of the passover, James White’s erroneous opinion notwithstanding.

Bible-believing Commentators

David Daniels⁶⁹ has these comments about Acts 12:4.

“Passover” is not the correct translation of pascha in this single New Testament passage. If we examine the Passover celebration and Days of Unleavened Bread from the Old Testament, we will see why Acts 12:4 cannot be about Passover...

Please note when the apostle James was killed: “These were the days of unleavened bread.” When were these days? The Bible is very specific. In Leviticus 23:5-8 and Numbers 28:16-25 we find two very clear definitions of Passover and the Feast/Days of Unleavened Bread.

- *Passover...occurs on the 14th day of the first month at even (starting at sunset).*
- *The Feast and the Days of Unleavened Bread start after Passover, on the 15th day of that month (Numbers 28:17) and continuing through the 21st day...*

Please note that Passover was before the Days of Unleavened Bread, and this pascha Herod was [awaiting] was after the Days of Unleavened Bread. Therefore while Herod may have been waiting for Easter (the feast of Ishstar, which the Greeks also called pascha), he was not waiting for Passover. That is why the King James Bible [translators], in this single instance, had to translate pascha by a word other than Passover.

Dr J. A. Moorman⁷⁰ explains further, his underlinings. He notes that the word “passover” did not even exist before William Tyndale coined it for his Version of 1526-31. His was also the first English Bible to use “Easter.” Previously the Hebrew and Greek were left untranslated. For example, in Wycliffe’s Bible, which was based on the Latin, we find pask or paske. Tyndale’s New Testament and the Coverdale, Great, Matthew, Bishops’ bibles have “**Easter**” but the Geneva Bible has “Passover.” The 1611 Authorized Holy Bible therefore has some, if not total, support from earlier English bibles.

It is precisely in this one passage that “Easter” must be used, and the translation “Passover” would have conflicted with the immediate context...the passage actually says: “...(Then were the days of unleavened bread.)...intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people.”

To begin with, the Passover occurred before the feast of unleavened bread, not after! “And in the fourteenth day of the first month is the passover of the LORD. And in the fifteenth day of this month is the feast: seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten. (Num. 28:16, 17)...

Herod put Peter in Prison during the days of unleavened bread, and therefore after the Passover. The argument that the translation “Passover” should have been used as it is intended to refer to the entire period is ruled out by the inclusion of “these were the days of unleavened bread.” Scripture does not use the word “Passover” to refer to the entire period [according to the first mention of the word “**passover**” in Exodus 12:11. That is important. See Dr Bouw’s comments following].

Peloubet’s Bible Dictionary says: “Strictly speaking the Passover only applied to the paschal supper and the feast of unleavened bread followed it (p. 486).”

Therefore, as the Passover had always been observed, and the days of unleavened bread were in progress, and yet Herod was still waiting for “after pascha,” we can only conclude that the word must be taken in a broader sense. History in fact does indicate a pagan and Christian interchange with the word through the translation “Easter.”

A. W. Watts writes: “The Latin and Greek word for Easter is pascha, which is simply a form of the Hebrew word for Passover – pesach (Easter – its Story and Meaning, p. 36).”

Thus, the word came to be associated with both Christian and pagan observance. And it was to this [latter] that Herod was referring...

Dake’s Bible adds: “Easter...is derived from Ishtar, one of the Babylonian titles of an idol goddess, the Queen of Heaven. The Saxon goddess Eastre is the same as Astarte, the Syrian Venus, called Ashtoreth in the O.T. It was the worship of this woman by Israel that was such an abomination to God (1 Sam. 7:3; 1 Ki. 11:5, 33; 2 Ki. 23:13; Jer. 7:18; 44:18)...”

This was the “pascha” that Herod was waiting for before releasing Peter. As an Edomite, he and his people had a long association with Babylon and her mystery religion (cf. Gen. 14:1-4).

Dr Ruckman⁷¹ adds, his emphases.

“**AFTER EASTER**” (vs. 4). The Holy Spirit has thrust Himself into the AV committee of 1611 and said, “WRITE...!” Easter was a **Roman Holiday** which **Herod** observed as religiously as any Babylonian priest observed it 1000 years **before** Christ was born. The feast of the Passover matched this pagan feast every few years, and since Herod was a **Roman**, the Holy Spirit has pointed out for you the Catholic feast which **Rome** substituted for the Passover...

To those still ignorant of this bunny, colored-egg day, the Holy Spirit has pointed out the Roman connection...the words “**the days of UNLEAVENED BREAD**” occur in verse 3 (see Exodus 12:2-8

and comments in that Commentary) to give you the *JEWISH* designation. *EASTER* is the *ROMAN* designation, and Herod (vss. 6, 1) was a **Roman**...

Dr Gerardus Bouw⁷² writes.

Note that Peter was taken during the days of unleavened bread (v. 3), the evening of the first day of which [Nisan 14th] is the Passover. In time the feast of unleavened bread came to be called the Passover. Luke bore witness of that when he wrote: "Now the feast of unleavened bread drew night, which is called Passover" (Lu. 22:1). In time, the Jews may have confused the two, but the Bible does not do so. Biblically, the Passover is the evening of the first of the seven days of unleavened bread. If Peter was taken during the days of unleavened bread, as Acts 12:3 states, then the Passover was already past and it would be trivial for verse 4 to say that Herod would bring him forth to the people after the Passover.

Easter, on the other hand, is a pagan holiday which periodically coincides with Easter...the reason why in Ac. 12:4 pascha is translated as Easter instead of Passover is that Passover was already past, but in that year the days of unleavened bread ended just before or at Easter time.

Will Kinney⁷³ is a staunch bible believer who has a somewhat different approach to "**Easter**" in Acts 12:4 than the foregoing writers cited but he nevertheless concludes that "**Easter**" is the correct reading in Acts 12:4. He also notes that *The KJV is not alone in translating this word as Easter. The Tyndale 1525, Bishop's Bible 1568, Coverdale 1535, Matthew's, Cranmer, the Great Bible (which preceded the KJB)...Martin Luther also translated this word as Easter. The Geneva New Testament was first published in 1557 and read "Easter" in Acts 12:4. When the Old Testament was published in 1560, the New Testament was revised and at that time "easter" was changed to "passover."*

In Sum – Why "Easter" is Correct

In sum, it may be concluded overall that "**Easter**" is correct because it fits the context of "**the days of unleavened bread,**" it matches Herod's Romish belief system and his desire to please Romans in Jerusalem, having already pleased the Jews with the murder of James, Acts 12:2 and it matches most English and German bibles compiled by faithful bible believers up to and including the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. Again, it should be noted that like all supposedly 'disputed' readings in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, God has not seen fit to oversee any change to these readings in 400 years, in any bible of any consequence with respect to the blessings of revival and reformation amongst the English-speaking peoples.

"Son" versus "Servant" and other Supposed KJV 'Errors'

Mr Amu e insists that *In Acts 3:15 [3:13] the word παιδα [paida] is translated 'son' by the KJV, where as [sic] the Greek reads servant/child. The Greek for 'son' is υιος [huios].*

Note that Mr Amu e allows that *paida* may mean "servant" NKJV in Acts 4:27, 30, or "**child**" 1611 Authorized Holy Bible in Acts 4:27, 30. Not all bible critics do. Consider this critic's statement⁷⁴ as follows.

"Your claim that modern renderings in these Acts passages [3:13, 26, 4:27, 30]...deny the deity of Christ should also be applied in consistency to the KJV in Matt. 12:18 since the underlying Greek phrase "Pais Theou" is exactly the same...The word "servant"...is a clear reference to the servant passages in Isaiah. The apostles had heard the Lord many times especially during the later part of his ministry, identify himself with the suffering servant figure. They were merely following him when they used the word "servant.""

So which 'textual critic' is the bible believer supposed to believe? Note Dr Gipp's experience⁷⁵, his emphases.

A self-impressed Bible scholar...was reading Romans 8. Upon reading a particular verse, he stopped at a particular word and stated, "Now the King James translators mistranslated the Greek word used here." Then he spent 10-12 minutes expounding on the merits of his choice of translation...

The very next day I was listening to another preacher on the radio. Coincidentally this zealot was also reading from Romans chapter 8. He **also** read the same verse and **ALSO** stopped at the very same word that the expert from the previous evening had accosted. He then stated, "Sadly, the King James translators did not properly translate the Greek word used here"...

But...**this** particular scholar pointed out that the word in question should have been translated an entirely different way...

He then, as the previous evening's butcher, expounded on the virtues of **HIS** choice over that of the King James translators, **or** last evening's expert. I was amazed! Two completely different men, two entirely different opinions. In fact, their **only** point of agreement was that the **Bible** could not possibly be **correct** as it was. I quickly consigned their esteemed (and humble) opinions to the garbage heap of education and accepted the choice that **GOD** had made for His Book in 1611.

A wise decision.

It should be noted that Matthew 12:18 is a quotation from Isaiah 42:1 "**Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles**" according to Matthew 12:17-18 "**That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall shew judgment to the Gentiles.**" The term "**servant**" is therefore rightly used in Matthew 12:18.

A search of the word "**servant**" in Matthew, Mark, Luke, John does not reveal any additional scriptures that specifically cross-reference with Isaiah 42:1, Matthew 12:17-18. The comment that "*The apostles had heard the Lord many times especially during the later part of his ministry, identify himself with the suffering servant figure*" is not supported by scripture.

Moreover, the expression "**the Holy One**" Acts 3:14 occurs 40 times in scripture, 30 times as "**the Holy One of Israel**" and in "**the old testament**" 2 Corinthians 3:14 the expression is always a reference to "**the LORD thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour**" Isaiah 43:3. See

"**the Holy One**" Job 6:10, Isaiah 29:23, 40:25, Ezekiel 39:7, Hosea 11:9, Habakkuk 3:3, Matthew 1:24, Luke 4:34, Acts 3:14, 1 John 2:20

"**the Holy One of Israel**" 2 Kings 19:22, Psalm 78:41, 89:18, Isaiah 1:4, 5:19, 24, 10:20, 12:6, 17:7, 29:19, 30:11, 12, 15, 31:1, 37:23, 41:14, 16, 20, 43:3, 14, 45:11, 47:4, 48:17, 49:7, 54:5, 55:5, 60:9, 14, Jeremiah 50:29, 51:5.

The context of Acts 3:13 and by extension that Acts 3:26, 4:27, 30 is "**the Holy One and the Just...the Prince of life**" Acts 3:14-15, making "**his Son Jesus**" Acts 3:13, 26 as in Daniel 3:25 "**Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God**" and "**thy holy child Jesus**" Acts 4:27, 30 as in Isaiah 9:6 "**For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace**" the correct expressions, not "**servant**." Note further.

Acts 3:13, 26

Concerning Acts 3:13, 26, the reading "**Son**" is found in the Wycliffe, Tyndale, Great, Matthew, Bishops' and Geneva bibles as "**sonne**," "**sonne**," "**Sonne**" in addition to the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. Coverdale has "**child**." How did all these translators manage to get the wrong reading? Answer, they didn't. Mr Amu   did.

Moreover, Dr Mrs Riplinger⁷⁶ states [*The modern versions*] use son for paida in John 4:51 in reference to the [*nobleman's*] son.

Mr Amu   in his third letter, page 2, point XIX of course insists that, his emphases Gayle (Gail) Riplinger's book is the most inaccurate book on the market filled with lies and false information. She

misquotes people and takes them out of context to prove a point. Check out the reviews about her book. A BOOK FULL OF FALSE INFORMATION.

You can almost hear the serpent's hiss. Naturally Mr Amu   does not provide any examples of *lies and false information* in Dr Mrs Riplinger's work. As for *reviews about her book* here is one by Dr Bouw⁷⁷, whose works have been cited earlier in this work. Others may be found on the same site.

A monumental piece of research work! I've sent copies to over a dozen skeptics and none have come up with any substantial arguments against Riplinger's work.

What sort of research into *New Age Bible Versions* did Mr Amu   carry out that was comparable to that of Dr Bouw? He should at least have made an attempt to do so, in view of the assertions he makes against Dr Mrs Riplinger's work. If he had done so, he would have seen that his dogmatic insistence in his third letter that *My final authority is the Masoretic and Received Texts, both that are inspired and preserved by God* in open defiance of the 1611 Holy Bible⁷⁸ is as the Lord said in Matthew 7:26 ***“And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand.”*** See also this writer's summary study⁷⁹.

James White makes similar charges against Dr Mrs Riplinger and *New Age Bible Versions*. I have addressed these charges as the separate study in my review of James White's book⁸⁰.

But we find that the NKJV has “son” in John 4:51. So do the Wycliffe, Great, Geneva and the Bishops' bibles with “sone,” “sonne,” in addition to the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew have “child.” Why doesn't Mr Amu   complain about the NKJV in John 4:51 and the other prominent English bibles? According to him, they are adrift from *the Greek*.

Dr Ruckman⁸¹ has these comments with respect to Acts 3:13, 26.

The word paida (Greek) has been translated “SERVANT” instead of “SON” (The King James text - “SON” - is found in Tyndale, Geneva, and the Bishop's Bible, so the word was not changed until 1881-1884 (RV) by Philip Schaff, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Sanday, Westcott and Hort.)

The first alibi given is that the word pais is translated in the Authorized Version as “servant” ten times; therefore why not here? The second alibi is that since the LXX...used paida for “servant” in Isaiah 42:1 and 52:13, the word should be inserted here. The third excuse given is that it would have to be huios (Greek), here, to be translated as “SON.” And the fourth excuse is that must ALWAYS MATCH ISAIAH'S DESIGNATION of the Messiah and, therefore, it has to be “servant.”

1. *NOT ONE TIME IN TEN...has the word pais been translated as “servant” where it was connected with JESUS CHRIST. Every one of the ten references was a reference to ISRAEL, or DAVID, or a HIRED SERVANT - Matthew 8:6, 8, 13; 12:18; 14:2, Luke 1:54, 69; 7:2; 15:26, and Acts 4:25.*
2. *How do we know that Origen, Philo, Symmachus, Aquila, Theodotian, etc., used the right Greek word in translating “servant” from Isaiah? And if they decided on pais, what of it? THEY HAD THE GREEK TEXT OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE (Acts 4:27, 30) ON THE TABLE WHEN THEY MANUFACTURED THEIR SEPTUAGINT. You can't find any “Isaiah Scroll” in GREEK, written before 100 A.D...What dunce couldn't write pais in Isaiah 42 and 52 after reading pais in Acts 4:27 and 3:13?*

\$10,000 reward for any accredited jackrabbit who can find any DIRECT REFERENCE to the “servant” of Isaiah 42 and 52 in Acts 3:13 or 4:27. Simon Peter isn't quoting one passage from Isaiah; SHOW IT TO US, SON!

3. *And why would it have to be huios to be “Son”? Didn't the (NIV translators) translate teknon (Greek for “child”) as “Son” in Matthew 21:28? YES, THEY DID. And did they not do it again in Luke 2:48? YES, THEY DID...If you don't keep YOUR OWN RULES, who is going to play by them? DO YOU THINK THAT GOD THE HOLY SPIRIT WILL?*

4. *Why did you pick “servant”, as Peter’s designation for the Messiah, when Isaiah has also said “SON” (Isaiah 7:14, 16) and “CHILD” (Isaiah 9:6) RIGHT IN THE SAME BOOK? “HAVE YE NOT READ?” Have ye never read? Have ye never read? (Can ye READ!?) If Peter was quoting Isaiah, which he was NOT, how do you know he wasn’t talking about the “Son” and the “child” of Isaiah 9:6?*

But the Lion of the Tribe of Judah is not through with the Conservative field mice yet. Notice the “clincher,” please! Romans 1:3, 4!

The context of Acts 3:13 is the Resurrection; look at verse 15. Christ was declared to be “THE SON of God” (not “the SERVANT of God”) by this transaction. Therefore, the substitution...is not merely unreasonable and inconsistent: IT IS NON-BIBLICAL.

Of Acts 3:26, Dr. Ruckman states:

Again we must note that the raising up of Christ from the dead (vs 26, “having raised up his Son Jesus...”) is connected with Christ’s SONSHIP, not His servitude. The word “servant” is out of place in either context (vss 13, 26), and you may disregard the scholarship of any man, college, institute, church, or university that recommends this kind of textual clap-trap.

Including Mr Amué’s.

John 1:3

Mr Amué states In John 1:3 the KJV says δια should read ‘by’. The correct reading is ‘through’ as in all Greek Lexicons or the [The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament].

Not according to the Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthew, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles, which all read with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. Again, how did all these faithful, bible-believing translators manage to get this particular meaning wrong? More will be said later about the trustworthiness, or otherwise, of modern Greek lexicons.

*Dr Ruckman⁸² has this over-arching comment with respect to meanings of prepositions. See the entire section, where the academic designated *our critic* repeatedly attacks the Holy Bible for its use of various prepositions.*

*Dr Ruckman speaks of *The approved legitimacy of the AV - by its enemies; those who tried to take it out of the hand of the student who enrolled - in choosing ANY way to translate a preposition, in view of the fact that most of them have five to ten meanings.* That is, even critics of the AV1611 have to concede that a Greek preposition may have several English equivalents, though not Mr Amué at this point.*

However, Dean Burgon⁸³, whom Mr Amué naturally only quotes on the exceptional occasion when Burgon disagrees with the 1611 Authorized Holy, has these comments about the prepositions “by” versus “through.”

*When [the present reviewer i.e. Dean Burgon] now for the first time reads (in Acts ix. 25) that the disciples of Damascus let S. Paul down ‘through [δια] the wall,’ he must be pardoned for regretting that the absence of a marginal reference to the history of Pyramus and Thisbe [characters in Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, who spoke to each other through a hole in a wall] in order to suggest **how** the operation was effected: for, as it stands, [also in the NKJV] the R.V. is to him simply unintelligible. Inasmuch as this basket...in which the Apostle effected his escape was of considerable size, do but think what an extravagantly large hole it must have been to enable them **both** to get through!...But let us look further...*

*(1st) These distinguished individuals [Westcott and Hort, pioneer authors of the Alexandrian Versions that Mr Amué declares to be corrupt, first letter, page 3, last paragraph] seem not to be aware that the properties of English speech forbid the use of ‘through’ (as a substitute for ‘by’) in certain expressions... Thus, ‘the Son of man’ was not betrayed ‘**through**’ Judas, but ‘**by**’ him (Matt. xxvi. 24: [also in the NKJV] Luke xxii. 22) [also in the NKJV]. – Still less is it allowable to say that a prophecy*

was... 'written,' **'through the Prophet'** (Matt. i. 22...) [also in the NKJV]. *'Who spake **BY the Prophets**' is even an article of the Faith...*

Burgon remarks upon the vacillation of the revisers in the use of **"by"** and *"through"* for *δια* in turn in Acts 2:43, 4:16, 2:22, John 1:3, 10, Colossians 1:16, 1 Corinthians 8:6, Hebrews 1:2. The NKJV avoids the vacillation by using *"through"* in each of those scriptures but thereby weakens the testimony of scripture to the Deity of the Lord Jesus **Christ** *"...the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God"* Revelation 3:14.

The modern translators of that day (1881 and the RV) did not know how to cope with the preposition *δια*. Today's modern translators (the NKJV etc.) are essentially no different. The King's men did and were.

Mark 2:15

Mr Amu  states that *In Mark 2:15 the Greek reads αυτος and cannot read Jesus (Ιησους) as the KJV claims.*

Although Wycliffe and Coverdale read *"he"* for the first **"Jesus"** in Mark 2:15, Tyndale, Great, Matthew, Geneva and the Bishops' bibles all say that *the Greek can read "Jesus"* in this place, along with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

The insertion of **"Jesus"** in this part of the verse actually clarifies the reading, which could be taken to refer to Matthew if the third person personal pronoun is used instead of **"Jesus"** because **"his house"** strictly refers to Matthew, **"who made him a great feast in his own house"** Luke 5:29. (A devotional point is possible with the reading **"Jesus"** instead of *"he"* in Mark 2:15 because **"Jesus"** should be invited to make every house **"his house"** including **"our earthly house of this tabernacle"** 2 Corinthians 5:1. But Mr Amu  would most likely not appreciate that slight digression.)

Although they are not aimed explicitly at Mark 2:15 in the RV, which reads *"he"* instead of **"Jesus"** along with the NKJV, Burgon's remarks⁸⁴ are again apposite, nevertheless, his emphases.

*A youth...has to be reminded of the requirements of the **English idiom**, and speedily becomes aware that the idiomatic rendering of a Greek author into English is a higher achievement by far, than his former slavish endeavour always to render the same word and tense in the same slavish way.*

But what supremely annoys us in the work just now under review is, that the schoolboy method of translation already noticed is therein exhibited in constant operation throughout. It becomes oppressive. We are never permitted to believe that we are in the company of Scholars who are altogether masters of their own language. Their solicitude seems to be twofold:- (1) To exhibit a singular indifference to the proprieties of English speech, while they maintain a servile adherence to...the Greek:- (2) Right or wrong, to part company from William Tyndale and the giants who gave us our 'Authorized Version.'

And the correct reading in Mark 2:15, which reading is undoubtedly idiomatic.

2 Corinthians 5:17

Mr Amu  states that *In 2 Corinthians 5:17...the Greek reads κτισις 'creation' and not 'creature' as the KJV claims.*

Along with the Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthew, Geneva and Bishops' bibles, *the giants who gave us our 'Authorized Version'* according to Dean Burgon.

The 1611 Authorized Holy Bible has *κτισις* or *ktisis* as **"creation"** in 6 verses, Mark 10:6, 13:19, Romans 1:20, 8:22, 2 Peter 3:4, Revelation 3:14. It has *ktisis* as **"creature"** in 11 verses, Mark 16:15, Romans 1:25, 8:19, 20, 21, 39, 2 Corinthians 5:17, Galatians 6:15, Colossians 1:15, 23, Hebrews 4:13.

The King's men were therefore familiar with both meanings of the word *ktisis* and used them as appropriate. Consider, for example, Mark 10:6.

“But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female” 1611 Authorized Holy Bible

But from the beginning of the creation, God “made them male and female” NKJV

Consider now Colossians 1:15

“Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature” 1611 Authorized Holy Bible

“He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation” NKJV

By inspection, both the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and the NKJV are correct in Mark 10:6 but the NKJV’s retention of “*creation*” in Colossians 1:15 forces what appears to be a paraphrase by means of the insertion of the word “*over*.” ‘The Greek,’⁸⁵ both Nestle’s New Testament, which underlies the ESV, NIVs, NASVs, NRSV i.e. *the Alexandrian Versions* that Mr Amué declares to be *corrupt*, first letter, page 3, last paragraph and Ricker Berry’s New Testament embodying Stephanus’s Textus Receptus, each reads the same in the last part of Colossian 1:15, i.e. *πρωτοτοκος πασης κτισεως* given as “*firstborn of all creation.*”

That is a literal reading, but one which substitutes the word “*creation*” for “***creature***” and thereby yields a nonsense reading because all of creation doesn’t have a ‘birth.’ Consider Job 38:28, Proverbs 8:26. God created all the parts of creation that are mentioned therein but they did not have a ‘birth’ or a ‘begetting’ as “***every creature***” does.

“Hath the rain a father? or who hath begotten the drops of dew?”

“While as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world.”

The NKJV’s insertion of the word “*over*” strongly implies that the word *επι* or *epi* should be in ‘the Greek,’ as in Matthew 24:47.

“Verily I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler over all his goods.”

But the word *epi* or “*over*” is not in the Greek for Colossians 1:15 so the NKJV is surely taking liberties with both ‘the Greek’ and the English, reinforcing the conclusion that the King’s men were correct in their choice of the word “***creature***” wherever it appears in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

Note that the NKJV reading cannot be excused on the grounds of idiom. The Lord is “***the firstborn among many brethren***” Romans 8:29 *who will be born by the Spirit* and therefore “***the firstborn***” of *new creatures*⁸⁶, 2 Corinthians 5:17 in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible but the NKJV has altered the meaning of the verse to imply the Lord’s oversight of all created things. Although the Lord Jesus Christ has such oversight, e.g. Psalm 148, the NKJV reading still implies that “*all creation*” has a ‘birth,’ which it does not and the reading thereby obscures the family relationship of the believer to the Lord Jesus Christ.

“For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren” Romans 8:29.

The NKJV is therefore wrong in *both* 2 Corinthians 5:17 *and* Colossians 1:15 – and in every other verse where it departs from the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, Mr Amué’s opinion to the contrary notwithstanding.

Finally, W. E. Vine⁸⁷, who is no friend of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, allows that *ktisis* can mean either “***creation***” or “***creature***” so it is strange that Mr Amué cannot make this concession.

John 1:18

Mr Amué’s objection to John 1:18 is as follows.

The word here is μονογενης [monogenes], which the KJV (and so does the NKJV) translates as ‘only begotten.’ Wrong translation. The word means ‘unique’ or ‘only.’ The KJV got its phrase from the Latin Vulgate – unigenitus (only begotten) and not from the Old Latin – unicus (only). The change from unicus to unigenitus was made by Jerome to counter the Arian view that Jesus was a created

being. *Jesus was never the begotten Son of the Father. This falls into heresy for it claims that Jesus Christ proceeded out of the Father.*

Mr Amué is in effect calling the Lord Jesus Christ a heretic.

“Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me” John 8:42.

Mr Amué is not alone in altering the meaning of *monogenes* or **“only begotten.”** James White⁸⁸ does so.

The translation “only-begotten” is inferior to “unique.” It was thought that the term came from μονος (monos), meaning “only” and γεννω (gennaō) meaning “begotten.” However, further research has determined that the term is derived not from γεννω but from γενος (genos), meaning “kind” or “type.” Hence the better translation, “unique” or “one of a kind.”

Our critic does likewise⁸⁹.

“Much scholarly discussion has centred around whether monogenes means “only begotten” or “only”...I am inclined to believe that the better translation is “only”, this indicating Christ’s uniqueness.”

The explanation for ‘the critics’ choice’ follows in sum in the next paragraph of that work, with updated reference.

Having insisted, along with Valentinus, Origen, Arius etc. [heretics who altered and/or approved of changing υιος [huios, “Son”] to θεος [Theos, “God”] in John 1:18] that John 1:18 should read “God” instead of “Son,” our critic CANNOT agree with “begotten.” The reason is clear. As Dr. Ruckman states⁹⁰: The teaching that Jesus Christ is a “god,” begotten in Eternity (or sometime before Genesis 1:1) is the official theology of the Jehovah’s Witnesses.

Before addressing Mr Amué’s supposed *wrong translation* in John 1:18, it should be noted that Dr Mrs Riplinger⁹¹ indicates that the pre-700 AD Anglo Saxon bibles and as this writer confirms the bibles of Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthew, Geneva and Bishops’ all agree with the AV1611 reading of **“only begotten”** in John 1:18 – representing the God-honoured, bible-believing textual tradition as providentially preserved from apostolic times and by *the giants who gave us our ‘Authorized Version.’*

To whom Mr Amué and a handful of other latter-day non-entities perceive themselves as superior. As indicated, Mr Amué despises Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work but he cannot refute the testimony of the English bibles that she cites, as this writer can confirm for Wycliffe to the Bishops’ bibles.

The following comments⁹² apply directly to Mr Amué’s supposed *wrong translation* in John 1:18, with updated references.

To return to “monogenes,” the TBS Article No. 58 The Only Begotten Son cites: Professor Cremer’s great Lexicon of N.T. Greek...as giving “monogenes” – “only-begotten.” Gail Riplinger⁹³ states: The Greek word preceding ‘Son’...is always “monogenes,” a two part word in which “mono” means ‘only’ or ‘one’ and “genes” means ‘begotten’, ‘born’, ‘come forth’. Buschel, in his definitive treatise on the meaning of the word ‘monogenes’ said, “It means only-begotten.” All inter-linear Greek-English New Testaments translate it as such.

Nestle is no exception and even Vine - no friend of the AV1611 - gives “only begotten” as the meaning of “monogenes”, adding that it “has the meaning “only” of human offspring, in Luke 7:12; 8:42; 9:38.”

*Our critic [along with Mr Amué, **“there is no new thing under the sun”** Ecclesiastes 1:9] then claims that the distinction between “only” and “only begotten” was not drawn “until Jerome’s Vulgate” which allegedly influenced “the KJV.” See Section 11.1. The TBS Article No. 58 flatly refutes this: The Old Latin translation was made not later than the 2nd century, and it is significant that the*

translators who were in a position to know how the word *MONOGENES* was understood by contemporary Greek Christians, rendered it *UNIGENITUS* - “only-begotten,” not *UNICUS* – “only”. It is therefore clear that the rendering “only begotten Son” in the Authorized Version is well supported by ancient evidence.

The Old Latin pre-dated Jerome by 200 years⁹⁴.

Dr Mrs Riplinger⁹⁵ writes further, her emphases, with respect to White’s, our critic’s and Mr Amué’s opinion of “**only begotten.**”

*There is a bird which is named the Phoenix...the **only one**...makes for itself a coffin of frankincense and myrrh...then dies. But as the **flesh rots**, a certain **worm** is engendered which is nurtured from the moisture of the dead **creature** and puts forth wings...It takes up that coffin where are the bones of its parent, and carrying them, it journeys...to the place called the City of the Sun.*

*This depraved pagan parody of the death, burial, and resurrection of our precious Saviour is given by NIV editor Richard Longenecker to ‘help’ us understand WHY the NIV [one of the Alexandrian Versions that Mr Amué declares to be corrupt first letter, page 3, last paragraph] translates John 1:14 and 1:18 as “One and Only” instead of “only BEGOTTEN” (see The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation, pp. 119-126). He points also to such occult literature as the magical papyri’s “One”, Plato’s (Critias) “one,” and the Orphic Hymn’s (gnostic) “only one”. He cites numerous other early Greek writers, like Parmenides, head of the Eleatic School. He brought **pantheism** to the West after his trips to India and initiation into the Greek mysteries. Do we look to a pantheist and their god ‘the One’ to alter **our** view of God?*

*Longenecker chides the KJV’s “begotten Son” because “it neglects the current [time of Christ] usage for the word.” Current usage amongst PAGAN OCCULTISTS should **not change** how Christians use words! He and the NIV translators have broadened the “semantic range of meaning” (Longenecker p. 122) to include the broad way that leadeth to destruction. The translators of the **King James Version** were so highly educated that they not only **knew of** these Greek quotes, but knew **who** Parmenides was and what he taught. They wouldn’t touch such pagan sources. Either the NIV translators are **ignorant** of the philosophies of those they cite, like Aeschylus, Plato and Parmenides, and the Orphic Hymns **or** they are **sympathetic** to such ideas...*

***Real** scholars like Buchsel (The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. IV, pp. 737-741) allot five entire pages of lexical evidence to the meaning of monogenes [the TDNT is one of Mr Amué’s ‘multiple authorities,’ first letter, paragraph 2. Why didn’t he cite Buchsel’s contribution for the meaning of monogenes?]. Buchsel proves that White’s “actual” definition of monogenes is **only** that of a **few** pagan philosophers. New version editors and advocates seem to pick the pagan lexical definition, time after time. (Imagine, for example, if 2000 years from now, a lexicographer reviewed our culture’s use of the word “love.” They would find the KJV’s definition of ‘charity’ **and** Hugh Hefner’s definition of ‘sex’.)*

Will Kinney⁹⁶ adds, with respect to “**only begotten**” versus “one and only,” *In spite of some Greek lexicons, like Thayer’s, which insist the meaning of monogenes is “unique” or “one of a kind”, there are many others like Kittel’s, Liddel and Scott and Vine’s that tell us the Greek word monogenes emphatically means “only begotten” and not “one and only”. It is significant that Thayer did not believe that Jesus Christ was God.*

In Kittel’s massive work Volume 4 page 741 the writer says: “In John 1:14,18; 3:16,18; 1 John 4:9 monogenes denotes more than the uniqueness or incomparability of Jesus. In all these verses He is expressly called the Son. (Notice he does not accept the false reading of ‘God’ in 1:18, and he states this on the previous page). In John monogenes denotes the origin of Jesus as the only begotten.”

Even the modern Greek language dictionary, which has nothing to do with the Bible, says that monogenes means “only begotten”, and not unique. The Greek word for “unique” or “one and only” is a very different and specific word - monodikos - not monogenes.

The translators of the King James Version were not unaware that monogenes can also be translated as “only” for they did so in Luke 7:12; 8:42; and 9:38, all of which refer to an only child and thus they were the only begotten, not an unique child.

Why didn't Mr Amué pass any comment on the different Greek words for “only begotten” and “unique”? He has already shown his eagerness for spotting different Greek words in the very same paragraph of his first letter.

In Acts 3:15 [3:13] the word παιδα [paida] is translated ‘son’ by the KJV, where as [sic] the Greek reads servant/child. The Greek for ‘son’ is υιος [huios].

Kittel is by no means a true bible believer – see Dr Mrs Riplinger's comments that follow – but even he does not subscribe to Mr Amué's reinterpretation of the meaning of the word *monogenes*.

A. Hembd⁹⁷ has these comments on the meaning of the term “*monogenes*,” his emphases.

A modern scholar, Richard Longenecker, has stated that monogenes in the Greek means ‘one and only of a kind’...Longenecker argues that monogenes is formed of two Greek words (which it is), with monos meaning ‘one’ or ‘only’ and genos ‘kind.’ Thus, says he, μονογενης means ‘one of a kind’ or a unique kind.’ Where we see monogenes huios, it properly means to Longenecker ‘the only and unique Son,’ whereas monogenes theos means to him, ‘the only and unique God.’ Thus, according to Longenecker and men of like sentiments with him, John 1:18 should follow the Greek of Vaticanus, but translating it in this way: ‘No man hath seen God at any time; the only and unique God, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.’

While we must commend Longenecker for seeing the impropriety of the ‘only begotten God’ rendering, we cannot agree with his defence of Vaticanus's reading of monogenes theos, and that, for the following...reasons.

*1. Genos (γενος) properly refers to an offspring whether literal or figurative. Thus monogenes would mean ‘a unique offspring,’ which also would then mean (as it always does in the New Testament) ‘only begotten.’ The Greek word genos, from which we get the word ‘genus,’ in its literal sense refers to the offspring of an ancestor, thus we see in the Greek of the New testament, Christ is referred to as the genos of David, that is, the offspring of David. We also see Israel referred to as the ‘stock’ or offspring of Abraham in Acts 13:26: ‘Men **and** brethren, children of the stock of Abraham,’ begins Paul in his address to the synagogue in Antioch of Pisidia. The word used for ‘stock’ is our word genos. He is calling them the offspring of David...*

*Genos may also refer to an offspring of a prototype, figuratively speaking, and thus to a ‘kind.’ However when genos is used to mean ‘kind,’ it always means that it is a **figurative offspring**, figuratively descended from a prototype of some sort. Our English word for ‘kind’ also follows this principle. Our word ‘kind’ comes from the Germanic word kint (pronounced kint), which means ‘a child’ [as in ‘kindergarten’]. Thus, our word ‘kind’ properly means a figurative child, that is, ‘a child of a prototype.’*

*2. But now in coming to the term monogenes, that term always means ‘only offspring.’ That term **always** is used in the New Testament to denote an only child...Michale Marlowe, though himself an advocate generally of the critical text, has also written a paper in which he shows that monogenes means ‘only begotten.’*

3. Athanasius and the Nicene Fathers, who knew the Greek of the New Testament far better than modern scholars do, being much nearer the period when that language was spoken, regularly referred to John 1:14, John 1:18 and John 3:16 as speaking of Christ as the only begotten Son. In speaking of Christ as monogenes huios, the Nicene Fathers referred to Christ as the only and unique offspring of the Father, and sometimes simply as the offspring of the Father.

*4. This being the case, along with the fact that genos **always** refers to an offspring of some sort, monogenes could **never** refer to God, or in no sense is God the offspring of another. God is not a kind descended from another prototype, for He is indeed the First Cause and Prime Mover of all things, as*

Aquinas rightly noted. Nor is the Godhead of Christ begotten. It is properly **only His Person** which is begotten. Thus, *monogenes theos*, as the Nicene Fathers rightly understood, cannot mean ‘the only and unique God.’ Rather, it would mean ‘the only offspring God,’ or ‘the only begotten God’ – and the phrase is at best a very harsh catachresis [perversion], and cannot be but offensive to orthodox ears.

Dr Thomas Holland⁹⁸ states with respect to John 1:18 that *The phrase in question is “the only begotten Son.” There are two variants here: one with the Greek text and the other with the translation. The Greek of the Traditional Text reads, “o monogenes eos” (the only begotten Son). The Greek of the Alexandrian Text reads, “o monogenes theos” (the only begotten God). Additionally, the Greek word “monogenes” is no longer looked upon as being translated as “only begotten” but is now considered better translated as “unique” or “one and only”...*

...all one need do is consult the Greek text of the King James Bible to see that the translators were not unaware that monogenes can be translated as “only” for they did so in Luke 7:12; 8:42; and 9:38. However, none of these verses deals with the person of Jesus Christ. Therefore, we see that the Greek word can mean “only” when dealing with humans, but when dealing with Christ it means “only begotten.”

Further, this is not only Biblical, but it is also clearly the historical understanding of both the passage and the translation of the Greek word “monogenes.” The Old Latin manuscripts read, “deum nemo uidit umquam. unigenitus filius. qui est in sinu patris. ipse narrauit.” The Latin word “unigenitus” means more than unique or only. My Latin dictionary from back in public school renders it as, “only begotten, only; of the same parentage.” (Dr. John C. Traupman, Latin Dictionary, p. 323). And Martin Luther translated the phrase in German as “der eingeborene Sohn”. Even without a knowledge of German, one can see that “eingeborene” means “only begotten.” As does the Spanish Reina-Valera in using, “el unigenito Hijo” (only begotten Son).

Dr Holland cites these early Church writers in support of *monogenes...when dealing with Christ... means “only begotten”*:

In 202 AD, Irenaeus...In 324 AD, Alexander of Alexandria...The context of the 5th Confession of the Nicene Creed (344 AD)...Athanasius (373 AD)...Ambrose (397 AD)...Augustine (430 AD) and concludes:

The point is that most of the early Theologians in the Church not only recognized that monogenes means “only begotten,” and defined it as such, but that the popular reading was “only begotten Son.”

Yet again, the 1611 Holy Bible, in this case concerning *monogenes* and John 1:18, is shown to be *right* and the critics, Mr Amu , James White, our critic, to be *wrong*.

More NKJV Readings versus the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible

Mr Amu  lists [eleven] verses you [i.e. John Davis] sent me to check up...I find no fault with the NKJV as translating them from the original language...Genesis 22:8; Ecclesiastes 5:8, 12:11; Isaiah 9:3; Ezekiel 23:6; Romans 1:18; 2 Corinthians 2:17; Colossians 3:1-3; 1 Thessalonians 5:22 and 1 Timothy 6:10, 20.

The readings from the respective versions are as follows. The reading of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is first, followed by that of the NKJV, the current online version. I will insert additional comment as necessary.

Genesis 22:8

“And Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering: so they went both of them together.”

“And Abraham said, “My son, God will provide for Himself the lamb for a burnt offering.” So the two of them went together.”

“God will provide himself a lamb” according to John 1:29⁹⁹, **“The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.”** The NKJV obscures the typology and detracts from the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The older versions, Wycliffe, Coverdale, Great, Matthew, Geneva and the Bishops’ bibles have various readings that are part-way between that of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and the NKJV, e.g. the Geneva has *“God will provide him a lambe for a burnt offering”* but *the Alexandrian Versions* that Mr Amu  declares to be *corrupt*, first letter, page 3, last paragraph, such as the ESV, NIVs, NASVs, NRSV, essentially follow the NKJV, e.g. the NIV has *“God himself will provide the lamb for the burnt offering,”* which reading destroys the typology just as the NKJV does.

Ecclesiastes 5:8

“If thou seest the oppression of the poor, and violent perverting of judgment and justice in a province, marvel not at the matter: for he that is higher than the highest regardeth; and there be higher than they.”

“If you see the oppression of the poor, and the violent perversion of justice and righteousness in a province, do not marvel at the matter; for high official watches over high official, and higher officials are over them.”

“Judgment and justice” can be perverted when a nation abandons the scriptures.

“And judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off: for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter” Isaiah 59:14.

“Righteousness” cannot be perverted because it is synonymous with the Lord Jesus Christ.

“But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption” 1 Corinthians 1:30.

The NKJV has cast a slur on the Lord Jesus Christ in the first part of its reading and obscured the Messianic reference in the latter part, as the following verses declare.

“This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones: to the intent that the living may know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men” Daniel 4:17.

“Therefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” Philippians 2:9-11.

Ecclesiastes 12:11

“The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies, which are given from one shepherd.”

“The words of the wise are like goads, and the words of scholars are like well-driven nails, given by one Shepherd.”

Dr Ruckman¹⁰⁰ comments as follows, his emphases.

*Notice the word “preacher” in verse 8, showing up again in verse 9 (“**the preacher was wise**”), and again in verse 10 (“**the preacher sought to find out acceptable words**”). This is in obedience to the commandment given by the apostle Paul, in 2 Timothy 2:13, to a young PREACHER. Then, it is this preacher who is identified in as “**the wise**” in verse 11, for it says: “**moreover, because the preacher was wise,**” in verse 9. This means that the PREACHER is one of the “**masters of assemblies,**” referred to in verse 11. (A church is a “called out ASSEMBLY”). In order to master an assembly, one must be able to get their attention, hold it, and keep it. While doing this, the speaker must edify, rebuke, correct, instruct, and motivate the assembly (“Tim. 4:2). This is **preaching**, in either Testament. (See*

the illustrations under 2 Tim. 4:2, in that Commentary). “Scholars” and “teachers” are found nowhere in the context of such an operation...

You don’t master any assembly unless you can **preach**. Hitler mastered “assemblies.” He was not a **teacher**...

The “**words of the wise**” are not only **nails**, but they are the **hammers** by which the **nails** are pounded in (Jer. 23:29). (ALL of the scholars, who professed to have gotten the “**words of truth**” from the “**shepherd**,” bombed out again. They couldn’t find the reference in Jeremiah. Standard, absolutely STANDARD. The “**shepherd**” showed them nothing. Why would He waste “words of wisdom” on hypocrites who are going to get rid of them?) These words are “**nails**” and “**goads**”; therefore, they mark those that are “nailed,” and they **stab** and **irritate** those who want to go in the wrong direction, or just stand still. That is what the ox goad is for. You can also **kill MEN** with an ox goad (Judg. 3:31), just like you can with a sword.

Observe that, according to the scriptures, you **KILL** people with Bible verses: “**I have slain them by the words of my mouth**” (Hos. 6:5). **Prophets** did this, not scholars. A Hebrew or Greek scholar couldn’t dent a beer can with a pick axe. All the scholars – all of them; **not one exception** – missed the scriptural cross references...

The NKJV reading is therefore greatly inferior to that of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. It even fails to identify who drove “the well-driven nails.”

Isaiah 9:3

“Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy: they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil.”

“You have multiplied the nation and increased its joy; They rejoice before You According to the joy of harvest, As men rejoice when they divide the spoil.”

Mr Amu  comments in some detail on this verse in his first letter. *The KJV reads “not increased the joy” and so does the Latin Vulgate. The KJV is wrong. The NKJV reads “increase (sic) its joy” and so does the Geneva Bible. It is interesting to [note] Charles Spurgeon’s note on this verse “Thou hast...increased the joy: they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil. – Isaiah 9:3. Notice that I make a correction in the version from which I am reading. The Authorized Version has it, ‘Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased their (sic) joy.’ This is not consistent with the connection; the Revised Version has very properly put it, ‘Thou hast multiplied the nation, thou hast increased their joy.’ I have not any learning to display; but I think I could show it to you...how the passage came to be read with a ‘not,’ and I could also prove to you that, in this instance, the revisers were right in making their alteration.”*

Charles Spurgeon would also have had to explain how “**the joy**” is altered to “**their joy**,” as found in the RV but left as “**the joy**” in the currently available Masoretic Hebrew-English Interlinear Old Testament¹⁰¹. Note that even the NKJV does not replicate this particular change as found in the RV.

Mr Amu  does not provide Spurgeon’s explanation of *how the passage came to be read with a ‘not.’*

It is a pity that he also did not see fit to provide Spurgeon’s overall evaluation¹⁰² of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and to explain why Spurgeon made such contradictory statements.

The Bible is God’s word, and when I see it, I seem to hear a voice saying, ‘I am the Book of God, man, read me; I am God’s writing: open my leaves, for I was penned by God’...I plead with you, I beg of you, respect your Bibles, and search them out. Go home and read your Bibles...O Book of books! And wast thou written by my God? Then I will bow before thee, thou Book of vast authority! For He has written this Book Himself...let us love it, let us count it more precious than fine gold!

Charles Haddon Spurgeon may be considered a seventh witness to the integrity of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. See quotations listed under **Revival versus No Revival** pp 3-4 of this work.

Doesn’t Mr Amu  know that “**A false balance is abomination to the LORD**” Proverbs 11:1a?

Moreover, Mr Amué's research into the pre-1611 bibles was noticeably slipshod. Contrary to his insistence that *The NKJV reads "increase (sic) its joy" and so does the Geneva Bible*, the Geneva Bible *does* contain the word **"not"** in Isaiah 9:3, in both the 1587, 1599 Editions¹⁰³. The Wycliffe "gladness," Great, Bishops' bibles also contain the word **"not"** though Great, Bishops', Geneva read *"their joy."* The Coverdale, Matthew bibles have the words **"not"** and **"the joy"** but turn the opening statement into a question. Though mixed, pre-1611 support for **"not"** is nevertheless appreciable.

Which rather leaves the NKJV out in the cold, along with *the Alexandrian Versions* that Mr Amué declares to be *corrupt*, first letter, page 3, last paragraph, as will be seen.

Inspection of the Septuagint¹⁰⁴ is interesting in this respect.

'The Greek' for **"not"** in the LXX is *ουκ* or *ouk* and this word occurs repeatedly in the New Testament. It is found a few verses further on from Isaiah 9:3 in the LXX, in Isaiah 9:12, 13, where the word **"not"** also occurs in the English Text for these verses.

But the word *ouk* does *not* appear in Isaiah 9:3 in the LXX. Nor does any equivalent Greek word appear for **"not."** This may explain the disappearance of the word **"not"** from Isaiah 9:3 in the modern versions.

The preface to the printed edition¹⁰⁵ of the NKJV states with respect to the Old Testament that, my underlining *The ben Asher text became in the twelfth century the only recognized form of the Hebrew Scriptures.*

Daniel Bomberg printed the first Rabbinic Bible in 1516-17; that work was followed in 1524-25 by a second edition prepared by Jacob ben Chayyim and also published by Bomberg. The text of ben Chayyim was adopted in most subsequent Hebrew Bibles, including those used by the King James translators. The ben Chayyim text was also used for the first two editions of Rudolph Kittel's Biblia Hebraica of 1906 and 1912. In 1937 Paul Kahle published a third edition of Biblia Hebraica. This edition was based on the oldest dated manuscript of the ben Asher, the Leningrad Manuscript B19a (A.D. 1008), which Kahle regarded as superior to that used by ben Chayyim.

For the New King James Version the text used was the 1967/77 Stuttgart edition of Biblia Hebraica, with frequent comparisons being made with the Bomberg edition of 1524-25. The Septuagint (Greek) Version of the Old Testament and the Latin Vulgate were consulted.

It may be therefore that the NKJV and the other modern translations justified the omission of **"not"** in Isaiah 9:3 by 'consultation' with the LXX. It is also possible that Mr Amué's insistence, first letter, page 2, paragraph 3 that *the Masorites made changes to the original text* comes from 'consultation' of the *Biblia Hebraica* where it reads differently from the ben Chayyim Text underlying the Old Testament of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. Dr Mrs Riplinger has informative comments about the *Biblia Hebraica* that will be studied later.

For now, summary comment on Isaiah 9:3 with updated references may be found here¹⁰⁶.

Isaiah 9:3

"Thou hast not increased the joy" AV1611

"You have increased their joy (or similar)" NIV, NKJV, NWT, JB

"Not" ("al") can be found in the Masoretic Hebrew Text. The verse is dealing with the restoration and suffering of Israel before the Second Advent, Zechariah 12, 13, a doctrine little understood by modern revisers.*

*The reading is actually לֹא or *la*, because Hebrew is read right to left like other Oriental languages such as Chinese, not left to right as in English. My apologies for this particular 'glitch' in 'O Biblios'.

Dr Ruckman has further detailed comment¹⁰⁷, his emphases. Note his references to *the Alexandrian Versions* that Mr Amué declares to be *corrupt* but with which he agrees with respect to Isaiah 9:3.

The word **“NOT”** has been slipped out of the text by the grossly corrupt “reliable translations” on the grounds that it must have “crept in”...from some other account. The old ASV, New ASV, old RSV, and New RSV all delete the [word] so that the verse will match the ignorance of their translating committees. On this verse, Evangelicals (ASV), Fundamentalists (New ASV), Conservatives (NIV), Communists (New RSV), and Liberals (old RSV) all reach ecumenical agreement in a sweet spirit of tolerance for **lying** and an intolerance of the Bible.

The problem was apparent to the Bible rejecting, Bible denying apostate Fundamentalists who believed in “the verbal inspiration of [Jimmy] Carter’s house cat.” How could the nation be **“multiplied”** without their joy being “increased”? Therefore the word **“not”** should **not** be in the text. So, in spite of the fact that the Hebrew Masoretic Text read **“NOT,”** some faculty members of Bob Jones, Pensacola Christian College...just pretended the word wasn’t there because they didn’t **“PREFER it.”** Typical: Alter the Bible text to match the ignorance of the faculty member.

Now, as we stated in our preface, this present book is written to show the superiority of the King James to Hebrew and Greek scholarship, especially the Evangelical brand.... Why should we change our thesis now simply because every single Christian educator connected with every translating committee since 1901 thought **“NOT”** should be taken out of the text? Well, we won’t.

1. God **INCREASES** the nation of Israel **without increasing their joy** (Isa. 26:15). As a matter of historical and Biblical truth, when the Lord increases them **BEFORE** the tribulation they would be doing anything but **rejoicing** for **“LORD, IN TROUBLE HAVE THEY...POURED OUT A PRAYER WHEN THY CHASTENING WAS UPON THEM”** (Isa. 26:16).

2. The Jews are to be increased as a multitude like the **“sand of the sea”** (Isa. 10:22) **BEFORE** they return as a remnant (Isa. 10:22).

3. By confounding this “increase” with the increase of Jeremiah 23:3 [**“And I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds; and they shall be fruitful and increase”**]¹⁰⁸ the apostate fundamentalists...determined they would alter the text of Isaiah 9:3 to match their own confusion.

Unable to master the most simple rudiments of prophecy (i.e. that 2000 years are often found following a comma or colon: see Gen. 3:15; 49:24; 49:11, etc.), the modern apostate Fundamentalists **subtracted** from the living words of the living God to line up with their own stupidity and to make you as stupid as they are. The colon in Isaiah 9:3 separates the church age from the Millennium.

Moral: The AV (1611) text is quite able to correct the faculty members of every Christian university and seminary in the world, and if their Greek or Hebrew texts are at fault, the Authorized English is quite able to straighten them out...

Once again, the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is *right* and its critics, including Mr Amué, are *wrong*.

Ezekiel 23:6

“Which were clothed with blue, captains and rulers, all of them desirable young men, horsemen riding upon horses.”

“Who were clothed in purple, Captains and rulers, All of them desirable young men, Horsemen riding on horses.”

Wycliffe’s Bible has the word **“iacinct”** in this verse, which word appears to be an early form of **hyacinth**, or deep purplish-blue¹⁰⁸. The Coverdale, Great, Matthew bibles have **“costly araye (array)”** without reference to colour. However, the Geneva and the Bishops’ bibles each have **“blue”** in agreement with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, showing that the description of the horsemen’s clothing in English was ‘colour fast’ by the latter part of the 16th century and up to 40 years before the publication of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, the Bishops’ Bible appearing in the year 1568.

Inspection of the Hebrew words translated as **“blue”** and **“purple”** in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is revealing.

The word translated as “**blue**” is תלכת, (I think!) with vowel points, or *tekeleth*. It appears 49 times in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and is never translated differently, although Young gives the word the meaning of “*violet*” in addition to “**blue**.” The word translated as “**purple**” in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is אַרְגָּמָן, (I think!) with vowel points, or *argaman*. It appears 36 times and is never translated differently in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

It is instructive to consider how NKJV and Green¹⁰⁹ translate these words in some sample verses. They read in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible as follows.

“**And blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair**” Exodus 25:4

“**blue and purple is their clothing: they are all the work of cunning men**” Jeremiah 10:9b

“**blue and purple from the isles of Elishah was that which covered thee**” Ezekiel 27:7b

“**These were thy merchants in all sorts of things, in blue clothes**” Ezekiel 27:24a

The NKJV has “*blue*” and “*purple*” in Exodus 25:4, Jeremiah 10:9, Ezekiel 27:7 in agreement with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible but changes “**blue**” to “*purple*” in Ezekiel 27:24.

Green has “*blue*” for “**blue**” and “*purple*” for “**purple**” in Exodus 25:4. He has “*violet*” for “**blue**” in Jeremiah 10:9 and “*purple*” for “**purple**” in the same verse. He then substitutes “*purple*” for “**blue**” in Ezekiel 27:7, 24 (and in Ezekiel 23:6) and “*violet*” for “**purple**” in Ezekiel 27:7, i.e. reversing the meanings, with respect to Jeremiah 10:9. He has therefore translated *tekeleth* three different ways and *argaman* two different ways.

Elsewhere, the NKJV reads “*blue*” in agreement with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, e.g. Exodus 26:1, 4, Numbers 4:6, 7, 9, 2 Chronicles 2:14, Esther 1:6, 8:15. Green has “*blue*” in all of these verses except for 2 Chronicles 2:14 and Esther 1:6.

Overall, it would appear from the 13 sample verses including Ezekiel 23:6 that modern versions such as the NKJV and Green exhibit some divergence from the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible with respect to the term “**blue**” along with repeated agreement, especially with respect to the furnishings of the tabernacle in the Book of Exodus. Exodus contains 34 of the 49 references to the word “**blue**” in the scriptures, or approximately 70%.

So the question arises, why the changes, where they occur, as in Ezekiel 23:6? Neither clarity nor accuracy is an issue and no particular ‘fundamental doctrine’ is at stake.

Dr Mrs Riplinger¹¹⁰ has provided a likely explanation, with respect to copyright. She is referring explicitly to changes in the NKJV from *simple one or two syllable Anglo-Saxon words to complex Latinized words* but the principle of the derivative copyright law would still apply even with respect to more elementary changes, such as “**blue**” to “*purple*.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger states, her underlinings.

The derivative copyright law insists that: “To be copyrightable, a derivative work [modern version] must be different enough from the original [1611 Authorized Holy Bible] to be regarded as a ‘new work’ or must contain a substantial amount of new material. Making minor changes or additions of little substance to a pre-existing work will not qualify the work as a new version for copyright purposes.

Mr Amué may despise both Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work but he surely cannot deny her statement of copyright law. Distinct changes in the text, even with respect to words for colours, will clearly assist in the compilation of a new version for copyright purposes. Note that the NKJV translators were evidently so pre-occupied with copyright issues, i.e. for maximum sales that they were even prepared to insert an incorrect translation in Ezekiel 23:6, 27:4, for the word *tekeleth*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger reports¹¹¹ an additional fact about the NKJV that Mr Amué would also no doubt find unpalatable. See **Figure 3 The Devil’s Counterfeit – the NKJV and its Masonic Logo**¹¹². The accompanying article by Terry Watkins is extremely informative.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states.

The NKJV logo is the ancient symbol for the pagan trinity – not the Christian Trinity. Use of number symbols (like this 666) can be traced back to Pythagoras (582 B.C.), initiate into the Egyptian mysteries. The symbol was popularized again by satanist Aleister Crowley (circa 1900) for the Royal Arch (Lucifer) of the 3rd Degree of the York Order of Masonry. The symbol's shape is duplicated as three initiates join arms and feet, while repeating the names of the ancient pagan trinity. The NKJV's symbol can be seen on satanic rock group albums like Led Zeppelin, as well as on New Age bestsellers like The Aquarian Conspiracy. Remember Acts 17:29: "We ought not to think the Godhead is like (anything)...graven by art..."

The same logo appears on the page facing the *Foreword to The King James Only Controversy*, by James White. Where does White's true allegiance lie? Or Mr Amué's?

Romans 1:18

"For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness."

"For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness."

Terry Watkins states with respect to the NKJV that *Romans 1:18: [changes] "hold the truth" to "suppress the truth" (ESV, NIVs, NASVs, NRSV, RSV)* and he reveals that the NKJV reading in most of the verses that follow in Mr Amué's list matches that of *the Alexandrian Versions* that Mr Amué declares to be *corrupt*, first letter, page 3, last paragraph.

James White¹¹³ has also joined in the attack on several of the New Testament verses that Mr Amué lists, because White tried ineffectually to refute Dr Ruckman's disclosures¹¹⁴ on the NKJV. Mr Amué's approval of the NKJV readings for these verses can therefore best be answered by addressing James White's attacks on the same verses.

White starts his attack with a quote from Dr Ruckman's comment on Romans 1:18 in the NKJV. The opening sentence is, author's emphasis, *It is proper to **hold** the word of God in unrighteousness as long as you aren't guilty of "suppressing it."*

White maintains that, his emphasis, *The Greek term is "katechonton," which means "to hold down, to suppress, to hold fast or firmly"...The KJV rendering...is still found to be inferior to the modern versions. "To suppress" is a perfectly acceptable translation of the Greek term, and it vividly displays the action of sinful man in **suppressing** the truth of God (which every man has) in unrighteousness. The plain translation "hold" does not express this action very clearly at all.*

Not even Vine¹¹⁵ explicitly includes "to suppress" as a meaning for "katechonton." This term appears to be an interpretation. Moreover, anyone who incurred the wrath of God for 'suppressing' the truth would be acting unrighteously by definition and therefore the expression "**in unrighteousness**" would be redundant.

But the expression is needed if "**hold the truth**" is the correct rendering, because it is possible to "**hold the truth**" in *righteousness*. Consider how Paul exhorts Timothy.

"Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus" 2 Timothy 1:13.

So White is wrong when he maintains that the modern translations *accurately render the Scriptures from Greek into English...[to] give the best translation of the Greek term that is possible [with] no conspiracies...just as the KJV translators would have wanted it.*

They clearly didn't want *the best translation* that White chose and Dr Ruckman¹¹⁶ explains why, his emphases.

[White] says that “suppress” should be “preferred” because...the KJV reading here “is still found to be inferior to the modern translations.” The truth is the “alternative reading” (AV) scared the pants off him. Anyone could prove that he was “holding the truth in unrighteousness” but who could prove that he or his buddies were “suppressing” truth? No one. **That was a safe reading**, so the scared sissy says: “it vividly displays the action of sinful man in **suppressing** the truth of God (which every man has) in unrighteousness.” Note! **He excluded all of his buddies!**

Three lies: (1) Every man certainly does **not** have the truth of God. Look at the passages (vss. 21, 23, 25-26, 28). Now look at John 10:26; Mark 12:24; and Isaiah 59:14. Not even the natural revelation of God in nature (Ps. 119; Rom. 1:19-20) is “HELD” by sinners, nor is it “suppressed.” **It is ignored.** (2) There is no “action” involved yet. There is no **action** when a man mentally suppressed the truth in his own conscience, or mind (see vs. 28). The man is **unrighteous** while **holding** “the truth of God.” (3) “Sinful man” was inserted because White had said (for 271 pages) **that every Bible perverter on every twentieth century Bible committee (ASV, NASV, TEV, NWT, NEB, RSV, NRSV, NIV, and NKJV) was a godly man who was trying to preserve God’s word accurately.** That obviously excludes “sinful man.” They were not “sinful”...

This time [White’s] “standard” for finding out the “intent of the original author” was **emotional panic**. His **heart** responded against the truth (Prov. 18:1-3), for “**as he thinketh in his heart, so is he**” (Prov. 23:7): not his HEAD. All scholarship only advocates are “**heady and high minded**” (2 Tim. 3:4).

Here are the four AV “variants” White rejected because they exposed his dirty rotten life which had been dedicated to justifying the sins of Bible-perverting scamps:

1. “To hold in a firm GRASP”
2. “To keep or RETAIN” (not “suppress”)
3. “To come into full POSSESSION”
4. “To have in FULL and secure POSSESSION”

Authorized Version, 1611: “**WHO HOLD THE TRUTH IN UNRIGHTEOUSNESS**”

An Alexandrian always chooses a “variant” that will **best cover up his sins.**”

The “variants” that Dr Ruckman lists match the primary meanings that Vine gives, namely, “to hold firmly, hold fast.”

So White is lying again when he states *This is all irrelevant to Dr Ruckman. Romans 1:18 says “hold the truth” because the AV 1611 says so, Greek notwithstanding.*

Mr Amu  is in good company. They are both of the company of Joshua 21:25 “**In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes**” and of Isaiah 14:14 “**I will be like the most High.**”

The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthew, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles all have the term “withhold” in Romans 1:18, a word that fitted the times when Rome and her allies could withhold the scriptures from ordinary believers, as in the case of Wycliffe’s Bible. It was common for Lollards, or bible believers who followed Wycliffe, to be burnt at the stake in England during the 14th and 15th centuries, along with any copies of the scriptures that they possessed, as Forbush¹¹⁷ notes.

When Lollardry increased, and the flames kindled, it was a common practice to fasten about the neck of the condemned heretic such of these scraps of Scripture as were found in his possession, which generally shared his fate.

The then Bishop of London, Cuthbert Tonsal^{118, 119}, seized and burnt the copies of Tyndale’s New Testament in 1526, in order to withhold them from ordinary Bible believers, although the Lord providentially used Tonsal to demonstrate the truth of Job 5:13.

“He taketh the wise in their own craftiness: and the counsel of the froward is carried headlong.”

Fox reveals that Tonal paid a merchant named Augustine Packington for the books, declaring, “Do your diligence, gentle Master Packington! Get them for me and I will pay whatever they cost; for I intend to burn and destroy them all at Paul’s Cross.” This Augustine Packington went unto William Tyndale, and declared the whole matter and so, upon compact made between them, the bishop of London had the books, Packington had the thanks, and Tyndale had the money.

Tyndale in the meantime had edited his New Testaments and with the money received from Tonal via Packington, he caused them to be newly imprinted, so they came thick and threefold over into England. Fox continues.

In short space after, it fortuneth that George Constantine was apprehended by Sir Thomas More, who was then Chancellor of England, as suspected of certain heresies. Master More asked of him, saying, “Constantine! I would have thee be plain with me in one thing that I will ask; and I promise that I will show thee favor in all other things whereof thou art accused. There is beyond the sea, Tyndale, Joye, and a great many of you: I know they cannot live without help. There are some that succor them with money; and thou, being one of them, hadst thy part thereof, and therefore knowest whence it came. I pray thee, tell me, who be they that help them thus?” “My lord,” quoth Constantine, “I will tell you truly: it is the bishop of London that hath holpen us, for he hath bestowed among us a great deal of money upon New Testaments to burn them; and that hath been, and yet is, our only succor and comfort.” “Now by my troth,” quoth More, “I think even the same; for so much I have told the bishop before he went about it.”

However, the term “**hold**” in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is now more appropriate to the end times, when the scriptures are readily available but are ‘held’ by bible critics who then corrupt them. See the comments on the next verse, 2 Corinthians 2:17.

2 Corinthians 2:17

“For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.”

“For we are not, as so many, peddling the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as from God, we speak in the sight of God in Christ.”

Terry Watkins¹²⁰ states, his emphases **2 Cor. 2:17**: *With all the “corruptions” in the NKJV, you’d expect 2 Cor. 2:17 to change. **IT DOES!** They change, “For we are not as many which **CORRUPT** the word of God” to “For we are not, as so many, **PEDDLING** the word of God” (ditto ESV, NIVs, NASVs, NRSV, RSV).*

James White¹²¹ attacks Dr Ruckman¹²² as follows with respect to the NKJV reading for 2 Corinthians 2:17.

White comments.

The NKJV simply translates the Greek text differently than the KJV, which has “corrupt the word of God”...The Greek term used here...is “kapeleuontes,” which literally means a peddler...One source [Louw and Nida, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains] defines it, “to engage in retail business, with the implication of deceptiveness and greedy motives – to ‘peddle for profit’”...Therefore we see that, in reality, the KJV rendering is inferior to all the modern translations...It is obvious therefore, that the NKJV translators are not seeking to give anyone an excuse to “corrupt” the Word of God, but are instead doing just as the KJV translators before them; seeking faithfully to translate the Word of God into English. Surely if the KJV translators were alive today they would gladly admit that “peddle” is a better translation than “corrupt” and would adopt it themselves.

White then launches into a tirade against Dr Ruckman and bible believers in general, his emphases.

*Nothing we have said is slightly relevant to the KJV Only advocate who follows the thinking of Peter Ruckman...What “kapeleuontes” meant to Paul or the original audience is **irrelevant**. Greek means*

*nothing. Greek lexicons mean nothing. The verse says “corrupt” in the KJV, and hence it **must mean corrupt**. Period, end of discussion. God determined what it meant when He brought the AV 1611 into existence and that’s it. Facts are to be ignored; those who present the facts are to be insulted, belittled and identified as “Alexandrians.” The tight circularity of the position is almost painful to behold...*

Once again, White denies that the AV1611 is the pure word of God and once again, he fails to specify any ‘bible’ which is the pure word of God but nevertheless, he insists that he is one of *those who present the facts* with respect to 2 Corinthians 2:17.

But has he? Note Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warnings about the unreliability of contemporary lexicons that follow but observe that they largely support the reading “**corrupt**” in 2 Corinthians 2:17, nevertheless, indicating that both James White and Mr Amu  are straw-clutching.

Dr Ruckman¹²³ responds as follows, his emphases.

When Jimmy hits that terror of all terrors (2 Cor. 2:17)...he justifies the perverted accounts (“peddle”) by deliberately omitting three-fourths of the definitions for the Greek word “kapeleuontes” found in Kittel’s Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Omissions mark Satanic scholarship.

*After telling you the AV reading (“**corrupt**”) is **inferior** “to all the modern translations” his only proof is that “one source says...” Well, why be “monolithic,” stupid? Let’s try another one. But before we give it, note this remarkable assertion based on nothing but White’s horror of the verse as it stands in the AV. He says “peddle is a better translation,” and if the KJV translators were alive today they would gladly admit it. Then, still unable to shake the conviction the verse got him under, as it stood in the AV, he limps off the stage by saying that if you follow the “thinking of Peter Ruckman” you ignore **Greek and Greek Lexicons**...*

No Greek lexicon, eh Jimmy? How is this; “TO CORRUPT OR ADULTERATE” (The Analytical Greek Lexicon, Zondervan Pub. Co., 1970, p 212). Ruckman ignores FACTS, does he Jimmy? It is “almost PAINFUL TO BEHOLD,” is it Jimmy? Well, you little foulmouthed, lying fakir, how about this one: “Deceitful...false...to misrepresent a thing...to FALSIFY THE WORD (as the kapelos purchases pure wine and then ADULTERATES IT WITH WATER)” (Kittel’s Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. 3, 1965, pp. 603, 605)...

*Paul is talking about “good, godly” scholars with “**good words**” and “**fair speeches**” using “**cunning craftiness**,” [Romans 16:18, Ephesians 4:14] etc. to **corrupt** what God wrote, and what He said. White, in his blind stupidity, forgot that **apocryphal books** had been written before Paul wrote, and were being written while he wrote. And the greatest **corruptions** of the New Testament which no one “peddled” [i.e. no-one “peddled” the New Testament] occurred between AD 50 and 190 while the New Testament was being completed. Those are historical facts known to every student of manuscript evidence on this earth...*

Now we read the final authority: Psalm 14:1, 73:8; Jeremiah 8:5, 23:36; Daniel 11:32; Matthew 7:17-18, 12:33.

Look at the context of 2 Corinthians, chapter 2, instead of a liar who would lie for fifteen cents.

1. Satan (vs. 11)
2. **Words** that are preached (vs. 12)
3. The word of God (vs. 17)
4. **Words** that are WRITTEN (3:1)
5. Words found in **epistles** (3:2-3)
6. **THE NEW TESTAMENT** (3:6)

Nobody was selling anything. No one was “peddling” God’s words. They were corrupting them.

Dr Holland¹²⁴ has these comments on 2 Corinthians 2:17.

The Greek word in question is “kapeleuontes,” and does mean a peddler or retailer. However, it connotes one who sells with deceit, a corrupter. Dr. Walter Bauer points out that the word came to mean “to adulterate” (A Greek-English Lexicon Of The New Testament And Other Early Christian Literature, p.403). Dr. Joseph Thayer agrees and states, “But as peddlers were in the habit of adulterating their commodities for the sake of gain... (the word) was also used as synonymous with to corrupt, to adulterate.” (Joseph Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon Of The New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Book, 1977 edition, pp. 324-325). And Dr. Gerhard Kittel states concerning “kapeleuontes;” “It also means...to falsify the word (as the “kapelos” purchases pure wine and then adulterates it with water) by making additions...This refers to the false Gospel of the Judaizers.” (Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. III., p. 605).

Note that the competing readings in 2 Corinthians 2:17 do not impinge on either Thayer’s Unitarianism or Kittel’s anti-Semitism. The meanings that they give for “kapeleuontes” should not therefore incur the bias about which Dr Mrs Riplinger¹²⁵ has warned.

Dr Holland continues.

The early Church Fathers understood the verse to refer to those who corrupt God’s word. Athanasius (373 AD) wrote, “Let them therefore be anathema to you, because they have, “corrupted the word of truth.” It is an Apostolic injunction, “If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.”” (Apologia Contra Arianos [Defence Against The Arians], III:49.) Gregory-Nazianzus (390) alludes to 2 Corinthians 2:17, Isaiah 1:22 and Psalm 54:15, using the word “corrupt:”

James R. White makes an interesting claim concerning this verse. “Surely” writes White, “if the KJB translators were alive today they would gladly admit that ‘peddle’ is a better translation than ‘corrupt,’ and would adopt it themselves.” (The King James Only Controversy, p. 114). In my critique of White’s book, I refer to such argumentation as “speaking for the dead.” It is one thing to cite those who have died and present what they themselves believed about a certain subject. It is quite another to draw conclusions for those who have died and insist that this would be their view if they were alive today. For the most part one cannot justly refute such invalid argumentation because those who have died cannot speak for themselves. However, this is not the case in this instance. One of the treasures left behind from the translators of the KJB are a few notes by Dr. John Bois, who helped in the translation of the KJB Old Testament Apocrypha and assisted in the final revision of the KJB New Testament (Romans through Revelation). In his note for 2 Corinthians 2:17 he wrote:

“Ibid. v. 17. kapeleuontes [being a retail dealer, playing tricks, corrupting] i.e. notheuonetes [adulterating]. kapelos is derived apo tou kallunein ton pelon [from glossing over lees] by corrupting and adulterating wine.” (the full note was written in Latin and Greek. Translating For King James, trans. and ed. by Ward Allen. Vanderbilt University Press, 1969, p. 51)

Apparently, the translators of the KJB were more aware of the meaning of the word than what James White and others give them credit. If we are indeed going to speak for the dead, we best learn to do so correctly.

They seem to have been more aware than either James White or his ally Mr Amué.

The Geneva Bible has “make merchandise of” in 2 Corinthians 2:17, which may reflect the connotation of the corrupt retail mentioned.

However, the Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthew and Bishops’ bibles all agree with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, Wycliffe having “do avowtry [adultery¹²⁶] to.” The others having “chop and change.” The reading of “**corrupt**” in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible thus has considerable, even if not unanimous, support from the early English versions.

Further support the reading “**corrupt**” in 2 Corinthians 2:17 comes from the work of Benjamin Wilkinson¹²⁷.

The fury of Satan, robbed of further opportunity to harass the Son of God, turned upon the written Word. Heretical sects, warring for supremacy, corrupted the manuscripts in order to further their ends.

Citing church historian G. P. Fisher, Wilkinson states:

“Epiphanius, in his polemic treatise the ‘Panarion,’ describes not less than eighty heretical parties.” The Roman Catholics won. The true church fled into the wilderness, taking pure manuscripts with her.

Citing Acts 20:30, 31, **“Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears,”** Wilkinson continues:

The Holy Spirit deemed it of high importance to put on record this prophecy, to warn us that even from among the elders or bishops there would arise perverse leadership.

Colossians 3:1-3

“If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.”

“If then you were raised with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ is, sitting at the right hand of God. Set your mind on things above, not on things on the earth. For you died, and your life is hidden with Christ in God.”

The Tyndale, Great, Matthew, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles all read with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible in the three particulars underlined. Coverdale has “*mynde*” in Colossians 3:2. Wycliffe approximates more closely to the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible than to the NKJV.

The ESV, NIVs, NASVs, NRSV, *the Alexandrian Versions* that Mr Amué declares to be *corrupt*, first letter, page 3, last paragraph, all match the NKJV in the expressions underlined in Colossians 3:1-3, weakening the testimony to the Christian’s resurrection as a present condition, altering “*affection*” to “*mind*” and weakening the testimony to the scriptural fact that the Christian is “*dead with Christ*” Romans 6:8 *now*.

It is “*those things above*” that should have the pre-eminence in the “*affection*” of the Christian, as the Lord Jesus Christ said in Matthew 6:21.

“For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.”

Dr Ruckman writes^{128, 129}, his emphases, *The passage [Colossians 3:1-3] is another touchstone which deeply grieves the “Christian” of the 20th century. You see, “affection” (vs 2 with Gal 5:24) deals with the heart, not the head. The puffed-up flesh-pots of Colossians 2:8 and 18 [by inspection, philosophers, deceivers, traditionalists, beguilers, idolaters and egotists] are majoring on the MIND, like the puffed-up flesh-pots who translated the ASV (1901). “For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also” (Matt. 6:21). The Lord is interested in the heart (Prov. 4:23) primarily, and the word always appears before the word “mind” in any list, except where the “newer translations” are mishandling the words of truth (see Prov. 23:26 in “The Bible Believer’s Commentary on Proverbs,” 1972).*

That commentary states *If God has your heart, you don’t have any problem at all understanding “the archaic, Elizabethan English” of the AV 1611. If God has your heart, you can smell the stink of an ASV (1901) as quickly as you can smell the stink of a paper mill.*

Or that of an NKJV.

1 Thessalonians 5:22

“Abstain from all appearance of evil.”

“Abstain from every form of evil.”

The Great, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles⁴⁶ agree with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, Wycliffe has an interpretative reading, “*evil spice.*” Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew have “*all suspicious things,*” which approximates well to the reading “**appearance.**”

Watkins¹³⁰ states that **1 Thess. 5:22** [changes] “*all appearance of evil*” to “*every form of evil*” (NASV, RSV, NSRV). Likewise the ESV and NIVs in effect, the *Alexandrian Versions* that Mr Amu  declares to be *corrupt*, first letter, page 3, last paragraph.

James White¹³¹ agrees with Mr Amu  with respect to 1 Thessalonians 5:22. White naturally insists that the NKJV, RSV etc. reading is superior to that of the AV1611, his emphases.

*The word... “eidos” can mean “form, outward appearance,” but it can also mean “kind.” The NKJV captures both possibilities with “form,” while the KJV’s rendering limits us to only one of the two possible meanings of the term. Again, the error of Dr Ruckman’s argument is plainly seen by simply reversing it: is the KJV trying to say it is OK to actually **do** evil as long as it does not **appear** that you are doing so? Of course not. The idea that there is some...conspiracy involved in trying to twist and change the teaching of Scripture is a common element of KJV Only writing...*

White’s argument disintegrates on examination of the context of 1 Thessalonians 5:22. The preceding clause in verse 21 states, “**hold fast that which is good.**”

That statement covers abstinence from “*every form of evil*” (and White’s proposition that the AV1611 might be taken to imply that *it is OK to actually do evil...*) but **not** “**all appearance of evil.**” Verse 22 must therefore read as it does in the AV1611 and not as in the NKJV.

Interestingly, the NKJV agrees with the AV1611 in verse 21, by translating “*katecho*” as “*hold fast.*” “*Katecho*” was the same word that White insisted should be translated as “*suppress*” in Romans 1:18, with which reading, as shown, Mr Amu  unequivocally agreed. In fact, the NKJV agrees with the AV1611 in each of the other four passages in which “*katecho*” is found, Romans 7:6, Hebrews 3:6, 14, 10:23 or in five verses out of six, overall.

Only in Romans 1:18 does the NKJV resort to the interpretive rendering “*suppress.*”

That observation certainly lends weight to Dr Ruckman’s conclusion. See foregoing remarks with respect to Romans 1:18.

*An Alexandrian always chooses a “variant” that will **best cover up his sins.***

Vine¹³² on this occasion agrees with White with respect to 1 Thessalonians 5:22.

He states Eidos...has a somewhat different significance in 1 Thess. 5:22, in the exhortation “Abstain from every form of evil” ...not “appearance,” A.V. This meaning was common in the papyri, the Greek writings of the closing centuries, B.C., and the New Testament era...

Vine’s comment is most revealing. Its significance will be considered in more detail later.

Dr Ruckman responds¹³³, his emphases.

This time [1 Thessalonians 5:22] there are no “textual variants” so, according to White’s rule (which he set up himself)^{134} he has to accept the reading (edios) but he doesn’t dare, for after all, his object...was to get rid of **one** Book. So he says the NKJV should be accepted here instead of the AV [because]...The NKJV reading “every kind [form] of evil” is “more inclusive” than “**Abstain from all APPEARANCE of evil.**”*

Lied again. *There isn’t an English dictionary in print that would make “form” include all appearances although appearances can include all forms, plus suspected forms. “Appearance” covers everything; covers good that can be evil spoken of (Rom. 14:16), and “form” doesn’t...Romans*

14:16 covers good that looks like evil...If all you did was abstain from “FORMS” you could sit on the curb and drink water out of a Four Roses’ whiskey bottle. Such action is not “evil.” But it **appears** to be evil...

*In the **vast majority** of the writings of Paul (or any other writer of scripture) we **can** determine exactly what was originally written **because there are no textual variants to hinder us from doing so!**

Dr Ruckman has these additional comments¹³⁵ on 1 Thessalonians 5:22, his emphases.

*The Holy Bible is saying that avoiding “evil” – any FORM or any KIND of evil – does no good if you fail to avoid **appearing** to be evil or **appear** to be doing evil...*

*This abortion of the truth was first slipped into English Bibles by Westcott and Hort back in 1881...between nine and twenty-one years before the **King James Bible** showed up; the correct reading is found in the **Great Bible**, the **Geneva Bible**, and the **Bishops’ Bible**. Tyndale, clear back eighty-six years before 1611, had a grasp of the “original Greek” that was denied to the apostate corrupters of the RV, RSV, NRSV, NKJV, ASV, NASV, and NIV...He says you are to “abstain from all **SUSPICIOUS** things” [also the reading of the Coverdale and Matthew Bibles]. That is **exactly** the “intent of the original author.” The new versions give you the intent of a **backslidden, carnal Christian** who wants freedom to do ANYTHING as long as it isn’t “evil”...*

*With [the new versions], any Christian boy could let his hair grow to his shoulders [like Absalom, 2 Samuel 14:26], put a ring in one ear, and then dress up in baggy pants and put on a T-shirt saying “Life is a Beach”; and as long as he is not **doing** “evil,” he is all right.*

Though the brother “**clean escaped from them who live in error**” 2 Peter 2:18b that “**stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak**” Romans 14:21b through the longhair’s unscriptural appearance is clearly not all right. It is instructive that the RV, RSV, NRSV, ASV, NASVs, ESV, NIVs omit the words “**or is offended, or is made weak**” along with the NWTs New World Translation and the NKJV disputes them in its margin. The JB, NJB Jerusalem Bible and New Jerusalem Bibles contain the words with alteration. Dr Ruckman continues.

*The Greek word here...can mean “external **appearance**,” just as quickly as “form” or “kind.” In 2 Corinthians 5:7, it is used as “form” in the sense of “sight” and “**perception**” – i.e. **what APPEARS before your eyes** (Analytical Greek Lexicon, Zondervan, 1970, p. 117).*

Dr Ruckman’s comments show that White has not consulted enough lexicons. Perhaps he stopped when he found some that contradicted the AV1611.

Dr Ruckman adds¹³⁶, his emphases, *Every apostate Fundamentalist took the word “**APPEARANCE**” and wrote down “forms” or “all kinds” or “every kind” or “every form of evil.” They all allowed you the liberty of APPEARING as a hippy, lesbian, lush, pimp, whore, embezzler, thief, extortioner, Bible perverter, adulterer, or queer as long as YOU WEREN’T ONE.*

Sincerity? What is THAT to an Alexandrian?...

*[Do you know] what εἶδος (eidous) means, among “other things”?...It means “**APPEARANCE, shape, or fashion.**” If you had corrected the ASV, RV, RSV, NASV, NIV, and NRSV [and ESV, NKJV] with the AV on the grounds that none of them were better translations of “the Greek text,” you would have been right, and **they** would have been wrong. Par for the course.*

1 Timothy 6:10, 20

“For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows...O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called.”

“For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil, for which some have strayed from the faith in their greediness, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows...O Timothy! Guard what was

committed to your trust, avoiding the profane and idle babblings and contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge."

The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthew, Geneva and Bishops' bibles all agree with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible in 1 Timothy 6:10, 20, except that Wycliffe has "*cunning*" instead of "*science*" in 1 Timothy 6:20, which is not so wide of the mark.

Watkins¹³⁷ states that, his emphases **1 Timothy 6:10: The NKJV changes "For the love of money is the root of all evil:" to "For the love of money is a root of all **KINDS OF** evil". The words "**KINDS OF**" are found in NO Greek text in the world! Where did they get them? **Straight from the NIV, NASV, NRSV! 1 Tim. 6:20: [changes] "science" to "knowledge" (ESV, NIVs, NASVs, RSV, NRSV).****

The words "*kinds of*" are not found in either Nestle's Greek Text or Ricker Berry's Edition of Stephanus's Greek Textus Receptus. The words are an unwarranted insertion in the modern versions, i.e. a paraphrase.

James White¹³⁸ writes as follows with respect to 1 Timothy 6:10, his emphases, *First, is the love of money **the** root of evil, or **a** root of evil? Secondly, is it a root of **all** evil, or of **all kinds** of evil? He maintains that The word for "root" in the Greek does not have the article before it, hence the more literal translation...would be "a root," not the definite **the** root. The text is not saying that the love of money is the **only** origin or source of evil, but that it is **one** of great importance...Literally the Greek reads "of all the evils," the terms being plural...The KJV translation is a possibility grammatically speaking, but it seems to miss Paul's point. The love of money gives rise to **all sorts** of evil things, but there are, obviously, evils in the world that have nothing to do with the love of money...it is difficult to see how rape, for example, can be blamed on "the love of money."*

White¹³⁹ takes Dr Grady¹⁴⁰ to task because he focuses upon this passage to accuse any and all modern version publishers of only seeking to make a profit.

White neglected to include the citation by Dr Grady of the independent witness, his emphases, whose report entirely justifies Dr Grady's reference to the NKJV reading for 1 Timothy 6:10.

*A Newsweek article about [Thomas Nelson Publisher's] president, Sam Moore, entitled "He Reaps What He sows" was "right on the money." "The business is blessed by its recession-proof nature. Unlike other products, the Good Book sells particularly well in tough economic times. And Nelson, which distributes its Bibles largely through Christian bookstores, has left no stone unturned. **The company publishes seven of the nine major translations of the Bible** and presents them in 650 different styles...It's all in keeping, [Moore] says, with his mission to "honour God, serve humanity – and enhance shareholder value."*" As Wall Street might say, Amen.

The motives of the modern translators have been summarized elsewhere¹⁴¹, including comments with respect to inclusion of the definite article for "**the root**" and in other passages of scripture where it is not in 'the Greek' but should be in 'the English' for accurate translation, in order not to miss Paul's point or that of any other biblical writer.

It never seems to occur to bible critics like James White or Mr Amué that matters such as the absence (or presence) of articles in *the Greek* and *the more literal translation* versus a more precise though idiomatic translation would have been elementary to scholars of the calibre of the King's men. For that reason, their comments often seem to reflect what Burgon¹⁴² termed *the schoolboy method of translation*. See p 29 of this work.) The summary follows, with updated references.

Our critic's next "wrong inclusion" is in 1 Timothy 6:10, where "the root of all evil", AV1611, should be "a root of all kinds of evil" as in the NIV, NWT, Ne and the renderings of the other Greek texts. The JB has "the root of all evils."

The modern alteration is not surprising because like all modern versions, the NIV is bound by Copyright. Gail Riplinger states¹⁴³: At the root of all the rhetoric about the need for new versions lies the true cause - covetousness...The KJV [Text] is the only version not bound by a copyright. No author or publisher receives a royalty because God is the author. However, "God is not the author of

confusion” (1 Corinthians 14:33) or of “commercial ventures.” The latter term was used to describe the ASV (NASB, Living Bible), RV (RSV) and ‘New’ Greek Text by Philip Schaff the chairman of their American Committee...

The autobiography of J. B. Phillips (NASB Interlinear Greek-English New Testament Forward, J. B. Phillips Translation, Living Letters et al) likewise lays bare his beliefs (about his billfold). He not only expects to receive royalties from the sale of these versions but those who use “extended quotes”...must expect to pay a proper copyright fee.

Is it any wonder new version editors twist or water down verses which warn of seeking wealth? 1 Timothy 6:10 is just such a verse.

Pastor Rockwood of Halifax, N.S., Canada cited *The Wall Street Journal*, Nov. 16th, 1978 in his review of the NIV: “Zondervan Corp. believes it has struck a new vein of gold in an ancient and well-mined lode: the Bible. Accordingly, it told analysts here, it raised its already-gleaming sales and earnings forecasts...Zondervan raised its earnings prediction 10 cents a share, to \$1.85, and its sales prediction \$3 million to \$41 million, for the year.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger¹⁴⁴ has this comment on White’s notion of crimes that supposedly *that have nothing to do with the love of money*. Her observations reflect a much more realistic worldview than that of James White.

She also has an incisive answer to White’s supposition of what should be derived from *the Greek*.

Speed reading 1 Tim. 6:10 brings White to his dead end conclusion. “[I]s the love of money the root cause of rape?” [White misreads] the word ‘ROOT’ (R-O-O-T) as the word ‘cause’ (C-A-U-S-E)...A root is not a ‘seed.’ A seed generates or ‘causes’ something; a root merely acts as a vehicle for feeding. The pornography, movie, fashion and advertising industry and their “love of money” are at the root. This root “leads into temptation” man’s sinful nature. This nature is ready and willing to bear evil fruit; the desire for gain inspires (or is at the root of) the tempters.

Also the new versions’ addition of the word “kinds of” does not occur in any Greek text. “Evil” is plural, disallowing their interpolation and implying all.

Dr Ruckman¹⁴⁵ has these comments on 1 Timothy 6:10, his emphases.

1. Every piece of communist literature on both sides of the Atlantic can be traced to **that** root...the Bilderbergers, the international bankers, the Illuminati, the House of Rothschild, and the whole BANKING system – with all financial wars, financial crime (the Mafia, the Cosa Nostra, etc.), all financial communist cells, and all financial revolutions – were MONEY-MAKING jobs. **THE LOVE OF MONEY IS THE ROOT OF ALL EVIL**, and never has been only A ROOT OF ALL KINDS OF EVIL...

2. Is there **unemployment** in your area? Do teenagers roam the streets because they have nothing to do? Are there **riots** and **demonstrations** because white people won’t hire black people? ...Behind the unemployment lies FDR, the “New Deal,” President Wilson, the Federal Reserve Bank, Carter, Kennedy, and Eisenhower with the Federal takeover. Martin Luther King Jr. was PAID to stir up a following to burn \$40,000,000 worth of property. He paid more income taxes in a year than most of you do in FIVE...

3. Are the Jehovah’s Witnesses rampant in your area? Do you have trouble with Mormons and Catholics? Are the Christian bookstores in your area flooded with various perversions of the Bible that back these cults up in their false doctrines? Well, where do phony “Bibles” come from? They are **published** are they not? **Are they not published to SELL?** ... “THE ARTICLE IS NOT IN THE GREEK TEXT OF 1 TIMOTHY 6:10”? Do you suppose anyone who has seen every reviser and every translator in the world INSERT ARTICLES where they are not “in the Greek text” through a period of 100 years, thinks YOU are sane or honest? Why is America flooded with trash called “reliable versions” (NASV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, NEB, NWT, TLB) which divide the body of Christ into fragments? Easy: **it’s a paying operation**. Sin pays. It pays in hard, cold **cash**...

4. Do you find 600,000,000 Mariolaters in Ireland, Italy, Spain, Canada, Mexico, and South America? ...Statues of “Mary” SELL. Beads sell. Go to Lourdes, Guadeloupe, and Fatima, and see if they do. Who was it that taught these people they had to believe such blasphemy to be “apostolic Christians”? Easy: some people that wanted their support and their income. The Vatican Billions (Avro Manhattan) lists and documents the income of the Vatican State. It is the richest corporation on the face of this earth, and no American or British “Imperialist” could touch it when it came to FINANCIAL RAPE of foreign populations. The Dark Age “Peter’s Pence” that built cathedrals was a money operation: so was the selling of indulgences and the purchase of church offices (simony).

5. ...Why does Bob Jones III want to be “identified” with a Book he doesn’t **believe** is the word of God? Easy: to get **more students**, and to sucker parents who will trust him and send their kids to his school. **“FOR THE LOVE OF MONEY IS THE ROOT [NEVER, NEVER “A” ROOT] OF ALL EVIL...”**

6. There are active, in America, three major TV networks whose only occupation 365 days a year [is] to create dissatisfaction and covetousness (Luke 16:14-15) in the hearts and minds of the people who watch them. Make no mistake about it; any man or woman who watches TV more than sixty minutes a day is getting brainwashed into WANTING things that cost **money** that he or she does not have. Whether this be a good-looking belly dancer, a prostitute, a new car, a fur coat, a new set of tools, a trip to Hawaii, a case of beer, some good-looking boy friends, an insurance policy, “more jobs,” or “more government handouts”: it is one ceaseless barrage from sunrise to midnight to the effect that you **NEED WHAT YOU DO NOT HAVE**...Television is the resurrected ghost of Karl Marx sitting in your living room...

With respect to the absence of the definite article in *the Greek* in 1 Timothy 6:10, Dr Ruckman cites 1 Corinthians 2:16, where the scholars inserted a definite article, Hebrews 2:9, where the scholars inserted *two* definite articles and Luke 1:17, with *four* definite articles inserted, all of which *are found in no copies of Greek manuscripts from any set of manuscripts found in any “family” of manuscripts.*

1 Timothy 6:10 does not differ grammatically from those cases. Dr Ruckman concludes, his emphasis, *5000 Bible perverters were brought under conviction by the **King James** text, and set about to get rid of it for personal reasons.*

5001, including James White. 5002, including Mr Amué.

Dr Ruckman¹⁴⁶ has these additional comments on 1 Timothy 6:10, his emphases.

But there is “no article in the Greek,” so we must drop the revelation of the AV and accept the unenlightened renderings of the ASV, NASV, NIV, RSV, NRSV, and NKJV: this must be done to cover the sins of the translators. Money can only be “A ROOT” of “all kinds of evil,” if you are a Greekolator, or a Manuscriptolator...the apostate reasons that since sin was first found in Satan, that PRIDE must have caused more sin than “the love of money,” and since Eve sinned with her mouth before there were any dollars, pounds, marks, pesos, francs, or lira around, the Holy Bible just couldn’t be true...

Well, thank God for the advanced – and I do mean “ADVANCED” – revelation of the Holy Bible (AV 1611). It states that “the love of money” (covetousness) “is” (present tense) “the ROOT” (not the source or cause) “of all evil” in the present world system (when Paul wrote). He didn’t say that the love of money was the first sin committed. He did not say that “the love of money” WAS the root of original sin. He said “THE LOVE OF MONEY IS THE ROOT OF ALL EVIL”...

Dr Ruckman furnishes many examples in support of the reading in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible for 1 Timothy 6:10, from *this love that put fifty English translations on the market in forty-five years with the lying alibi that the English language got “archaic” EVERY YEAR* to the battle for the sea shipping lanes (oil, minerals, etc.) and the murders in South Africa, Israel, and Ireland (1989) that are connected with **“THE LOVE OF MONEY”**...

And he concludes that, his emphases *The context of this remark is the evil that takes place in the life of the child of God where it is connected with **material things** because our modern apostate Fundamentalists believe “**THAT GAIN IS GODLINESS**” 1 Timothy 6:5. It is not surprising that the NKJV, along with the ESV, NIVs, NASVs, NRSV, changes 1 Timothy 6:5 as well, to read, “men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth, who suppose that godliness is a means of gain” instead of what it actually states, “**men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness.**”*

Modern fundamentalists can easily dissociate themselves from the implications of the NKJV reading but *not* those of the reading of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

Dr Ruckman¹⁴⁷ has these comments with respect to 1 Timothy 6:20, his emphases.

The “New” King James Bible: “avoiding...contradictions of what is falsely called KNOWLEDGE.”

*You mean “**SCIENCE**”? Ah no! The sacred word cannot be uttered! People would think they were “unscientific” if they believed the **Holy Bible**. And what could be more “unscholarly” than that?...*

*The sacred cow [of science] must be protected at all cost. It is more precious than Aaron’s golden calf, more valuable than Dagon’s bust (1 Sam. 5), more sacred than the **Holy Bible**, so it must be guarded and kept more carefully than THE FUNDAMENTAL TEACHINGS OF THE BIBLE.*

*If the reader would like to see “the other side of the coin,” let him obtain the publication of 1985 Bible Baptist Bookstore) called *The Christian’s Handbook of Science and Philosophy*, and he will find 150 pages devoted to proving that not **one** scientist who ever lived ever discovered and produced **one thing** for mankind that enabled mankind to solve **ONE MAJOR PROBLEM** that has existed since 4000 BC: poverty, famine, war, sin, death, religious disunity, and economic disasters. In 6000 years, **all** of the scientists who ever lived, **combined** with all of their researches, studies, findings, inventions, documented facts, and discoveries have never been able to do **one thing** for the human race other than make pain a little more tolerable for those who had enough money to pay for the gas, pills, and anesthesia. Outside of **THAT**, “progress” has been stuck in the mud “hubcap high to a ferris wheel.” (For absolute documentation, see *The Christian’s Handbook of Science and Philosophy*.) Not one Christian who reads this book has time to take off his hat to **science** (or scientists) one time in a lifetime. There is no purpose at all in making a respectable object out of it, let alone a sacred cow. **SCIENCE IS A CLOWN...***

Dr Ruckman refers, his emphases, to the *scientific principles of higher criticism and the great, scientific principles of textual criticism*. Any bible critic who worshipped at the altars of these principles would certainly object to the reading “**science falsely so called**” in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. Dr Ruckman continues, identifying the original source of the modern reading.

*The nineteenth century Christians who altered the text (RV, following the Jesuit Rheims Bible of 1582)...had the word “**SCIENCE**” in all of their English AVs as it was first written in the first edition of 1611. They simply thought they were smart enough to get rid of it. They did, and swallowed Paley, Huxley, Darwin, Marx, Lenin, Engels, “Strata” Smith, Lyell, and Haeckel like drunks going after a martini. They got their reward: the Franco-Prussian War, two World Wars, Korea, Vietnam, and three World wars coming up. “**SCIENCE**” IS A SILLY, IMMOBILE ASS THAT MAKES A LIVING BY PRETENDING TO BE MOVING HUMANITY FORWARD.*

As in the case of the bible for the mission field, namely the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, pp 8-9 of this work, Dr Ruckman sees the big picture. Mr Amué does not. Nor is he apparently aware of the sinister Jesuit source for the modern reading “*knowledge*” as found in the NKJV, in agreement with *the Alexandrian Versions* that Mr Amué declares to be *corrupt*, first letter, page 3, last paragraph.

Good Lexicons (?)

After listing these verses, Mr Amu   urges that they be rechecked *from the original languages and use a good lexicon like Brown/Drivers (sic)/Briggs and Thayer's* first letter, page 2, paragraph 1.

Dr Mrs Riplinger¹⁴⁸ has detailed and extensive comments, her emphases, about the reliability of most currently available *good lexicon[s] like Brown/Drivers (sic)/Briggs and Thayer's*. Mr Amu   may dismiss Dr Mrs Riplinger's work out of hand like he did her book *New Age Bible Versions* but that kind of dismissal would not constitute refutation.

Greek & Hebrew Lexicons and Editions

Q What Greek and Hebrew lexicons, grammars, interlinears or study and translation aids do you recommend for studying or translating new foreign versions, considering the corruption in lexicons by James Strong (Strong's Concordance), Vine, Zodhiates, Thayer, Gesenius, Brown, Driver, Briggs, Bauer, Danker, Arndt, Gingrich, and others?

A *My upcoming new book, Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers: The Voice of Strangers, is subtitled, The Men Behind the Smokescreen, Burning Bibles Word by Word (possibly ready in 2008). It documents the heresies held by Strong, Thayer, Liddell, Scott, Moulton, Milligan, Gesenius, Brown, Driver, Briggs, Bauer, Danker, Arndt, Gingrich and others. Their beliefs are shocking. The Bible teaches that "man's wisdom" is "not" to be our tool for Bible study; spiritual things must be compared within one's own Holy Bible. "[N]ot in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual" (1 Cor. 2:13). There are no safe and reliable sources available today, outside of the Holy Bible, that can be used for Bible study or translation work. (Even the Oxford English Dictionary defines words using old Bibles.) I say this after spending hours upon hours each day, for the last 20 years, researching the authors and texts of these 'so-called' study tools. God warns: "...for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it." Ex. 20:25. Lexicons are dictionaries which purport to 'define,' in English, the 'original' Greek and Hebrew words of the Bible. They are all marred by corrupt Greek and Hebrew texts. They define words based on subjective analysis of secular, often pagan, usage. There are seminal lexical works for Greek and Hebrew, from which all subsequent abridged lexicons are derived. These exhaustive and early works were all written by unbelievers with the express purpose of undermining the words in the Holy Bible to which the common man has access. (It must be remembered that all current lexicons are based strictly upon these works and are therefore just as corrupt. Just because a lexicon's author has not been mentioned here does not mean that his lexicon is uncorrupted.) When observing the errors in new bibles, it is necessary to explain the history of the revision of the Greek text by Westcott and Hort in 1881. Likewise, those who use new lexicons and new versions need to be aware of the men who are behind the 'new meanings' in them. Their authors revolted against the traditional translation of the Bible and sought to replace it with 'new meanings' for Greek and Hebrew words. Just as the NIV nowhere gives the name of Westcott, so lexicons and commentaries do not always give the name of the original lexicon from which their definitions were taken. Therefore it is important to see just what lies at the basis of every Greek and Hebrew study tool.*

The following facts are thoroughly documented in my upcoming book on Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers¹⁴⁹:

- *Kittel's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament underlies most Greek lexicons available today. It was used in the writing of the NIV. Gerhard Kittel was Hitler's propaganda high priest and was "discredited by his ties with the Nazis, as reflected in his anti-Semitic tract Die Judenfrage (1934). Arrested by French occupation forces in 1945 and imprisoned for seventeen months, he was not allowed to return to his university post or to receive a pension" (see New Age Bible Versions, ch. 42, footnote 1; and Twentieth Century Dictionary of Christian Biography, J. D. Douglas, ed., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1995, p. 205).*

- The Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament by *Walter Bauer* is another lexicon produced by a *Nazi-philosophy sympathizer*. *Bauer's heretical views, expressed in his book, Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity, include the notion that those early Christians who spread the New Testament were 'heretics' and pagan philosophers held the 'truth.'* Even the secular *Wikipedia* (wikipedia.org/wiki/Walter_Bauer) states that "*Bauer's conclusions contradicted nearly 1600 years of essentially uncontested church history and thus were met with much skepticism among Christians*". Various editions of *Bauer's work* have been edited or translated by liberals such as *Danker, Arndt and Gingrich*; they are variously called *BAG, BAGD, BDAG*. *Danker was tried for heresy by his own liberal denomination and lost his teaching position (See his own admission in his books, No Room in the Brotherhood, and Under Investigation). The impact of Danker's heretical theology (regarding salvation) on his lexicon's definitions, was the subject of an article in the Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society (Autumn, 2004).*
- *The Liddell and Scott Greek-English Lexicon also hides behind today's so-called 'Bible' lexicons. The author of Alice in Wonderland was a close friend of lexicographer, Henry Liddell, and his young daughter 'Alice.'* Many have written about author *Lewis Carroll's alleged pedophilia* [*Carroll researchers are divided in that respect*¹⁵⁰]. *The story of Alice in Wonderland contains many not-so-subtle references to his non-Christian lifestyle and the 'scheme' of his friend, lexicon author, Henry (Humpty) Liddell. (See The Language of the King James Bible, p. 7 and upcoming new release Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers.)*
- *The Moulton and Milligan Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament, a Greek-English Lexicon, uses dangerous secular material from Egypt to define the words in the Holy Bible. In Alice in Wonderland, Humpty Dumpty said, "When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean." This line was so popular among lexical writers, that even James Hope Moulton repeated the line in one of his many books which are soft on pagan religions. (See James Hope Moulton, The Treasure of the Magi: A Study of Modern Zoroastrianism, London: Humphrey Milford, 1917, p. 221.)*
- *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon was written by Unitarian, J. Henry Thayer, a denier of the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the blood atonement, and the punishment of hell. His lexicon even contains a warning by the publisher in the preface alerting, "A word of caution is necessary. Thayer was a Unitarian, and the errors of this sect occasionally come through in the explanatory notes. The reader should be alert for both subtle and blatant denials of such doctrines as the Trinity (Thayer regarded Christ as a mere man and the Holy Spirit as an impersonal force emanating from God), ...the eternal punishment of the wicked, and Biblical inerrancy...[He held] the view that man is inherently good, needing Christ not as Savior but only as an example"* (*Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, preface, p. VII*).
- *Vine's Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words (See Preface) and almost every other Greek Lexicon and interlinear in print (see their prefatory material) spread Thayer's poison to the unwary. Vine's Old Testament work is equally flawed by the use of questionable Hebrew texts and lexicons. [Thus to be used with great caution but a significant witness, therefore, like Kittel's theological dictionary, when it actually agrees with the wording of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, against the critics.]*
- *The Gesenius, Brown, Driver and Briggs Hebrew-English Lexicon (BDB) hides behind all Hebrew study today. The authors of this standard Hebrew lexicon are among the Founders of Old Testament Criticism and paramount among the "Old Testament critics"* (*Founders of Old Testament Criticism by T. K. Cheyne, London: Methuen & Co., 1893, p. v.*). *Briggs' heresy trial is just one of the many cited in the Dictionary of Heresy Trials in American Christianity (George H. Shriver, ed., Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 46-64; see also pp. 327 (on Schaff), pp. 94, 419 (on Danker and cohorts). Their secular and pagan ideas echo in The Interlinear Bible by Jay P. Green (see Green's p. xiv).*

The pagans and pseudo-Christian profane Greek philosophers of the first centuries are wrongly consulted by lexicon authors to determine Greek word meanings. This error was the subject of the Bible's warnings. The words of God were **"unto the Greeks foolishness"** (1 Cor. 1:23), God warned. **"But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker..."** (2 Tim. 2:16, 17). Once the Holy Bible is undermined, 'anything goes.' J. Lee in *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography* admits, "...the concise, seemingly authoritative statement of meaning can, and often does, conceal many sins - indecision, compromise, imperfect knowledge, guesswork, and above all, dependence on predecessors" (*Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker, ed. B. Taylor, J. Lee, R. Burton, and R. Whitaker, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004, p. 66*). The first temptation was, **"Yea, hath God said...?"** (Gen. 3:1). This is the perpetual temptation. The most exhaustive analysis of Greek and Hebrew study aids currently in print is *In Awe of Thy Word*. Further explanation is given in the audio lecture, *Roots of the Language of the New Versions*. (All are available at avpublications.com or by calling 1-800-435-4535.) When you have read *In Awe of Thy Word's* 1200 pages, you will not only understand why lexicons give secular, desacralized, subjective and truncated 'definitions,' but you will learn exactly how to find the meaning of the Bible's words within the English Bible itself. (See chapter 1 of *In Awe of Thy Word*, as well as Chapter 1 in *The Language of the King James Bible*). Hebrew and Greek lexicons and grammars are not only unsafe, they are unnecessary. If they were a **"need"** (Phil. 4:19), God would make good lexicons available.

I await Mr Amué's detailed refutation of *In Awe of Thy Word* with interest but I will not be holding my breath.

Mr Amué then asks, first letter, page 2, paragraph 2, *What about the Geneva, Tyndale, Webster, Matthew's*, [compiled by John Rogers 1500-1555¹⁵¹, friend of Tyndale and incorporating Tyndale's 1535 New Testament. Rogers compiled the Old Testament from the work of both Tyndale and Myles Coverdale. Rogers¹⁵² was burnt at the stake on February 4th 1555, the first of the martyrs to die during the reign of Bloody Mary, 1553-1558] *Bishop's* (sic) *and Young* [compiled by Robert Young¹⁵³, 1822-1888, best known for his *Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible*]? *Are all those bibles corrupt?*

The foregoing analyses have shown that bibles such as Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthew, Geneva and the Bishops' were faithful precursors to the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. They repeatedly agree with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible against the NKJV and the Alexandrian Versions that Mr Amué declares to be corrupt, first letter, page 3, last paragraph and with which the NKJV is repeatedly in agreement. See analyses of the 13 verses where Mr Amué states *I find no fault with the NKJV as translating them from the original languages*. See pp 34ff of this work. Those earlier bibles were bibles in need of refinement, as Dr Mrs Riplinger¹⁵⁴ states, her emphases. Again, although Mr Amué despises both Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work, it is his responsibility to refute her material, which responsibility he has not seen fit to discharge as yet.

When early English Bibles dawned, their simple lines were like the swan. Now they pale with the magnified details of the King James Bible. The previous Bishops' Bible (c. 1568-1611) was no less perfect, pure, and true than the KJV. Its beauty was simply polished, like pure gold is polished, so that the KJV magnifies and mirrors more finely the glorious reflection of our precious Saviour, "Jesus, the author" (Heb. 12:2)...Earlier English Bibles were written in a simpler language. If God wanted the Bible of today jotted in the style of a memo, he would have retained the Tyndale or the Bishops' Bible. This author's word-for-word collation of earlier English Bibles with the KJV shows that the few changes the KJV made were not done to update an evolving English language or to represent the language of that day [the excuses that the NKJV translators¹⁵⁵ used i.e. Subsequent revisions of the King James Bible have sought to keep abreast of changes in English speech. The present work is a further step towards this objective]. The fine-tuning done by the KJV translators was done to magnify the following qualities:

- *Intensify meter*
- *Add alliteration*
- *Ensure continuity*
- *Introduce a separate-from-sinners' vocabulary*
- *Give a transparent view of the Greek and Hebrew*
- *Polish the synchronization of letter sounds, syllabication, and syntax to enhance memorization, comprehension, and parasymphathetic rhythms.*

The KJV translators took these 7 elements into consideration and chose words (usually from earlier English Bibles [i.e. than the Bishops']) which carried the greatest number of these qualities.

It is interesting that Mr Amué makes no comment about the quality of *syntax to enhance memorization*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger¹⁵⁶ contrasts the literary effects of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible with those of the modern versions and concludes that *The NIV, NKJV, and NASB have no literary effects worth illustrating, just blaring thunderblasts.*

She¹⁵⁷ has this comment about Webster's bible.

Noah Webster (1758-1843) spoke scores of languages; he remains America's wisest linguist and etymologist. He did an Americanized King James Bible. Among other changes, he switched 'unto' to 'to'... God ignored Webster's bible.

God likewise ignored Young's bible. As indicated, Young is best known for his concordance to *the* Holy Bible, not for *his* bible.

Mr Amué then states *Show me these corrupt readings*, which he insists are not corrupt because such readings come, supposedly, from *somebody who has not compared the NKJV to the Masoretic or Received Text.*

The foregoing analyses have examined with respect to readings in 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and the NKJV the following verses in order of appearance; Acts 12:4, Acts 3:13, 26, John 1:3, Mark 2:15, 2 Corinthians 5:17, John 1:18, Genesis 22:8, Ecclesiastes 5:8, 12:11, Isaiah 9:3, Ezekiel 23:6, Romans 1:18, 2 Corinthians 2:17, Colossians 3:1-3, 1 Thessalonians 5:22, 1 Timothy 6:10, 20. See pp 21-51 of this work.

Those scriptures amount to a total of 20 verses. The underlying Greek or Hebrew texts have been examined as appropriate, together with the scriptural context in which these verses occur, the need for consistency with respect to ***“comparing spiritual things with spiritual”*** 1 Corinthians 2:13b and the combined witness of the bible versions with which God empowered the English Reformation from the time of Wycliffe to the publication of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. Mr Amué overlooked those additional necessary considerations.

The NKJV has been shown to be wrong in every case where it departs from the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and in so doing, to conform repeatedly to *the Alexandrian Versions* that Mr Amué declares to be *corrupt*, first letter, page 3, last paragraph.

The booklet on the NKJV that the Trinitarian Bible Society¹⁵⁸ publishes reveals more corruptions in the NKJV. These include over 20 unwarranted omissions from the NKJV New Testament, compared with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible that are not supported by the Textus Receptus.

Dr Mrs Riplinger¹⁵⁹ has denounced many more errors and omissions in the NKJV, including denials of the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, e.g. in Matthew 20:20 *“kneel”* instead of ***“worship,”*** Matthew 26:64 *“the right hand of the Power”* instead of ***“the right hand of power”*** and Acts 4:27, 30 *“servant”* instead of ***“child.”*** She states with respect to Genesis 22:8 – pp 34-35 of this work – her emphasis, *Genesis 22:8 is another denial of the deity of Jesus Christ in the New King James. As a prophetic comment, Abraham said, “God will provide himself a lamb.” The New King James says, “God will*

provide for Himself the lamb.” We know this was prophetic because a ram was provided for Abraham, not a lamb; God provided **himself** as a lamb, a sacrifice for our sins. The NKJV denies that Jesus is God here.

Dr Mrs Riplinger¹⁶⁰ also notes that the [The] NKJV omits the word “Lord” 66 times...the word “God” 51 times...the word “heaven” 50 times...the word “repent” 44 times...the word “blood” 23 times...the word “hell” 22 times...the word “JEHOVAH” entirely...the word(s) “new testament” entirely...the word “damnation” entirely...the word “devils” entirely. [The] NKJV ignored the Greek Textus Receptus over 1,200 times. [The] NKJV replaced the KJV Hebrew (ben Chayyim) with the corrupt Stuttgart (ben Asher) Old Testament. See comments on *Isaiah 9:3* with respect to the NKJV’s use of the Stuttgart Old Testament p 37 of this work and more detailed comments follow.

Of the NKJV’s omission of the word “hell” that Mr Amué appears to favour, Dr Mrs Riplinger¹⁶¹ states, [The NKJV] replaces [“hell”] with “hades” in the New Testament. *hades* has numerous New Age interpretations. The rock group Styx tells teens on Saturday night that they can party in ‘hades’ forever. Then, an NKJV pastor, on Sunday morning, tells lost teens that they will die and go to ‘hades.’ No wonder the teens are not moved to repentance. No one wants to go to ‘hell’ but ‘hades’...that might be fun!

Mr Amué states that he witnesses to stop those from going to *gehenna* second letter, page 1, point 6. One wonders what he says to them about ‘hades.’

Mr Amué would no doubt object strongly to those observations but it is his responsibility to disprove them and to demonstrate that God has in any way honoured the NKJV with respect to reformation, revival and missionary effectiveness, pp 3-5, 8-9 of this work, anywhere in the world during its now quarter-of-a-century existence.

As indicated earlier, p 4 of this work, all else can be resolved “*before the judgment seat of Christ*” Romans 14:10, 2 Corinthians 5:10.

Revision of the Textus Receptus

Mr Amué informs us, first letter, page 2, paragraphs 2, 3 that *the Textus Receptus* needs revising, according to Dean Burgon¹⁶², whom Mr Amué quotes as stating, “again and again we shall have occasion to point out that the *Textus Receptus* needs revising.”

Burgon subsequently refers to *the spurious clause* [“raise the dead,” (*νεκρους εγειρετε*, S. Matthew x. 8)] retained by our Revisionists; because it is found in those corrupt witnesses – *κ B C D*, and the Latin copies. See point no. 11 under **Multiple Authorities**.

Mr Amué also refers to this clause, although he does not explicitly cite Burgon in this instance.

However, he states with respect to *the phrase νεκρους εγειρετε*, raise the dead, first letter, page 2, last paragraph, page 3, first paragraph, *This word (sic) is not found in any of the ancient Greek manuscripts or even the Syrian. It is found in the Latin Vulgate, and was copied from there by Erasmus into his Greek New Testament, the Textus Receptus. Oddly enough it is found in the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. It should be removed from the Bibles as it is from the Latin Vulgate text.*

Mr Amué has contradicted himself in that statement but his research is again noticeably lacking in substance, though he appears to have quoted Burgon with respect to the absence of the words in Syrian sources. His citations with respect to Greek sources are not only contradictory but also misleading. Burgon¹⁶³ states in a footnote that, his emphasis *Eusebius, - Basil, - Chrysostom, - Jerome, - Juvencus, omit the words. P. E. Pusey found them in no Syriac copy. But the conclusive evidence is supplied by the Manuscripts; not more than 1 out of 20 of which contain this clause.*

Yet the evidence for the clause was conclusive enough for it to be included in the Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthew, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles, along with the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. Where is Mr Amué’s unambiguous evidence that the phrase was copied from [the Latin Vulgate] by Erasmus into his Greek New Testament, the *Textus Receptus*?

Moreover, Dr J. A. Moorman¹⁶⁴ has obtained more comprehensive data on the words **“raise the dead”** in Matthew 10:8. He confirms that the words are found in the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ bibles and in the Receptus editions of Stephanus 1550, Beza 1598 and Elsevier 1624. He states that they are found in manuscripts 16, 348, 372, 1093, 1579 and *though in a different sequence...in many other mss., including* Ⲙ, i.e. Aleph or Sinaiticus (first corrector), B or Vaticanus, C (first corrector), D, N, Family 1 and 13 and manuscripts 33, 565, 892, 1010.

Dr Moorman¹⁶⁵ notes in another work that Families 1 and 13 consist of at least 18 known manuscripts and represent *the type of text current in Caesarea in the 3rd or 4th centuries* i.e. quite ancient, by the standards of Greek manuscript evidence. Dr Moorman describes the Caesarean manuscripts as *a kind of halfway house textually to Alexandria* and supporting the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible in 356 important doctrinal verses that Dr Moorman surveys against the NIV in ratio 3:1.

So, again, where is Mr Amué’s evidence that the phrase **“raise the dead”** *was copied from [the Latin Vulgate] by Erasmus into his Greek New Testament, the Textus Receptus*? How does Mr Amué know that Erasmus didn’t locate it in the many Greek sources that he consulted? See remarks following on **Erasmus and the Textus Receptus**.

Moorman adds that the words are in fact found in the Syriac Peshitta (although the words do not appear in Lamsa’s translation of the Peshitta*) and the Old Latin, both of which reflect texts that date from the 2nd century AD¹⁶⁶, in addition to Jerome’s Vulgate – it may be that the clause was inserted into some copies of the Vulgate that Burgon did not have sight of, because he states that Jerome did not cite the words. Moorman also cites Cyril of Alexandria 444 AD, as quoting the words **“raise the dead”** in Matthew 10:8.

*Dr Ruckman¹⁶⁷ states that *Corruptions did not enter the text [of the Peshitta] until the middle of the third century, at the time when Origen moved from Alexandria to Caesarea (bringing his publishing company with him)*. Origen’s influence would explain the existence of the *halfway house* Caesarean text. See Dr Moorman’s foregoing comments. Moreover, Ray¹⁶⁸ notes that Lamsa’s New Testament omits 40 of 162 *important portions of Scripture* in the New Testament, including **“repentance”** in Matthew 9:13 and **“of the heart”** in Matthew 12:35. However, Dr Moorman notes that the Old Latin¹⁶⁹, the text of which is contemporaneous with that of the Peshitta, contains **“repentance”** in Matthew 9:13 and both the Old Latin and Tatian¹⁷⁰, writing from Syria in 172 AD have **“of the heart”** in Matthew 12:35. It is entirely possible, therefore, that Lamsa’s Peshitta and other extant versions of the Peshitta represent partially mutilated copies of this particular version.

Some of the sources noted, e.g. the numbered Greek manuscripts, are more reputable than others e.g. Ⲙ, B, C, D and some disagreement exists over whether the Peshitta contains the words – some copies apparently do not - but Dr Moorman has nevertheless produced an array of witnesses to the authenticity of the words **“raise the dead,”** which casts serious doubt on Mr Amué’s insistence that these words are merely *from the Latin Vulgate*.

Clearly they are not and are certainly part of **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21, Mr Amué’s ill-considered opinion and even that of Dean Burgon notwithstanding.

Dr Moorman’s words of caution¹⁷¹ should be kept in mind, his underlinings, especially with respect to readings in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible that appear to have only minority support.

Our extant MSS reflect but do not determine the text of Scripture. The text was determined by God in the beginning (Psa. 119:89, Jude 3). After the advent of printing (AD 1450), the necessity of God preserving the MS witness to the text was diminished. Therefore, in some instances the majority of MSS extant today may not reflect at every point what the true, commonly accepted, and majority reading was 500 years ago...

When a version has been the standard for as long as the Authorized Version, and when that version has demonstrated its power in the conversion of sinners, building up of believers, sending forth of preachers and missionaries on a scale not achieved by all other versions and foreign language combined; the hand of God is at work. Such a version must not be tampered with. And in those

comparatively few places where it seems to depart from the majority reading, it would be far more honouring to God's promises of preservation to believe that the Greek and not the English had strayed from the original!

Again, it is Mr Amu e's responsibility to prove that the NKJV has demonstrated any level of power equivalent to that of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, in any respect.

It should also be noted in passing that the so-called Majority Text for the New Testament is actually von Soden's 1913 collation¹⁷² of 414 manuscripts out of 88 papyri, 274 uncials and 2,700 cursives, not including 2,143 lectionaries or *the vast field of Patristic and Versional evidence*. von Soden therefore collated only about 8% of available Greek sources and according to Moorman was *strongly Alexandrian* so that he deliberately selected manuscripts that exhibited Alexandrian corruptions. A full collation of the evidence, therefore, could well transform so-called 'minority' readings in the AV1611 to 'majority' readings and Moorman's compilation must be considered a 'worst case' scenario – though not from a bible-believing perspective because God has consistently honoured ALL AV1611 readings, regardless of majority or minority manuscript support.

Changes in the Masoretic Text and Sources for the Textus Receptus

Different Masoretic Texts

Mr Amu e insists that, *the Masorites made changes to the original text. The changes are Genesis 18:22; Numbers 11:15, 12:12; 1 Samuel 3:13; 2 Samuel 16:12, 20:1; 1 Kings 2:16; 2 Chronicles 10:16; Job 7:20, 32:3; Psalm 106:20, Jeremiah 2:11; Lamentations 3:20; Ezekiel 8:17; Hosea 4:7; Habakkuk 1:12; Zechariah 2:12 and Malachi 1:12.*

Mr Amu e does not specify the source of *the original text* but it is likely to be *the 1967/77 Stuttgart edition of Biblia Hebraica* used for the NKJV Old Testament. See remarks on ***Isaiah 9:3*** and the NKJV preface, p 37 of this work.

Dr Mrs Riplinger¹⁷³ states, her emphasis, that instead of *the traditional ben Chayyim Rabbinic Bible used by the KJV...the NKJV's Old Testament is based on a corrupt Hebrew text devised by Rudolf Kittel (Biblia Hebraica Kittel, aka BHK). He recommended the use of the faulty Leningrad Ms B 19a (ben Asher text). Kittel's son's conviction and imprisonment for his involvement in the death of millions of Jews during Hitler's holocaust makes his father's alterations to the Jewish Old Testament highly suspect. The NKJV's Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia took Kittel's corruptions even further. The NKJV's use of corrupt texts such as the Septuagint, Vulgate, and Dead Sea cave manuscripts (see NKJV preface [p vi]) contradicts the Bible's doctrine of preservation (Ps. 12:6-7) "to a thousand generations" (Ps. 105:8). Did God skip the generations from the fourth century to the twentieth centuries when these were unearthed? The secular notion of continual progress and evolutionary development cannot be applied to the scriptures.*

Mr Amu e makes reference to Donald Waite's book¹⁷⁴ in this context, insofar as he disagrees with Waite's statement that God has preserved "*the exact WORDS of the ORIGINALS themselves*" in "*the WORDS of the Received Greek and Masoretic Hebrew texts that underlie the KING JAMES BIBLE.*"

Mr Amu e then refers to the foregoing 18 verses listed in order to substantiate his disagreement with Waite but his opposition to Waite may rest simply upon the differences between the texts of Ben Chayyim and Ben Asher, from which the NKJV Old Testament was largely translated – with changes from other sources as the translators saw fit, as Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals.

Dr Waite has a further explanation to this effect that Mr Amu e neglected to mention, even though he clearly had access to it. This explanation¹⁷⁵ is as follows, the full citation having been taken from an article by bible-believing independent Baptist Pastor Joseph Chambers¹⁷⁶. I have inserted Dr Waite's emphases into this citation.

A modern scholar, Randall Price, has reviewed the Dead Sea Scrolls and written an excellent book on the text and facts of this marvelous discovery. While Randall is not a KJV enthusiast, he personally stated to me that these scrolls support the Old Testament Masoretic text as translated in the King

James Version 80% of the time. When you study the nature of these Jewish descendants and their lifestyle, an 80% agreement with the Masoretic text cannot be less than a miracle. No wonder there has been loud voices claiming that the Catholic church sit on this discovery for over forty (40) years.

*What most students of Scripture do not know is that the Old Testament Masoretic Text in the new Bibles is not the Masoretic of the King James Version. Here is a clear quotation from an excellent book by Dr. D. A. Waite, graduate of Dallas Theological Seminary. "Here's some background on it. The **Daniel Bomberg edition**, 1516- 1517, was called the **First Rabbinic Bible**. Then in 1524-25, Bomberg published a second edition edited by Abraham Ben Chayyim (or Ben Hayyim) iben Adonijah. This is called the **Ben Chayyim edition** of the Hebrew text. Daniel Bomberg's edition, on which the KING JAMES BIBLE is based was the **Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text**. This was called the **Second Great Rabbinic Bible**. This became the standard Masoretic text for the next 400 years. This is the text that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE. For four hundred years, that was the Old Testament Hebrew text. Nobody translated the Old Testament except by using this text." [This is from *Biblical Criticism Historical, Literal, Textual* by Harrison, Walkie and Guthrie, 1978, pages 47-82.] (Defending The King James Bible, Rev. D. A. Waite, page 27.)*

*The new Masoretic is then described according to Dr. Waite as the following, "The edition we used when I was a student of Dr. Merrill F. Unger at Dallas Theological Seminary (1948-53), was the 1937 edition of the *Biblia Hebraica* by Kittel. All of a sudden in 1937, Kittel changed his Hebrew edition [Dr Waite notes that Kittel had used the Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text in the first two editions of his *Biblia Hebraica*, dated 1906 and 1912] and followed what they called the **Ben Asher Masoretic Text** instead of the **Ben Chayyim**. They followed in that text, the **Leningrad Manuscript**, (B19a, or "L.") The date on it was A.D. 1008. This was not the traditional Masoretic Text that was used for 400 years and was the basis of the KING JAMES BIBLE. They changed it and used this Leningrad Manuscript. **So even the main text used by the NKJV, NASV, and NIV in the Hebrew is different from that used for the King James Bible.** In addition to the various changes in the Hebrew text at the top of the page, the footnotes in Kittel's *BIBLIA HEBRAICA* suggest from 20,000 to 30,000 changes throughout the whole Old Testament." (Defending The King James Bible, Rev. D. A. Waite, page 27.)*

Must I say more to show you what is happening behind the scenes that most good and studious people have very little opportunity to learn? That is, unless they study beyond the average book available on the bookstore shelves.

*No one has hated and opposed the King James Bible and other similar versions of the Bible, as has the Roman Catholic Church. When you read Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, research the many thousands of men and women burned at stakes or savagely tormented and murdered by Catholic priests just because they were devoted to translating, printing, or reading the Holy Bible in the common language, you cannot just walk away. Now couple what is happening today with the history (beyond argument) of the Roman Catholic Church.*

*As indicated and as Dr Waite states, Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* was revised again and published as the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* 1967/77, also based on the Ben Asher text and in turn the Leningrad Codex and forming the basis for the NKJV Old Testament. The NKJV Old Testament is therefore based on a by-passed minority text just as the *Alexandrian Versions* that Mr Amu   deems to be *corrupt* are mainly based on the largely corrupt old uncials, by-passed by the bible-believing church down through the centuries; Aleph, i.e. Sinaiticus and B Vaticanus, on the false assumption that, as Dr Waite states *They believe the "oldest" texts...must always be the best. Not necessarily. These so-called "old" texts...such as "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) and their some forty-three allies, were corrupted, I believe, by heretics within the first 100 years after the original New Testament books were written. Therefore, even though these might be the oldest, they were doctored by heretics and therefore are not "the best."**

*Citing H. S. Miller, author of *General Biblical Introduction*, who documented the stringent rules which the Jewish scribes applied in copying the Hebrew Old Testament, Dr Waite¹⁷⁷ states, his emphases, Miller...added these words which we should bear in mind: "Some of these rules may appear extreme*

*and absurd, yet they show how sacred the Holy Word of the Old Testament was to its custodians, the Jews (Rom. 3:2), and they give us strong encouragement to believe that **WE HAVE THE REAL OLD TESTAMENT, THE SAME ONE WHICH OUR LORD HAD AND WHICH WAS ORIGINALLY GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD.***" [Miller, p. 185]

Mr Amu   complains, first letter, page 2, paragraph 2 that Dr Waite was one of those of whom *none of them could give me an answer* with respect to identification of corrupt readings in the NKJV. If Mr Amu   gave no indication in his letter that he understood the nature of the isolated and *doctored* source for the NKJV Old Testament, i.e. the Leningrad Codex, it is not surprising that Dr Waite did not see fit to reply.

The issue of the AV1611 and extant Hebrew Old Testament Texts is more detailed than Mr Amu   supposes. See this writer's summary study¹⁷⁸ courtesy of missionary Brother Brent Logan.

Erasmus and the Textus Receptus

Mr Amu   states, first letter, page 2, paragraph 3, that *The Textus Receptus is made up of five manuscripts put together by Desiderus Erasmus*. He then lists them and declares that *neither can the Textus Receptus be direct from the autographs*. Dr Hills¹⁷⁹ identifies Erasmus's manuscripts that Mr Amu   has listed as follows.

When Erasmus came to Basel in July, 1515, to begin his work, he found five Greek New Testament manuscripts ready for his use. These are now designated by the following numbers: 1 (an 11th-century manuscript of the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles), 2 (a 15th-century manuscript of the Gospels), 2ap (a 12th-14th-century manuscript of Acts and the Epistles), 4ap (a 15th-century manuscript of Acts and the Epistles), and 1r (a 12th-century manuscript of Revelation). Of these manuscripts Erasmus used 1 and 4ap only occasionally. In the Gospels Acts, and Epistles his main reliance was on 2 and 2ap.

Mr Amu   tries to imply, therefore, that Erasmus compiled his Greek New Testament using only scant resources. But Dr Hills continues.

Did Erasmus use other manuscripts beside these five in preparing his Textus Receptus? The indications are that he did. According to W. Schwarz (1955), Erasmus made his own Latin translation of the New Testament at Oxford during the years 1505-6. His friend, John Colet who had become Dean of St. Paul's, lent him two Latin manuscripts for this undertaking, but nothing is known about the Greek manuscripts which he used. He must have used some Greek manuscripts or other, however, and taken notes on them. Presumably therefore he brought these notes with him to Basel along with his translation and his comments on the New Testament text. It is well known also that Erasmus looked for manuscripts everywhere during his travels and that he borrowed them from everyone he could. Hence although the Textus Receptus was based mainly on the manuscripts which Erasmus found at Basel, it also included readings taken from others to which he had access. It agreed with the common faith because it was founded on manuscripts which in the providence of God were readily available.

Dr Mrs Riplinger¹⁸⁰ has researched Erasmus's labours in great detail. She writes, as follows, giving the lie to Mr Amu  's assertions that Erasmus created the Textus Receptus and that it is therefore not *direct from the autographs*. Note the verdict of Kenneth W. Clark in this respect.

*Erasmus continued combing Europe and England for manuscripts, "examining libraries," throughout his entire life. "He spent his time in the great libraries, devouring all the books he could find." He moved constantly, after he had exhausted the libraries and bookshelves of a city. He wrote that he had acquired so **many** manuscripts that he needed two assistants to help carry them and plenty of time to "arrange them" ...Erasmus' own manuscript collection was so large and valuable, it was covetously seized by customs when he left England to go to the Continent to finalize the Greek New Testament in 1514. He protested saying that "they had stolen the labours of his life." The manuscripts were returned in a few days...*

Kenneth W. Clark, the scholar who has examined more Greek manuscripts than most, admits, "We should not attribute to Erasmus the creation of a 'received text,' but only the transmission from a

manuscript text, already commonly received, to a printed form, in which this text would continue to prevail for three centuries” ...

Today there are over 5200 manuscripts of the Greek New Testament. KJV critics ignore the fact that over 99% agree with Erasmus’ Greek New Testament and the KJV. Less than one percent [44 corrupt ones] ...agree with the old omissions and changes in the NIV, NASB, NRSV [and in the NKJV footnotes as stated in the preface to the printed edition for the benefit of readers representing all textual persuasions¹⁸¹]...The agreement of this tiny minority is far from unanimous on many changes.

Yet other critics, such as James White¹⁸², feel that, “Erasmus guessed” or “Erasmus’ hunch” led him to the readings which match almost every Greek manuscript known today...Without the preservation of the text by God, try guessing all of them for yourself...

James White feigns¹⁸³, “Three men were primarily responsible for the creation of the Greek text utilized by the KJV translators in their work on the New Testament: Desiderius Erasmus, Robert Etienne, better known as Stephanus, and Theodore Beza.” White...is trying to give his readers the false impression that these men ‘created’ this text, rather than merely PRINTING the Greek text that was received everywhere. Erasmus’ Greek New Testament text was a mirror of the handwritten Greek texts which were used before the advent of the printing press. Erasmus was merely the first to PRINT IT, PUBLISH IT AND CIRCULATE IT, in the new printed format...

Critics often assert that ‘Erasmus did not have the manuscripts we have today.’ In fact, he had access to every reading currently extant, and rejected those matching the Catholic Vulgate, NIV, NASB today [and those in the NKJV footnotes]...

Erasmus reveals clearly in the Preface (p. xviii) to his Greek New Testament, that he knew of the readings of the corrupt Greek text type. He attributed corruption to Origen!

So given that Erasmus’ Greek New Testament text was a mirror of the handwritten Greek texts which were used before the advent of the printing press how does Mr Amué prove that the Textus Receptus was not direct from the autographs?

*Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals further that Errors critics ascribe to Erasmus’ first edition were chiefly not errors, but misprints and quotes, her emphases, Erasmus as stating in the dedication to his Greek New Testament, “And so I have revised the whole new Testament against the standard of **the Greek originals.**” Erasmus evidently disagreed with Mr Amué.*

Mr Amué concludes his first letter with the statement that those who support and dearly hold to the King James Version [are] afraid that...nobody will read the AV anymore and with the questions that If the Authorized Version is so good...surely it can defend itself (?) and The NKJV is based on the same Hebrew and Greek as the KJV, so why knock it?

Like his unsubstantiated assertion that readers of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible are confused by the word “hell,” second letter, page 1, last paragraph, Mr Amué provides no evidence to support his concluding statement. It can therefore be dismissed as idle speculation on his part but it will be addressed in more detail in the comments on the conclusion to his third letter.

The answer to Mr Amué’s first question is simply Paul’s exhortation to Timothy in 2 Timothy 1:13.

“Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.”

*The capacity of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible to defend itself is evident in the comparison of the 20 verses listed earlier, p 55 of this work, with respect to the readings of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and the NKJV, although some additional comment has been necessary for any prospective bible critic, to highlight the significance of the differences between the equivalent readings. See pp 21-51 of this work. The 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is clearly **“the form of sound words”** that has been vindicated by the testimony of church history, missionary effectiveness and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.*

“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away” Matthew 24:35, Mark 13:31, Luke 21:33.

It is **“the form of sound words”** as found in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible that is the final form of those words that Paul first gave to Titus.

“Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers” Titus 1:9.

And as Paul exhorts Timothy, 2 Timothy 2:25 in a similar vein, with respect to the need for additional explanatory comment.

“In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.”

It is worth reiterating the words of H. L. Mencken – see remarks under **Revival versus No Revival** p 3 of this work – who rightly described the capacity of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible to *defend itself*, my underling.

“[M]any learned but misguided men have sought to produce translations that should be mathematically accurate, and in the plain speech of everyday. But the Authorized Version has never yielded to any of them, for it is palpably and overwhelmingly better than they are...”

The answer to Mr Amué’s second question is simply that the NKJV *isn’t based on the same Hebrew and Greek as the KJV*. See remarks on the **Different Masoretic Texts** pp 58-60 of this work and the many departures from the Received Text underlying the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible that the NKJV exhibits¹⁸⁴.

And therefore *those who support and dearly hold to the King James Version* are simply following Paul’s exhortation to the Ephesian Church with respect to the NKJV, with its Satanic logo and any other Satanic counterfeit, Ephesians 5:11.

“And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.”

Some Questions and Answers

Mr Amué has supplied some brief answers on page 1 of his second letter to questions that have been posed to him in separate correspondence. I will address these as follows. Note that some of the material has been addressed already, together with Mr Amué’s opinions about *gehenna*, *hades* and *tartarus*. See comments under **Multiple Authorities, “Perfect Bibles” – except for the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible** and **“hell,” gehenna, hades, tartarus** and I have therefore inserted references to earlier parts of this study as necessary. See pp 5-20 of this work.

Note, of course, that my comments that have been made earlier on any of the issues raised by Mr Amué’s answers are for information only because his answers actually raise further questions, which are included in my comments to follow.

It is to be hoped that these further questions will highlight the kind of inconsistencies in Mr Amué’s correspondence that are inherent in all attacks on the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

As Solomon observed in Proverbs 18:1-2.

“Through desire a man, having separated himself, seeketh and intermeddleth with all wisdom. A fool hath no delight in understanding, but that his heart may discover itself.”

First Answer

Mr Amué’s first answer is, *God wrote one book and called it the Holy Bible...the Old Testament in Hebrew known as the Masoretic Text and the New Testament in Greek known as the Received text (aka Textus Receptus).*

Where can anyone get a *single* copy, i.e. between two covers, of *this book*, called (in English) *the Holy Bible* and consisting of a *Hebrew* Masoretic Old Testament and a *Greek* Received Text New Testament? Mr Amué certainly does not inform his readers where such a book can be obtained.

Who can read *both* Testaments *fluently* and to which editions of those Testaments is Mr Amué referring? What about individuals on the mission field? See remarks earlier under *Missionary Effectiveness* pp 8-9 of this work.

What has God done in the history of the church with *this particular book*, consisting of *both* Testaments that is *superior* to the *results* of believing, reading, preaching and propagating the single Book available between two covers called the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible?

How has God resolved the apparent discrepancies to which Mr Amué has referred in his first letter, namely, *The Masorites made changes to the original text and neither can the Textus Receptus be direct from the autographs and the Textus Receptus needs revising?* Or are we at liberty to set aside such discrepancies, in the light of Mr Amué's first answer and why?

Second Answer

Mr Amué's second answer is *[God] promised to preserve [the Holy Bible] in the form of the Masoretic and Received Texts, and no other.*

Where did God say this and to whom, i.e. Chapter and Verse – from *any* bible? The King James translators¹⁸⁵ would probably take issue with Mr Amué's answer, their emphases.

AN ANSWER TO THE IMPUTATIONS OF OUR ADVERSARIES

*Now to the latter we answer; that we do not deny, nay we affirm and avow, that the very **meanest translation** of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession, (for we have seen none of theirs of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God.*

*As the King's speech, which he uttereth in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin, is **still the King's speech**, though it be not interpreted by every Translator with the like grace, nor peradventure so fitly for phrase, nor so expressly for sense, everywhere.*

Third Answer

Mr Amué's third answer is *All Bibles, whether they are written in Aramaic etc....that are based on these two text (sic) (Masoretic and Received) are perfect Bibles. The Authorized Version IS NOT THE ONLY BIBLE given to the human race by God.*

His third answer clearly contradicts his first and second answers. As indicated, *all Bibles* cannot include the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. The supposed flaws in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible constitute the main thrust of Mr Amué's entire correspondence. According to the rest of his correspondence it *cannot possibly* have been one of the bibles *given to the human race by God.*

Moreover, not even the NKJV is one of the *perfect bibles* according to Mr Amué. It has given a *wrong translation* in John 1:18. See his first letter, page 1, paragraph 3 and comments on **John 1:18** pp 30-34 of this work.

And surely *all bibles based on...the Received text* are flawed? According to Mr Amué, first letter, page 2, last paragraph, they contain interpolations *copied from [the Latin Vulgate]* such as **“raise the dead”** in Matthew 10:8 that should therefore *be removed from the Bibles* p 56 of this work. The supposedly offending phrase **“raise the dead”** persists in *all* editions of the Received Text to the present day.

Given that Mr Amué has already declared that *the Alexandrian Versions are corrupt*, how can *any* bible therefore have been *given to the human race by God?*

For information, irony aside, Mr Amué has no cause for indignation with respect to bibles in other languages that are faithful to the Masoretic and Received Texts – specifically those that underlie the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. Dr Ruckman^{186, 187, 188} reports that such bibles appeared all over Europe

during the 16th century; in translations for Holland, Denmark, Iceland, Yugoslavia (i.e. Serbia), Croatia, Finland, Hungary, Poland and elsewhere and that the Text of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible had been translated into over 800 languages by the year 1900.

So the question of bibles in other languages is not really an issue – for a genuine bible believer. However, see also the remarks earlier on *Revival versus No Revival* and *Missionary Effectiveness* and, including the evaluations of literary experts and even secular historians, pp 3-5, 8-9 of this work.

Remaining Answers

Mr Amué’s remaining answers are that *all those Bibles, in any language, based on the Masoretic and Received Texts, can be trusted* because [God] did preserve [the Holy Bible] as...mentioned in point number 2 – where God is said to have preserved *the Holy Bible...in the form of the Masoretic and Received Texts, and no other* my underlining, to highlight the as yet unresolved inconsistencies in Mr Amué’s answers.

Mr Amué’s final answer is that he is warning folks about *gehenna* and *bibles based on the Alexandrian Text*. As this study shows, he ought, in all consistency, also warn them about *hades* and those portions of the NKJV where it *agrees with bibles based on the Alexandrian Text*.

Mr Amué reiterates his inconsistencies, especially with respect his point number 2 on page 2 of his letter, paragraph 1.

The AV is not the only Bible that God has preserved. He has, as indicated, gone to great lengths to prove that God *hasn’t* preserved His word, or words, as the AV. *KJV Only advocates believe that...only the AV is the word of God.* Bible believers don’t. See the references to Dr Ruckman’s comments¹⁸⁹ on translations matching the Text of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible in existence during the 16th century in Europe and all over the world before 1900. *ALL BIBLES based on the Masoretic and Received Texts are the WORD OF GOD.* They aren’t and cannot be, according to reasons that Mr Amué has advanced himself. The bible believer of course takes a different view. See again remarks on *Revival versus No Revival* and *Missionary Effectiveness* pp 3-5, 8-9 of this work.

Mr Amué concludes his second letter with the expression *our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ*, revealing that he has fallen for yet another error in the NKJV, with respect to the wording in Titus 2:13 *our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ* and similar wording in 2 Peter 1:1 *our God and Saviour*. The proof follows.

‘Our Great God and Saviour’

The following remarks also apply¹⁹⁰, with updated references.

1. *Titus 2:13: ALL Greek texts have the wording of the KJV, “God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.” None render it as the new versions do.*
2. *2 Peter 1:1 Lewis Foster, NIV and NKJV committee member, reveals WHY new version editors insert Christ’s deity in Peter and Titus, yet removed it (in) nearly 100 other places. “Some would point out that in passages Titus and 2 Peter, the expression of the deity of Christ has been strengthened by renderings even in liberal translations. What many do not realize is that even here the strong affirmation of deity is used to serve a purpose. The liberal translator ordinarily denies that Paul wrote Titus or that Peter wrote 2 Peter. He points to the very language deifying Jesus as an indication of the later date of these epistles when Paul and Peter could not have written them.”*
3. *Titus 2:13, and 2 Peter 1:1 are called “hendiades,” from the Greek “hen, dia dyoin,” ‘one by two’. Grammatically it is the “expression of an idea by two nouns connected by “and”, instead of by a noun and an adjunct. It would be like introducing one’s spouse as “my wife and best friend.””*

Dr. Ruckman adds¹⁹¹: Any fool could have seen the same construction in Isaiah 45:21.

The AV1611 reading in Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 is actually a superior testimony to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ than the NIV variation. “Our God”, NIV, simply designates the Lord as God of the Christians. The expression “**God and our Saviour**”, AV1611, shows that the Lord is GOD universally but effectually the Saviour of the Christian. Doctrinally, the Lord is, of course, “**Saviour of the world**” John 4:42.

See these references, noting that the NKJV etc. omit the definite article each time:

Genesis 17:1 “**And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the LORD appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect.**”

1 Kings 18:39 “**The LORD, he is the God; the LORD, he is the God.**”

Ezra 1:3 “**Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the LORD God of Israel, (he is the God,) which is in Jerusalem.**”

Isaiah 9:6 “**For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.**”

James White¹⁹², who agrees with Mr Amué with respect to the wording “our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ,” then devotes four pages at the end of Part Two of his book to a discussion of Granville Sharp’s Rule and the KJV in order to discredit the AV1611 readings for Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1. The essence of his discussion is as follows, his emphasis.

*The great scholars who labored upon the AV...would have welcomed the study undertaken by Granville Sharp late in the 1790s. Sharp’s work resulted in a rule of koine Greek that bears his name, a rule that was not fully understood by the KJV translators. Because of his work, we are able to better understand how plain is the testimony to the deity of Christ that is found in such places as Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1. The KJV translators...obscured these passages through less than perfect translation. Modern translations correct their error. And yet, KJV Only advocates continue to defend a rendering that is shared by such Arian translations as the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ New World Translation, and that solely because of their presupposition that “if it is in the KJV, it **must** be right.”*

What White dismisses as *presupposition* (and what Mr Amué would probably do also) is proven fact. Not one of his objections to the Text of the AV1611 examined so far has proved valid. And the same will be true for the remainder of his objections. His objection to the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ New World Translation is again, at best ‘pots and kettles.’ It should be remembered that of the 241 passages of scripture where White compares the AV1611 with the NIV, the NIV agrees with the AV1611 in only 9 of those passages, or 4%. The NIV agrees with the NWT in 192 of those passages, or 80%¹⁹³. It is easy to see which version is one of the *Arian translations*. See this reference¹⁹⁴ for more comparisons.

White¹⁹⁵ has of course evaded the Arian reading “only begotten God” in John 1:18 in the NASV by shifting to the spurious NIV reading “God the One and Only” – pp 30-34 of this work - and refusing to state the NWT reading for John 1:18 which is “only-begotten god,” i.e. a match mate to the NASV reading. With the height – or depth – of hypocrisy, White then criticises the NWT as demonstrating *bias* because it *mistranslates John 1:1 so as to attempt to hide its testimony to Christ’s deity*. It is clear where the real *bias* lies, with respect to White’s comments on *Arian translations*.

White continues.

*Basically, Granville Sharp’s rule states that when you have two nouns, which are not proper names...which are describing a person, and the two nouns are connected by the word “and,” and the first noun has the article (“the”) while the second does not, **both nouns are referring to the same person**. In our texts, this is demonstrated by the words “God” and “Savior” at Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1. “God” has the article*, it is followed by the word for “and,” and the word “Savior” does not have the article. Hence, both nouns are being applied to the same person, Jesus Christ.*

*White should understand that *our* is not an article. It is an adjective¹⁹⁶.

White then argues on the basis of the word order in Greek in 2 Peter 1:11 for “*our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ*” that the modern alteration in 2 Peter 1:1 is superior to the AV1611 reading because the Greek word order is the same, except for *the substitution of [Lord] for [God]* and he insists that *Consistency in translation demands that we not allow our personal prejudices to interfere with our rendering of God’s Word* [still undefined].

White’s *personal prejudices* against the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible continue unabated.

Granville Sharp¹⁹⁷ is said to have been a classical Greek grammarian but he devoted much of his life to assisting William Wilberforce in his campaign for the abolition of slavery, for which ministry Sharp is chiefly remembered. Although, as Wikipedia indicates, Sharp proposed his rule supposedly to ‘correct’ *Passages Which Are Wrongly Translated in the Common English Version*, why should anyone believe that his part-time researches exceeded the scholarship of the King James translators? Remember that they included men¹⁹⁸ like Dr Miles Smith, who *had Hebrew at his fingers’ ends* and Dr John Boys who *sometimes devoted himself to his studies of Greek in the university library from 4 a.m. to 8 p.m.*

And mainly-political-activist-but-partly-classical-grammarian Granville Sharp is supposed to have understood the biblical languages better than Drs Smith, Boys and their colleagues?

Dean Burgon, whom even White¹⁹⁹ acknowledges as a true scholar and who lived after Granville Sharp, makes no mention of either Sharp or his rule in *The Revision Revised* – even though the RV has the modern readings in Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 that White, along with Mr Amué, prefers and justifies according to Sharp’s rule. It appears therefore that Dean Burgon did not regard Granville Sharp as a classicist of any distinction.

Dr Holland²⁰⁰ has these comments with respect to Sharp’s rule, his emphases.

It is argued e.g. [by James White] that the KJV incorrectly translated [Titus 2:13] and violated the Granville Sharp Rule of Greek grammar. Basically this rule states that the two nouns (God and Savior) refer to the same Person, Jesus Christ. They are correct in their understanding of this grammatical rule. They are incorrect in stating that the Authorized Version has violated it.

The problem is not with the KJV, but rather a lack of understanding English grammar. In English, when two nouns are separated by the phrase ‘and our,’ the context determines if the nouns refer to two persons or to two aspects of the same person. Consider the following sentence, “He was a great hero and our first president, General George Washington.” This statement is not referring to two persons but two aspects of the same person. Washington was a great hero by everyone’s standards, but he was not everyone’s president. He was our president.

The same is true of the phrase in Titus 2:13. When Christ returns he is coming as King of kings and Lord of lords (Revelation 19:16). He is returning as the great God (Titus 2:13, Revelation 19:17). Therefore, he will return as everyone’s King, everyone’s Lord, as the great God over all. But he is not everyone’s Savior. He is only the Savior of those who have placed faith in him. When he returns he is coming as the great God but he is also returning as our Savior, two aspects of the same Person.

This is illustrated elsewhere in Scripture. Consider the following two passages in the New Testament. In both cases two nouns are separated by the phrase ‘and our.’ However, it is also clear that the two nouns refer to the same Person: God, who is our Father. In Galatians 1:4 we read, “Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father.” Likewise, in 1 Thessalonians 1:3 we read, “Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father.” In both passages we know that ‘God’ and ‘Father’ are the same Person. They are separated by ‘and our’ to convey the truth that the Eternal God over all is also our Father, thereby personalising our relationship with Him.

The King James translation of Titus 2:13 is also consistent. In the Book of Titus we find the Greek phrase *soter os emon* (Savior of us) used six times (1:3, 4; 2:10, 13; 3:4, 6). Each time the Authorized Version consistently translates it as 'our Savior.' In the final analysis, we see that the KJV is harmonious in its use of Greek as well as in its proclamation of the deity of Christ...

The Authorized Version has been accused [by James White and Bruce Metzger] of inconsistency in its translation of 2 Peter 1:1 when compared with its translation of 2 Peter 1:11. In the later passage we read, "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." In making such an accusation, some have provided the following comparison between 2 Peter 1:1 and 2 Peter 1:11.

1:1: *tou theou emon kai soter os Iesou Christou*

1:11: *tou kuriou emon kai soter os Iesou Christou*

It is then noted that the only difference between the two verses is the substitution of *kuriou* (Lord) in verse eleven instead of *theou* (God) as found in verse one. Therefore according to the Greek, verse one must be translated as "our God and Savior" in order to be consistent. Since the KJV does not do this, it is looked upon as mistranslating this passage.

The point...would be correct if the Greek text that underlies the KJV read as presented. However, it does not. The Greek text used by the King James translators was Beza's text of 1589 and 1598. There we find an additional *emon* (our) at 2 Peter 1:1 that is not provided by those who call this a mistranslation. The two are compared below with Beza's text presented first.

Tou theou emon kai soter os emon Iesou Christou

Tou theou emon kai soter os Iesou Christou

The translation of Beza's text is correct in the Authorized Version, and is consistent since the additional *emon* appears in 2 Peter 1:1 and not 2 Peter 1:11.

The question exists why Beza provided the additional *emon* at 2 Peter 1:1 that is not found in the other Greek texts. Dr Bruce Metzger may supply the answer. Although not discussing this passage, Dr Metzger does note the following concerning Beza: Accompanied by annotations and his own Latin version, as well as Jerome's Latin Vulgate, these editions (of Beza's text from 1565, 1582, 1589, and 1598) contained a certain amount of textual information drawn from several Greek manuscripts which Beza had collated himself, as well as the Greek manuscripts collated by Henry Stephanus, son of Robert Stephanus.

Since the Greek text of Robert Stephanus did not contain the addition, and the Greek text of Beza does, it is logical to assume that Beza added the *emon* at 2 Peter 1:1 based on various manuscripts that he possessed (or the ones possessed by Henry Stephanus). We would be mistaken to presume that all existing manuscripts used in the sixteenth century are still in existence today. Some have undoubtedly passed away over time. Regardless, the inclusion of the extra *emon* in this passage provides evidence of its preservation. It is certainly not a mistranslation on the part of the KJV.

Dr Holland concludes, his emphasis, with an admonition that precisely sums up James White's attitude to the scriptures – and his entire book.

We would do well to take note and exercise caution when seeking to correct what we **perceive** is a mistranslation. It just may be that the one in error is the one passing judgment.

Like Mr Amué. Moreover, by inspection the expressions "**the glorious appearing**" Titus 2:13 AV1611 and "**the righteousness**" 2 Peter 1:1 AV1611 must apply to *one* individual, not two.

About the autographs

Mr Amué mentions *the autographs* and *the original text* first letter, page 2, last paragraph. Like our critic²⁰¹ in 'O Biblios,' most bible critics defer to 'the originals' at some point.

But where did this deference for *the autographs* come from, at least in the modern era? I believe that it is useful to address this question, given the unquestionably wide-ranging influence of *the autographs* amongst the Lord's people today, especially fundamentalists.

One should note first the words of a certain Doug Kutilek, who is an unequivocal fundamentalist advocate of *the autographs*. Kutilek is also a close ally of arch-bible critic James White and said by him²⁰² to be the author of *fine, ongoing work* i.e. spreading disbelief in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. Kutilek's site²⁰³ is *dedicated to the defense of the Bible as originally written, against the flood of falsehood propagated by King James Onlyism*. Kutilek is typical of 'scholarship-onlyists' like Mr Amué, who frequently gravitate to 'originals-onlyism,' like our critic and whose attitude to bible believers is as the King's men²⁰⁴ warned with such brilliant foresight 400 years ago.

We shall be maligned by self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their anvil.

Of course, these *self-conceited Brethren* usually evade the fact that *the Bible*, as such, was never *originally written*, in the sense of being compiled into one volume²⁰⁵ (impossible with hand-written manuscripts).

Kutilek et al are therefore perpetuating the fable propagated by 19th century Princeton theologians, A. A. Hodge and B. B. Warfield^{206, 207} that only 'the originals' were – not are - 'inspired.' Hodge and Warfield were thus the latter day proponents of the notion that "*the holy scriptures*" 2 Timothy 3:15 are to be found *only* in the long-vanished and non-existent 'original autographs' i.e. the Lord Jesus Christ lied when He made His promise in Matthew 24:35, Mark 13:31, Luke 21:33.

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

The view of Hodge and Warfield was a radical departure from what had been a long-held view at Princeton that appears to have been similar to Dean Burgon's, i.e. that *the traditional text* was the pure word of God.

Hodge and Warfield may have been attempting a compromise measure designed to counter the growing influence of "*heady, highminded*" academics 2 Timothy 3:4, who rejected the belief that "*all scripture is given by inspiration of God*" 2 Timothy 3:16. In any event, the outcome of their lukewarmness Revelation 3:16, has been disastrous, as the history of the 20th century with respect to bible belief starkly reveals.

According to a Presbyterian publication²⁰⁸, my underlinings, *The son and successor of Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, shifted away from his father's insistence on the inerrancy of the traditional text in use to the inerrancy of the (lost) original autographs. A. A. Hodge with B. B. Warfield co-authored the definitive statement in the Princeton doctrine of Scripture, summarized in an 1881 article on "Inspiration."*

1881 was of course the same year that "*heady, highminded*" Cambridge academics, Westcott and Hort, published the Revised Version New Testament²⁰⁹. The Devil was clearly at work on two academic fronts at that time, in the two leading Protestant and bible-believing nations. Revelation 3:15-18 strongly suggests that the Lord gave him permission so to do, in return for the gathering apostasy in the Body of Christ that ushered in the Laodicean Church age. Hodge and Warfield²¹⁰ stated their belief as follows, in this article entitled *Inspiration*, my emphases.

All the affirmations of Scripture of all kinds, whether of spiritual doctrine or duty, or of physical or historical fact, or of psychological or philosophical principle, are without any error, when the ipsissima verba [the precise words] of the original autographs are ascertained and interpreted in their natural and intended sense.

All copies and therefore Bible translations are therefore said to be imperfect where they depart from the precise words of *the original autographs*. Note that, to this day, *no* bible critic professes unequivocally to possess all the precise words of *the original autographs*. Not even Mr Amu   makes such a profession, nor can he when his correspondence is examined closely. The inconsistency of his assertions in his second letter about *all those Bibles, in any language, based on the Masoretic and Received Texts, are perfect Bibles [that] can be trusted* and *ALL BIBLES based on the Masoretic and Received Texts are the WORD OF GOD* have been highlighted. See pp 6, 64 of this work.

Of course, the bible critics i.e. Amu  , White, Kutilek, Westcott, Hort, Hodge, Warfield, our critic²¹¹ etc. will insist that they are best suited to expound the contents of the precise words of the original autographs, in blatant violation of the priesthood of all believers as Peter exhorts.

1 Peter 2:9 **“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 marvellous light:”**

Note this extract²¹².

In answer to Grievous Wolf’s citation of Spurgeon *against* the 1611 Holy Bible in *Question 61*, this is what Spurgeon²¹³ said to his students about the 1611 Holy Bible a few months before he died in 1892.

If this book be not infallible, where shall we find infallibility? We have given up the Pope, for he has blundered often and terribly; but we shall not set up instead of him a horde of little popelings fresh from college. Are these correctors of Scripture infallible? Is it certain that our Bibles are not right, but that the critics must be so?...

But where shall infallibility be found? “The depth saith, it is not in me”; yet those who have no depth at all [spiritually] would have us imagine that it is in them; or else by perpetual change they hope to hit upon it...

We shall gradually be so bedoubted and becriticized, that only a few of the most profound [intellectually] will know what is Bible, and what is not, and they will dictate to all the rest of us. I have no more faith in their mercy than in their accuracy: they will rob us of all that we hold most dear, and glory in the cruel deed. This same reign of terror we shall not endure, for we still believe that God revealeth himself rather to babes than to the wise and prudent, and we are fully assured that our own old English version of the Scriptures is sufficient for plain men for all purposes of life, salvation, and godliness. We do not despise learning, but we will never say of culture or criticism, “These be thy gods, O Israel!”

Hodge and Warfield’s article has influenced most of the body of Christ since then. Few Christians today actually believe that they possess **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”** 2 Timothy 3:16. Most are like our critic in ‘*O Biblios*’ and our current critic, Mr Amu  . As Solomon rightly observed, **“one sinner destroyeth much good”** Ecclesiastes 9:18b. Two, in the UK and two more, in the US, Westcott, Hort, Hodge, Warfield, clearly wreaked untold havoc.

Observe that it is always **“heady, highminded”** academics who seek to subvert bible belief. Note Dr Ruckman’s discussion²¹⁴ of the early Alexandrian academic, Adamantius* Origen and his African ‘university.’ *Did rock-pop star Adam Ant²¹⁵ get his name from this source, I wonder?

Hodge and Warfield were the culprits in the modern era but remember that subversive academics also existed in John Bunyan’s day, in the 17th century²¹⁶.

This is the testimony of John Bunyan²¹⁷: *A university man met Bunyan on the road near Cambridge. Said he to Bunyan, “How dare you preach, not having the original Scriptures?” “Do you have them - the copies written by the apostles and prophets?” asked Bunyan. “No,” replied the scholar. “But I have what I believe to be a true copy of the original.” “And I,” said Bunyan, “believe the English Bible to be a true copy too.”*

A university man met Bunyan on the road near Cambridge. Said he to Bunyan, "How dare you preach, not having the original Scriptures?"

"Do you have them—the copies written by the apostles and prophets?" asked Bunyan.

"No," replied the scholar. "But I have what I believe to be a true copy of the original."

"And I," said Bunyan, "believe the English Bible to be a true copy, too."

"Then away rid the scholar," said Bunyan, telling about it afterward.

John Charles Ryle²¹⁸ was the first Church of England Bishop of Liverpool. In the 1870s, Ryle²¹⁹ wrote about the great revival preachers like Whitefield and Wesley. He said this about these preachers and the 1611 Holy Bible, his emphases.

*The spiritual reformers of the last century taught constantly **the sufficiency and supremacy of Holy Scripture**. The Bible, whole and unmutilated, was their sole rule of faith and practice. They accepted all its statements without question or dispute. They knew nothing of any part of Scripture being uninspired...In all their preaching they were eminently men of one book. To that book they were content to pin their faith, and by it to stand or fall. This was one grand characteristic of their preaching. They honoured, they loved, they revered the Bible.*

As do all genuine bible believers. As Gail Riplinger has rightly said²²⁰, this writer's emphases:

*The desire to appear intelligent or superior by referring to 'the Greek' and downplaying the common man's Bible, exposes a naivety concerning textual history and those documents which today's pseudo-intellectuals call 'the critical text,' 'the original Greek,' the 'Majority Text,' or the 'Textus Receptus.' **There existed a true original Greek (i.e. Majority Text, Textus Receptus). It is not in print and never will be, because it is unnecessary. No one on [earth] speaks first century Koine Greek, so God is finished with it. He needs no 'Dead Bible Society' to translate it into "everyday English," using the same corrupt secularised lexicons used by the TNIV, NIV, NASB and HCSB [Holman Christian Standard Bible]. God has not called readers to check his Holy Bible for errors. He has called his Holy Bible to check us for errors.***


Conclusion

Mr Amué objects to the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible with respect to its repeated use of the word "**hell**," numerous so-called mistranslations and supposedly scanty sources, such as Erasmus's access to a mere 5 manuscripts. He also supposes that the corrupt NKJV is superior in many respects to the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

This study has shown that every one of Mr Amué's objections and suppositions is wrong and is indeed a lie. In that respect, Mr Amué is no different from all the bible critics before him and any that will come after him, until the Second Advent. Consideration of his third and final letter will follow as soon as possible. For now, as the Lord promised His Old Testament saints²²¹ but which holds true now for today's believers of whom Paul declares "**Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular**" 1 Corinthians 12:27:

Happy art thou, O Israel: who is like unto thee, O people saved by the LORD, the shield of thy help, and who is the sword of thy excellency! and thine enemies shall be found liars unto thee; and thou shalt tread upon their high places.

- Deuteronomy 33:29 (KJV) -



God the Creator and Destroyer




Figure 1 Earth and "The Nether Parts of the Earth"

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth...the LORD God made the earth and the heavens" Genesis 1:1, 2:4. Note the difference²²²!

Figure 1 - Key to Texts. N.B. *"Hell"* occurs 54 times in *"the scripture of truth"* Daniel 10:21

"Nether parts of the earth" Ezekiel 31:14, 16, 18, 32:18, 24

"Abraham's bosom" Luke 16:22

"Pillars of the earth" 1 Samuel 2:8


"A great gulf fixed" Luke 16:26

"Bottomless pit" Revelation 9:1, 2, 11, 11:7, 17:8, 20:1, 3

"Sides of the pit" Isaiah 14:15, Ezekiel 32:23

"Hell" (*sheol**) Deuteronomy 32:22; 2 Samuel 22:6; Job 11:8, 22:6; Psalm 9:17, 16:10, 18:5, 55:15, 86:13, 116:3, 139:8; Proverbs 5:5, 7:27, 9:18, 15:11, 24, 23:14, 27:20; Isaiah 5:14, 14:9, 15, 28:15, 18, 57:9; Ezekiel 31:16, 17, 32:21, 27; Amos 9:2; Jonah 2:2; Habakkuk 2:5 (*hades**) Matthew 11:23, 16:18; Luke 10:15, 16:23; Acts 2:27, 31; Revelation 1:18, 6:8, 20:13, 14, (*geena**) Matthew 5:22, 29, 30, 10:28, 18:9, 23:15, 33; Mark 9:43, 45, 47; Luke 12:5, James 3:6, (*tartarus**) 2 Peter 2:4. *The distinctions are irrelevant in English

"Lowest hell" Deuteronomy 32:22, Psalm 86:13



The earth is divided into four main layers: the **inner core**, **outer core**, **mantle**, and **crust**. The core is composed mostly of iron (Fe) and is so hot that the outer core is **molten**, with about 10% sulphur (S). The inner core is under such extreme **pressure** that it remains solid. Most of the Earth's mass is in the mantle, which is composed of iron (Fe), magnesium (Mg), aluminum (Al), silicon (Si), and oxygen (O) **silicate** compounds. At over 1000 degrees C, the mantle is solid but can deform slowly in a **plastic** manner. The crust is much thinner than any of the other layers, and is composed of the least dense calcium (Ca) and sodium (Na) aluminum-silicate minerals. Being relatively cold, the crust is rocky and **brittle**, so it can fracture in **earthquakes**.

Figure 2 Earth's Interior – from the Nevada Seismological Lab²²³



Figure 3 The Devil's Counterfeit – the NKJV and its Masonic Logo²²⁴

References – 2012, 2022 Update

All web references were current at the time of writing. Web reference and author are given the first time a particular work is cited. Only the work itself is cited in subsequent references. Note that page references to *Early Manuscripts, Church Fathers and the Authorized Version with Manuscript Digests and Summaries* by Dr J. A. Moorman actually refer to the earlier edition of his work entitled *Early Manuscripts, Church Fathers and the Authorized Version A Closer Look! with Manuscript Digests and Summaries*. Page references to Dr Moorman's work *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text* refer to his 2nd Edition. See shop.timefortruth.co.uk/ruckman.html for Dr Ruckman's books.

¹ babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=inu.30000011793225&view=1up&seq=12 left hand text for Wycliffe 1385, right hand text for Wycliffe 1395

www.e-sword.net/downloads.html

www.biblesupport.com/e-sword-downloads/category/2-bibles/

² www.hailandfire.com/1582RheimsTestament/index.shtml JR 1582 NT

³ www.e-sword.net/downloads.html

⁴ www.e-sword.net/downloads.html

⁵ www.e-sword.net/downloads.html

⁶ www.e-sword.net/downloads.html

⁷ www.e-sword.net/downloads.html

⁸ biblemegasite.com/outline-niv84.html

Alternatively, use www.e-sword.net/downloads.html for the 2011 NIV and biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/ NIV2011/NIV2010 Changes for changes from the 1984 NIV

⁹ www.e-sword.net/downloads.html

printed edition

¹⁰ www.biblegateway.com/

¹¹ mullumbimbycatholic.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Jerusalem_Bible_Readers_Edition.pdf JB

www.catholic.org/bible/ NJB

¹² www.jw.org/en/publications/bible/ 1984, 2013 NWTs

¹³ www.biblegateway.com/

¹⁴ www.biblegateway.com/

¹⁵ www.amazon.co.uk/Interlinear-Greek-English-New-Testament/dp/B000XE6EQC *The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament, Stephens' 1550 Edition* edited by George Ricker Berry

www.amazon.co.uk/R-S-V-Interlinear-Greek-English-New-Testament/dp/B007XDDBYDE *The R.S.V. Interlinear Greek-English New Testament: The Nestle Greek Text with a Literal English Translation*

www.amazon.co.uk/GREEK-NT-MAJORITY-TEXT-According/dp/0840749635 *THE GREEK NT MAJORITY TEXT: According to the Majority Text* by HODGES & FARSTAD (Author)

¹⁶ www.cliffsnotes.com/cliffsnotes/subjects/history/who-wrot-a-man-convinced-against-his-will-is-of-the-same-opinion-still *Who wrote, "A man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still"?*

¹⁷ www.amazon.co.uk/Operation-World-Handbook-Intercession/dp/0903843382 *Operation World – A Handbook for World Intercession* by P. G. Johnstone, p 53

¹⁸ www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 14

¹⁹ www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html *In Awe of Thy Word* by Gail Riplinger, Chapters 21, 22 pp 777-778, 873

²⁰ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 24

www.tyndale.org/tsj09/wolfe.html *Postwar Bible Translations: the New King James version*

²¹ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p vi

www.tbsbibles.org/ TBS *Quarterly Record*, No. 529, October to December 1994, *God's Message of Salvation* by Rev. M. J. Roberts, pp 13-14. PDF copy may be obtained on request

²² en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_King_James_Version *New King James Version*

²³ www.christian.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/news_winter2021.pdf *The Christian Institute Newsletter Winter 2021*

²⁴ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 86

store.kjv1611.org/ *The History of the New Testament Church Volume II* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, p 110

²⁵ www.christianitytoday.com/history/people/evangelistsandapologists/billy-sunday.html *Billy Sunday Salty evangelist*

²⁶ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p vi

www.earnestlycontendingforthefaith.com/Books/GustavusSPaine/GustavusPaine%27sTheMenBehindTheKingJamesVersion01.html *The Men Behind the KJV* by Gustavus S. Paine, pp 182-183

- store.kjv1611.org/ *The Men Behind the KJV* by Gustavus S. Paine, pp 182-183
- www.liberator.net/articles/SloanGary/Shaw.html *George Bernard Shaw: Mystic or Atheist?* by Gary Sloan
- ²⁷ archive.org/details/humannatureinbi01phelgoog/page/n16/mode/2up *Human Nature in the Bible* by William Lyon Phelps, Introduction pp x-xi
- ²⁸ www.imdb.com/title/tt1021794/?ref=tttep_ep4 *Monarchy* with David Starkey S2 E4 *The Stuart Succession*
- ²⁹ [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/H. L. Mencken](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/H._L._Mencken) *H. L. Mencken*
- ³⁰ *The Men Behind the King James Version* p viii
- ³¹ www.timefortruth.co.uk/ *Time for Truth!*
- ³² 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 85
- ³³ www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/36722?msg=welcome_stranger#toc9 *The Revision Revised* by Dean John William Burgon, Centennial Edition, 1883-1983, A. G. Hobbs Publications, P.O. Box 14218, Fort Worth TX76117, 1983, pp 21, 108 printed edition. All page numbers given subsequently for *The Revision Revised* refer to this edition
- www.amazon.co.uk/Revision-Revised-Refutation-Westcott-Theory/dp/1888328010 *The Revision Revised* by Dean John William Burgon
- ³⁴ www.amazon.co.uk/King-James-Only-Controversy-Translations/dp/0764206052 *The King James Only Controversy, Can You Trust the Modern Translations?* by James White
- archive.org/details/kingjamesonlycon00whit/mode/2up *The King James Only Controversy, Can You Trust the Modern Translations?* by James White
- ³⁵ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Scholarship Only Controversy* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, pp 24-26
- ³⁶ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* pp 3-6
- ³⁷ www.eden.co.uk/christian-books/bible-study/bible-study-reference-books/concordances/young-s-analytical-concordance-to-the-bible/ *Young's Analytical Concordance to the Bible* by Robert Young
- ³⁸ *Young's Analytical Concordance to the Bible*
- ³⁹ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Primus_inter_pares *Primus inter pares*
- ⁴⁰ store.kjv1611.org/ *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1149
- ⁴¹ www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html *Which Bible is God's Word?* by Gail Riplinger, 2007 Edition p 116
- ⁴² store.kjv1611.org/ *Bible Believers' Bulletin* November 1998 *Why God Dumped the Greek for the English* p 1
- ⁴³ www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/gehenna *gehenna*
- ⁴⁴ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 145
- ⁴⁵ www.chick.com/ *Answers to Your Bible Questions* by David Daniels, pp 75-76
- ⁴⁶ vulgate.org/ *Vulgate.org The Latin Vulgate Bible*
- ⁴⁷ www.amazon.co.uk/Dispensational-Truth-C-Larkin/dp/0001473727 *Dispensational Truth* by Clarence Larkin, pp 95ff
- babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.e0000771642&view=1up&seq=7&skin=2021 *Dispensational Truth* by Clarence Larkin, #158-#159
- ⁴⁸ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Books of the General Epistles Volume 1* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, pp 338-339
- ⁴⁹ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Book of Revelation* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, p 187
- ⁵⁰ www.amazon.co.uk/Geocentricity-biblical-Cosmology-Gerardus-Bouw/dp/B0006QKVG6 *Geocentricity* by Dr Gerardus Bouw, pp 12-14, 17
- ⁵¹ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Mark of the Beast* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman
- ⁵² www.onlinemetals.com/en/melting-points *Melting Points of Metals*
- ⁵³ www.verywellmind.com/what-does-lgbtq-mean-5069804 *What Does LGBTQ+ Mean?*
- ⁵⁴ *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 99
- ⁵⁵ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Book of Job* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, p 132
- ⁵⁶ store.kjv1611.org/ *Where Do The Dead Go?* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, p 12
- ⁵⁷ store.kjv1611.org/
How to Teach Dispensational Truth by Dr Peter S. Ruckman
The Big Flap by Dr Peter S. Ruckman
- ⁵⁸ *The Books of the General Epistles Volume 1* pp 338-339
- ⁵⁹ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alcatraz *Alcatraz Island*
- ⁶⁰ www.chick.com *Final Authority* by Dr William P. Grady, pp 304-305
NKJV Preface p v
- ⁶¹ www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *The KJB 1611 to 2011+ Invulnerable in The Critics' Den* pp 19, 32-44

- www.timefortruth.co.uk/alan-oreilly/
The AV1611 versus NKJV Deception- Case Study
Hell versus hades
- ⁶² Letter to Michael Penfold from this writer February 12th 2002 p 9. PDF copy available on request
www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php *Yes, The King James Bible is Perfect* p 4/
Bible Article The Perfect KJB p 5
- ⁶³ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chair_of_Saint_Peter *Chair of Saint Peter*
- ⁶⁴ www.timefortruth.co.uk/alan-oreilly/ *Christ our Passover Sacrifice*
- ⁶⁵ www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/the-answer-book-by-sam-gipp.php *The Answer Book* by Dr Sam Gipp Q2 *Isn't "Easter" a Mistranslation?* pp 3-8 printed edition
- ⁶⁶ *The King James Only Controversy* pp 233-234
- ⁶⁷ www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php *KJO Review Full Text* pp 545-546
- ⁶⁸ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Book of Exodus* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, pp 182-183
- ⁶⁹ *Answers to Your Bible Questions* pp 77-78
- ⁷⁰ www.av1611.org/kjv/easter2.html *Conies Brass and Easter* by Dr J. A. Moorman, pp 13-15 printed edition
- ⁷¹ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Book of Acts* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, pp 356-357
- ⁷² www.daystarpublishing.org/product/the-book-of-bible-problems/ *The Book of Bible Problems* by Dr Gerardus D. Bouw, p 229
- ⁷³ brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *Easter is Correct*
- ⁷⁴ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 141
- ⁷⁵ *The Answer Book* Q47 *What About the Nuggets Found Only in the Greek?* pp 124-131 printed edition
- ⁷⁶ www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html *New Age Bible Versions* by Gail Riplinger, 2008 Edition p 336 2019 Edition p 374
- ⁷⁷ www.avpublications.com/3_catalogue/nabv/testimonials.htm *WHAT OTHERS ARE SAYING NEW AGE BIBLE VERSIONS*
- ⁷⁸ www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html *Hazardous Materials, Greek & Hebrew Study Dangers* by Gail Riplinger, PARTS III, V, VI
- ⁷⁹ www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *Seven Purifications of the Textus Receptus*
- ⁸⁰ *KJO Review Full Text*
- ⁸¹ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* pp 141-144
The Book of Acts pp 146ff, 185ff
- ⁸² 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 147
- ⁸³ *The Revision Revised* pp 171, 173-174
- ⁸⁴ *The Revision Revised* p 155
- ⁸⁵ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 35
- ⁸⁶ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Books of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, p 488
- ⁸⁷ www.amazon.co.uk/Vines-Complete-Expository-Dictionary-Testament/dp/0785211608 *Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words* by W. E. Vine
- ⁸⁸ *The King James Only Controversy* p 259
- ⁸⁹ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 260
- ⁹⁰ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, p 119
- ⁹¹ *In Awe of Thy Word* p 716
- ⁹² 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 261
- ⁹³ *New Age Bible Versions* 2008 Edition p 342 2019 Edition p 380
- ⁹⁴ www.amazon.co.uk/Which-Bible-David-Otis-Fuller/dp/0944355242 *Which Bible?* 5th Edition by Dr David Otis Fuller, p 344
- ⁹⁵ www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html Resources *The James White Controversy Part 1* by Gail Riplinger
- ⁹⁶ brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *John 1:18 the only begotten Son*
- ⁹⁷ www.tbsbibles.org/page/articles *An Examination of the New King James Version, Part 1* by A. Hembd, pp 32-33 PDF
An Examination of the New King James Version, Part 1 by A. Hembd, TBS Quarterly Record, Issue Number: 581 – October to December 2007 pp 32-33
- ⁹⁸ members.tripod.com/bible_study/courses/mssevidence/original.htm Lesson 11: *Translational Considerations*

- ⁹⁹ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Book of Genesis* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, p 474
- ¹⁰⁰ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Book of Ecclesiastes* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, pp 286-291
- ¹⁰¹ www.christianbook.com/interlinear-hebrew-greek-english-bible-volumes/9781565639805/pd/639804 *Interlinear Hebrew/English Old Testament 3 Volumes* edited by Jay P. Green
- ¹⁰² 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 1
- ¹⁰³ www.amazon.com/Geneva-Bible-Facsimile-Undated-Sternhold/dp/0962988804 *Geneva Bible 1599 Hardcover*, L L Brown Pub Co (May 1, 1991)
- ¹⁰⁴ www.amazon.co.uk/Septuagint-Apocrypha-L-C-Brenton/dp/0913573442 *Septuagint with Apocrypha (Greek)* by L. C. L. Brenton (Author)
- ¹⁰⁵ www.abebooks.co.uk/9780718003111/Holy-Bible-New-King-James-071800311X/plp *Holy Bible: The New King James Version (NKJV)*, Thomas Nelson Publishers (1982), p vi
- ¹⁰⁶ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* pp 39-40
- ¹⁰⁷ store.kjv1611.org/ *Problem Texts* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, pp 294-296 now *The 'Errors' In The King James Bible* pp 296-298
- ¹⁰⁸ www.esp-world.info/Articles_1/Colour/blue.html *English for Specific Purposes World, Colour Words, Blue Interlinear Hebrew/English Old Testament*
- ¹⁰⁹ www.avpublications.com//avnew/home.html Downloads *New King James Omissions* by Gail Riplinger
- ¹¹⁰ Downloads *New King James Omissions*
- ¹¹¹ Downloads *New King James Omissions*
- ¹¹² www.av1611.org/tracts.html *The New King James Counterfeit* by Terry Watkins
- ¹¹³ *The King James Only Controversy* pp 112ff
- ¹¹⁴ store.kjv1611.org/ *About The "New" King James Bible* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, p 15
KJO Review Full Text pp 220ff
- ¹¹⁵ *Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words*
- ¹¹⁶ *The Scholarship Only Controversy* p 79
- ¹¹⁷ www.amazon.com/Foxs-Martyrs-William-Byron-Forbush/dp/B000J32PRO *Fox's Book of Martyrs* edited by William Forbush, p 138
- ¹¹⁸ *William Tyndale, Select Works* From Focus Christian Ministries Trust, 1986, p 6
- ¹¹⁹ *Fox's Book of Martyrs* pp 178-181
- ¹²⁰ *The New King James Counterfeit*
- ¹²¹ *The King James Only Controversy* pp 112ff
KJO Review Full Text pp 220ff
- ¹²² *About The "New" King James Bible* p 15
- ¹²³ *The Scholarship Only Controversy* pp 76ff
- ¹²⁴ Lesson 11: *Translational Considerations*
www.amazon.co.uk/Crowned-Glory-Ancient-Authorized-Version/dp/0595146171 *Crowned With Glory* by Dr Thomas Holland, pp 187-188
- ¹²⁵ *New Age Bible Versions* 2008 Edition pp 601-602 2019 Edition pp 658-660
- ¹²⁶ www.thefreedictionary.com/avowtry *avowtry* the crime of adultery
- ¹²⁷ *Which Bible?* 5th Edition pp 180ff
www.sdadefend.com/Living-Word/Wilkinson/AuthorizedBibleTOC.htm *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* by Dr Benjamin Wilkinson, Chapter 1
- ¹²⁸ *The Books of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians* p 576
- ¹²⁹ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Book of Proverbs* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, p 523
- ¹³⁰ *The New King James Counterfeit*
- ¹³¹ *The King James Only Controversy* pp 112ff
KJO Review Full Text pp 220ff
- ¹³² *Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words*
- ¹³³ *The Scholarship Only Controversy* pp 83-84
- ¹³⁴ *The King James Only Controversy* p 125
- ¹³⁵ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Books of First and Second Thessalonians and Philemon* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, pp 101-102
- ¹³⁶ *Bible Believers' Bulletin* November 2005 p 12
- ¹³⁷ *The New King James Counterfeit*

- ¹³⁸ *The King James Only Controversy* pp 113, 139-140
KJO Review Full Text pp 274ff
- ¹³⁹ *The King James Only Controversy* pp 139-140
- ¹⁴⁰ *Final Authority* pp 283-285
- ¹⁴¹ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* pp 150-151
- ¹⁴² *The Revision Revised* p 155
- ¹⁴³ *New Age Bible Versions* 2008 Edition pp 171-172 2019 Edition pp 185-187
- ¹⁴⁴ *The James White Controversy Part 4*
www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html *King James Version Ditches Blind Guides* by Gail. Riplinger, pp 45ff
- ¹⁴⁵ store.kjv1611.org/ *Pastoral Epistles* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, pp 133ff
- ¹⁴⁶ *Bible Believers' Bulletin* December 2005 pp 17-18
- ¹⁴⁷ *Pastoral Epistles* pp 160ff
- ¹⁴⁸ *Which Bible is God's Word?* 2007 Edition pp 128-134
- ¹⁴⁹ *Hazardous Materials, Greek & Hebrew Study Dangers*
- ¹⁵⁰ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lewis_Carroll *Lewis Carroll*
- ¹⁵¹ www.amazon.co.uk/Brief-History-English-Bible-Translations/dp/0962889814 *A Brief History Of English Bible Translations* by Dr Laurence M. Vance, pp 15-16
- ¹⁵² www.amazon.co.uk/Pioneers-Reformation-England-LOANE-M/dp/B002800LCC *Pioneers Of The Reformation In England* by Dr Marcus Loane pp 92ff
- ¹⁵³ *A Brief History Of English Bible Translations* p 47
- ¹⁵⁴ *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 17, 129ff
- ¹⁵⁵ *NKJV Preface* pp iv-v
- ¹⁵⁶ *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 331ff
- ¹⁵⁷ *In Awe of Thy Word* p 490
- ¹⁵⁸ www.tbsbibles.org/page/articles *The NKJV: What today's Christian needs to know/What Today's Christian Needs To Know About The New King James Version* by G. W. & D. E. Anderson
- ¹⁵⁹ *Which Bible is God's Word?* 2007 Edition pp 24-25
- ¹⁶⁰ Downloads *New King James Omissions*
www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/version-comparison.php *1611, 2011 AV1611 Precision versus Modern Version Impurity* pp 3-14, 16-28
- ¹⁶¹ *Which Bible is God's Word?* 2007 Edition pp 27-28
- ¹⁶² *The Revision Revised* pp 21, 108
- ¹⁶³ *The Revision Revised* p 108
- ¹⁶⁴ www.amazon.co.uk/When-KJV-Departs-Majority-Text/dp/1568480989 *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text – A New Twist In The Continuing Attack On The Authorized Version* by Dr J. A. Moorman, pp 29, 33
- ¹⁶⁵ www.amazon.co.uk/Manuscripts-Fathers-Authorized-Manuscript-Summaries/dp/1568480482 *Early Manuscripts, Church Fathers and the Authorized Version with Manuscript Digests and Summaries* by Dr J. A. Moorman, pp 27-28
- ¹⁶⁶ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 4
- ¹⁶⁷ *The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* p 79
- ¹⁶⁸ www.amazon.com/GOD-WROTE-ONLY-ONE-BIBLE/dp/B000J563VQ *God Wrote Only One Bible* by J. J. Ray, pp 32, 34, 36
- ¹⁶⁹ *Early Manuscripts, Church Fathers and the Authorized Version with Manuscript Digests and Summaries* p 64
- ¹⁷⁰ *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text – A New Twist In The Continuing Attack On The Authorized Version* p 34
- ¹⁷¹ *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text – A New Twist In The Continuing Attack On The Authorized Version* pp 27-28
- ¹⁷² *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text – A New Twist In The Continuing Attack On The Authorized Version* pp 11, 14-15
- ¹⁷³ *Which Bible is God's Word?* 2007 Edition p 31
- ¹⁷⁴ www.amazon.co.uk/Defending-James-Bible-Th-D-Ph-D/dp/1568480121 *Defending the King James Bible* by Dr D. A. Waite, pp 48-49
- ¹⁷⁵ *Defending the King James Bible* pp 27-28
- ¹⁷⁶ www.pawcreek.org/ Paw Creek Ministries Pastor Joseph Chambers

- www.pawcreek.org/apostasy-a-jesuit-priest-and-the-niv-bible/ *Apostasy: A Jesuit Priest And The NIV Bible*
- ¹⁷⁷ *Defending the King James Bible* pp 24-26
- ¹⁷⁸ www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-7434.php *The 1611 Bible versus OT Hebrew Editions*
- ¹⁷⁹ archive.org/details/TheKingJamesVersionDefended/mode/2up *The King James Version Defended* 3rd Edition by Dr Edward F. Hills, Chapter 8
- www.amazon.co.uk/King-James-Version-Defended/dp/0915923009 *The King James Version Defended* 3rd Edition by Dr Edward F. Hills, Chapter 8
- ¹⁸⁰ *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 933ff
- ¹⁸¹ NKJV Preface p vii
- ¹⁸² *The King James Only Controversy* pp 58-59
- ¹⁸³ *The King James Only Controversy* p 62
- ¹⁸⁴ *The AV1611 versus NKJV Deception - Case Study*
Downloads *New King James Omissions*
The New King James Counterfeit
1611, 2011 AV1611 Precision versus Modern Version Impurity
- ¹⁸⁵ www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm *The Translators to the Reader*
- ¹⁸⁶ *The King James Only Controversy* pp 58-59
- ¹⁸⁶ store.kjv1611.org/ *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Chapter 5 now *Biblical Scholarship* Chapter 5
- ¹⁸⁷ store.kjv1611.org/ *The History of the New testament Church Volume I* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, pp 390-391
- ¹⁸⁸ *The History of the New testament Church Volume II* p 60
- ¹⁸⁹ *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* Chapter 5 now *Biblical Scholarship* Chapter 5
The History of the New testament Church Volume I pp 390-391
The History of the New testament Church Volume II p 60
- ¹⁹⁰ *New Age Bible Versions* 2008 Edition pp 370-371 2019 Edition pp 409-410
'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 240
- ¹⁹¹ *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* p iii now *Biblical Scholarship* pp xi-xii
- ¹⁹² *The King James Only Controversy* pp 201-204
- ¹⁹³ *KJO Review Full Text, Introduction and Appendix* Tables A1-A4
- ¹⁹⁴ www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *What is the Bible?* now *O Biblios - The Book – Overview* Table 1 pp 79-93
- ¹⁹⁵ *The King James Only Controversy* pp 198, 258
- ¹⁹⁶ continuingstudies.uvic.ca/elc/studyzone/330/grammar/poss University of Victoria English Language Centre
- ¹⁹⁷ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Granville_Sharp *Granville Sharp*
- ¹⁹⁸ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 17
- ¹⁹⁹ *The King James Only Controversy* p 91
- ²⁰⁰ *Crowned With Glory: The Bible From Ancient Text To Authorized Version* Chapter 9 *Translational Considerations* pp 188-190, Chapter 10 *Deliberating the Arguments* 192-194
members.tripod.com/bible_study/courses/mssevidence/lesson12.html Lesson Twelve: *Deliberating the Arguments*.
Summary
- ²⁰¹ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 85
- ²⁰² *The King James Only Controversy* p 121
- ²⁰³ www.kjvonly.org/index.html Site no longer active. See www.bible.ca/b-kjv-only.htm *Historical bloodline of "KJV only" false teachers* by Doug Kutilek for his ongoing anti-AV1611 stance
- ²⁰⁴ www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm Epistle Dedicatory to the King James Bible penultimate paragraph
- ²⁰⁵ 'O Biblios' *The Book* p 85
- ²⁰⁶ *In Awe of Thy Word* p 553
- ²⁰⁷ *Bible Believers' Bulletin* February 2002, August 2002
- ²⁰⁸ www.pcusa.org/site_media/media/uploads/resolutions/scripture-use.pdf *Presbyterian Understanding and Use of Holy Scripture Biblical Authority and Interpretation* p 26
- ²⁰⁹ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revised_Version *Revised Version*
- ²¹⁰ commons.ptsem.edu/id/presbyterianrevi2618unse-dmd002 *The Presbyterian Review* 1881, Vol. 2, No. 6, pp 237-238

- www.bible-researcher.com/warfield4.html *INSPIRATION* by Archibald Hodge and Benjamin Warfield *The Presbyterian Review* 6 (April 1881), pp. 225-260
- ²¹¹ 'O Biblios' – *The Book* Chapter 8 et seq
- ²¹² www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php Answers to the Wolf-Man Part I/*Grievous Wolf Questions* p 61
- ²¹³ archive.spurgeon.org/misc/gfw.php *The Greatest Fight in the World* By C. H. Spurgeon
- ²¹⁴ *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* Chapters 3, 4 now *Biblical Scholarship* Chapters 3, 4
- ²¹⁵ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adam_Ant *Adam Ant*
- ²¹⁶ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 85
- ²¹⁷ *Bible Believers' Bulletin* March 1994, *Hot Dog Hymers Video on Ruckmanism* p 14, citation from *John Bunyan, The Immortal Dreamer* by W. Burgess McCreary
- books.google.co.uk/books/about/John_Bunyan_the_immortal_dreamer.html?id=U5HyAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y
John Bunyan, The Immortal Dreamer by William Burgess McCreary, p 38
- ²¹⁸ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/J._C._Ryle *J. C. Ryle*
- ²¹⁹ www.amazon.co.uk/Christian-Leaders-Last-Century/dp/1360878009 *The Christian Leaders of the Last (18th) Century* by John Charles Ryle
- The Christian Leaders of the Last (i.e. 18th) Century* by Rev J. C. Ryle, T Nelson and Sons, 1878, Preface, pp 26, 90
- www.monergism.com/christian-leaders-last-century-ebook *The Christian Leaders of the Last (i.e. 18th) Century* by Rev J. C. Ryle, PDF Preface, pp 19, 77
- ²²⁰ *In Awe of Thy Word* p 956
- ²²¹ www.heartlight.org/cgi-shl/dailywisdom.cgi?day=20180604&ver=kjv
- ²²² *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1
- ²²³ sites.google.com/view/louie-class-geol100/earths-interior *Earth's Interior* by Professor Emeritus John Louie
- ²²⁴ *The New King James Counterfeit*