

COPY

5 Ilkley Grove
Guisborough TS14 8LL
North Yorks.
February 12th 2002

Michael Penfold
Penfold Book and Bible House
P.O. Box 26
Bicester
Oxon, OX26 4GL

Dear Michael

Re: Leaflet *Is the King James Version Perfect?*

I continue to appreciate your ministry and trust that the Lord enables you to maintain a steadfast witness. However, I was disappointed to see in your catalogue that your leaflet of the above title returns a resounding *no* to the question posed. According to your analysis it is “*illogical*” to believe that the AV1611 is “*perfect*”, even though the opening statement in the first paragraph of your leaflet is that the AV1611 “*is an excellent translation*” and “*the word of God in English*”. I find it hard to follow the ‘logic’ of this position because when one reads the very last paragraph of the leaflet, one finds that there is no definite answer to the related question, namely “*What is the word of God today?*”, small “*w*”. In answer, one finds only that “*The word of God exists wherever a faithful translation is made of what was originally written. To a very high degree, that is what the KJV is*”. In other words, you conclude that the AV1611 is not actually “*an excellent translation*” nor “*the word of God in English*” but rather “*a faithful translation*” that isn’t quite “*the word of God*” but contains “*the word of God...to a very high degree*”.

Please don’t misunderstand me. I am anxious that your ministry continues to enjoy the blessing of God that it has experienced thus far. I believe that such blessing depends on how one fulfils Isaiah 66:2b. “***To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word***”.

In passing, I don’t accept that the English of the AV1611 is “*old fashioned*”. Dr. Lawrence M. Vance has carried out a very detailed study to show that much of the AV1611 vocabulary is still found in many respected and contemporary journals. See his book entitled *Archaic Words and the Authorised Version*. Moreover, I agree with Dr. Hills who said “*the English of the King James Version...is not a type of English that was ever spoken anywhere. It is biblical English...*” See *The King James Version Defended*, p 218. The problem today is not unfamiliarity with the language of the AV1611 as such but wilful ignorance of the scriptures themselves, because we have entered the “*perilous times*” 2 Timothy 3:1-7, as you have no doubt experienced many times in your witness.

Your second paragraph contains several provocative statements that are likely shock the reader into thinking “*Oh! This cannot possibly be true*”, thus discouraging him from enquiring further. For example, you state “*Dr. Peter Ruckman...actually believes the KJV will be the Bible used in heaven...*” but if one was to enquire further, can you genuinely prove otherwise? When John refers to “***a book written within and on the backside, sealed with seven seals***” Revelation 5:1, can you be certain this is *not* an AV1611? Isn’t there a good chance that it *might* be, given the extent to which God has honoured this Book over the centuries? Psalm 138:2b states “***for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name***”. Can you think of any *complete* Bible that merits this honour more than the AV1611? Could you prove it from scripture?

At the end of this paragraph you cite the words of Dr. M. Carter in order to imply that his stance, is typical of the so-called “*KJV only’ theory*”, as allegedly espoused by “*one leading KJV perfectionist, Dr. Peter Ruckman*”. I have listened to many of Dr. Ruckman’s tapes and read most of his books and articles over a period of more than 15 years. I have never heard him make a statement like Dr. Carter’s, nor read any statement of his in print that matches Dr. Carter’s. The Bible Baptist Bookstore Catalogue

states only that “*Dr. Ruckman stands for the absolute authority of the Authorised Version*”. This statement is clearly not as prescriptive as that of Dr. Carter’s but Dr. Carter does define the terms “*verbal*” and “*plenary*” as they apply to the AV1611 and rightly indicates that “*inspiration*” is not limited to ‘the original’. Undoubtedly the AV1611 fulfils 2 Timothy 3:15-17. It is “*the holy scriptures...given by inspiration of God*” and *perfect according to scripture* because it is “*incorruptible...the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever*” 1 Peter 1:23. It is “*the absolute authority*” because its purpose is “*that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works*” – which statement is another testimony to its perfection *according to scripture*.

Dr. Ruckman has expressed his stance on the AV1611 in his *Commentary on Acts*, p 577. “*Our thesis is that God has preserved for this century – in the universal language of the globe – an infallible translation without proven error in it*”. I believe this statement to be an entirely realistic *practical* definition of perfection as it applies to the AV1611.

Of course you are probably aware that Dr. Ruckman has stated that the AV1611 is *superior* to ‘the originals’ but he does so for very cogent reasons that have never been challenged honestly. See *The Bible Babel*, p 118 and *The History of the New Testament Church*, Vol. 1, p 390.

At the end of the fourth paragraph of the leaflet is another provocative statement. The sentence reads “*By faith [KJV only advocates] ‘believe’ that God supernaturally guided the KJV translators to pick the right Greek and Hebrew words and translate them perfectly every single time, despite having several options to choose from throughout...the Bible*”. If the Lord Jesus Christ spoke the truth in John 16:13 and 17:17, would not the Bible believer have at least some basis for believing that the Spirit of God guided the translators “*into all truth*”, especially if “*thy word is truth*”? Might not the Lord have been constrained by His own promise?

“The Lord gave the word: great was the company of those that published it” Psalm 68:11.

Later on in the leaflet you cite the book by McClure, *Translators Revived*. Would not this statement from that author, p 223-224, lend support to belief in supernatural guidance for the 1611 translators? McClure is here describing the results of a comparison of six editions of the AV1611, including the original 1611 edition, carried out by the American Bible Society between 1849-1852.

“The number of variations in the text and punctuation of these six copies was found to fall but little short of twenty-four thousand. A vast amount! Quite enough to frighten us, till we read the Committee’s assurance, that “of all this great number, there is not one which mars the integrity of the text, or affects any doctrine or precept of the Bible.””

In *Final Authority*, p 171, Dr. Bill Grady cites the conclusion of the committee as follows:

“The English Bible as left by the translators has come down to us unaltered in respect of its text. With the exception of typographical errors and changes required by the progress of orthography in the English language, the text of our present Bibles remains unchanged, and without variation from the original copy as left by the translators. The present copies of the Bible accord throughout with the edition of 1611.”

Does not this conclusion also support belief in supernatural guidance for the 1611 translators? Are you prepared to state categorically that the AV1611 translators were *not* supernaturally guided, or if they were, at least to some extent, where this guidance began and ended? Is it certain that if the Lord bestowed supernatural guidance on the AV1611 translators, it ceased in 1611? Might it not have continued to 1638, by which time 72% of textual variations in the AV1611 had been completed, with the assistance of some of the original translators, including Dr. John Bois and Dr. Samuel Ward? See Grady, *ibid.* p 171. Surely readers of your leaflet are entitled to know? After all, God has honoured the cumulative modifications to 1638 for over 360 years!

However, the assumption in paragraphs 4-6 of the leaflet is that because these differences between various editions of the AV1611 exist, the AV1611 therefore cannot be perfect in any particular edition, unless all editions that differ from it are deemed imperfect. Dr. Grady, *ibid.* p 168ff has a most

penetrating analysis of this issue and of the “75,000 details” of difference between a 1769 AV1611 and the 1611 edition that you mention at the end of paragraph 5. He informs the reader that the distinguished Dr. Scrivener alluded to “*less than two hundred as noteworthy of mention*” and cites examples of these notorious 200, showing that they are in fact trivial.

It is disappointing that you do not refer the reader to Dr. Grady’s more detailed research. Nevertheless, your leaflet is forced to agree with Scrivener’s findings because it reduces this vast number of 75,000 differences to just 421, which are not shown to be error but merely “*noticeable to the ear when...read aloud*” and not necessarily giving rise to any inconsistencies between editions.

However, paragraph 5 implies that even changes in spelling between editions of the AV1611 must be deemed inconsistencies. Dr. Gipp, *The Answer Book*, p 15ff, citing pastor Dr. David F. Reagan, shows that this judgement is entirely unreasonable. Dr. Reagan states “*In the 1600’s spelling was according to whim...not until the eighteenth century did the spelling begin to take a stable form*”. The stability of spelling or orthography is entirely independent of *textual* changes and, like printing errors, has no bearing on the perfection of the AV1611. (You may dismiss Dr. Gipp as “*a radical KJV only author*”, paragraph 7 but that is not a valid method of refuting his material.)

It is also disappointing that you do not refer readers to the very informative booklet by Dr. Ruckman, entitled *Differences in the King James Editions*. They may then summarily examine both sides of this issue, according to the principle of Proverbs 18:17, “**He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him**”. Dr. Ruckman wrote in the *Bible Believers’ Bulletin* in September 1984 “*I think that every Christian should read Stewart Custer’s pamphlet called The Truth about the King James Controversy. Along with this he should obtain our answer called Custer’s Last Stand. These two polemics should be laid side by side and studied word for word. The spiritual benefits of this study will be almost beyond calculating and the spiritual light that it will give the most simple minded Christian on the difference between TRUTH and ERROR is staggering. Buy both books and read them for yourself. (And woe unto you if you read only ONE of them! We believe in presenting both sides of a matter clearly, plainly, and in the open. No-one here has ever worried about censoring anyone’s material)*”. I believe this to be a fair approach.

You cite 8 of the 421 details “*where your KJV has added to, changed or contradicted the 1611 edition*” in order to ‘prove’ imperfections in the AV1611. I am further disappointed that you make no allowance for the limitations imposed by printing, which was a very tedious process in 1611 and very prone to error. See Grady, *ibid.* p 168 and again Gipp, *ibid.* p 15ff. Dr. Gipp cites Reagan’s explanation that the editions of 1629 and 1638 were carried out for the correction of earlier printing errors and those of the eighteenth century for standardisation of spelling. It is undoubtedly a printing error that accounts for the only actual contradiction in your list of 8. Let us consider whether or not these 8 differences are genuine ‘imperfections’.

1. Genesis 39:16, “**her lord**” 1611 AV1611 versus “**his lord**” 2002 AV1611

1 Peter 3:6 and Esther 1:22 show that *both* readings are correct. (This reference is similar to the apparent contradiction in Ruth 3:15 between the 1611 and 2002 AV1611s, resolved by Ruth 4:1 that shows that both editions are correct.) Unlike Sarah, Potiphar’s wife was not a godly woman but her attempted infidelity did not affect her status before her husband in God’s sight. It only emphasised her disobedience, Ephesians 5:33b. However, the 2002 AV1611 reading is in closer harmony with the rest of the chapter, verses 2, 3, 8, 9, 19, 20 and yields more evidence for likening Joseph to the Lord Jesus Christ in the Old Testament. See Dr. Ruckman’s *Commentary on Genesis*. Like Joseph, the Lord obeyed *His* Lord, Psalm 110:1 and like Joseph “**when he was reviled, reviled not again...but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously**” 1 Peter 2:23. One notes in verses 2, 3, 5, 21 and 23 of Genesis 39 that “**the Lord was with Joseph**”.

2. Leviticus 20:11, “**shall be put to death**” 1611 AV1611 versus “**shall surely be put to death**” 2002 AV1611

The expression ***“shall surely be put to death”*** or ***“shall be surely put to death”*** is found Leviticus 20:2, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 of both editions. The omission of ***“surely”*** from verse 11 in the 1611 edition is almost certainly a printing error BUT the text is not affected.

3. Deuteronomy 5:29, ***“my commandments”*** 1611 AV1611 versus ***“all my commandments”*** 2002 AV1611

The actual expression, in *both* editions is ***“...my commandments always”***. Moreover, the expressions ***“all the commandments, and the statutes, and the judgements”*** and ***“all the ways which the Lord your God hath commanded you”*** are found in verses 31 and 33 of both editions. No misinterpretation is possible. No confusion is possible. The 2002 edition simply has added emphasis. No ‘imperfection’ or ‘inconsistency’ exists.

4. 2 Kings 11:10, ***“in the temple”*** 1611 AV1611 versus ***“in the temple of the Lord”*** 2002 AV1611

2 Kings 11 reads ***“house of the Lord”*** in verses 3, 4 twice, 7, 15, 18, 19 and ***“temple of the Lord”*** in verse 13 so there is no contradiction between editions about the identity of the ***“the temple”*** in verse 10. Both readings are correct. However ***“the temple”*** occurs three times in verse 11. The expression in verse 10 could easily have been associated with the repetitions in the very next verse by the printers in 1611. For the record, ***“Jehovah”*** appears in Green’s Masoretic Hebrew-English Interlinear.

5. Isaiah 49:13, ***“God hath comforted”*** 1611 AV1611 versus ***“the Lord hath comforted”*** 2002 AV1611

Isaiah 49 reads ***“the Lord”*** in verses 1, 4, 5, 7 twice, 8, 14 with ***“my Lord”***, 18, 23, 25, 26, ***“the Lord, ...my God”*** in verses 4, 5 and ***“the Lord God”*** in verse 22 so that both editions are consistent with respect to the identity of the Comforter in verse 13. That the editions do not read verbatim at this point therefore does not mean that one or the other is ‘imperfect’ – apart from printing errors, the same could be said for all these ‘examples’.

6. Ezekiel 24:7, ***“poured it upon the ground”*** 1611 AV1611 versus ***“poured it not upon the ground”*** 2002 AV1611

This is the only ‘contradiction’ of substance in these 8 examples but inspection of verses 7 and 8 shows that it is obviously the result of a printing error from 1611. Verse 8 states ***“I have set her blood upon the top of a rock, that it should not be covered”***. For the record, ***“not”*** is in the Hebrew-English Interlinear.

7. 1 Timothy 1:4, ***“edifying”*** 1611 AV1611 versus ***“godly edifying”*** 2002 AV1611

This ***“edifying”*** is ***“in faith”*** and contrasts with the strictures of ***“the law”*** that ***“is not made for a righteous man, but...for the ungodly”*** verse 9. There is therefore no uncertainty in either edition about the ***“godly”*** nature of the edifying and no inconsistency between editions. However, the word ***“theou”*** is in the Berry’s Interlinear of Stephanus’ 3rd Edition Receptus, so that insertion of ***“godly”*** simply corrects a printing omission from 1611.

8. 1 John 5:12, ***“the Son”*** 1611 AV1611 versus ***“the Son of God”*** 2002 AV1611

1 John 5 reads ***“born of God”*** in verse 1 and ***“Son of God”*** in verses 5, 10, 13 twice and in 20 with ***“Son Jesus Christ”***. Both editions are clear about the identity of ***“the Son”*** in verse 12. However ***“the Son”*** appears in the first half of verse 12 and could have influenced the printers in 1611. The 2002 AV1611 reading was introduced in 1638, according to Beale, *A Pictorial History of Our English Bible*, p 47 and God has clearly honoured the insertion since then. Again, for the record, ***“tou theos”*** is in the Receptus in the second half of verse 12.

Please understand that although I have cited the Masoretic Hebrew and the Greek Receptus, I am not implying that these are ***“the absolute authority”***, the AV1611 is ***“the absolute authority”***. I refer to them simply because the 1611 translators used them, both for their original work and the few genuine alterations that subsequently were found to be necessary.

These alterations did not involve changes in the source text, such as the Revised Version introduced. They were carried out for the purpose of correcting *printing* errors, not textual errors, updating spelling and modifying some of the Italics *without* altering the text. It is quite misleading therefore to assert in paragraph 6 that the need for such modifications, in effect, “*spells the end of the myth of a ‘perfectly preserved KJV’*”. The American Bible Society, whose researches I referred to earlier, had a much more realistic appraisal in 1852:

“That the edition of 1611, although prepared with very great care, was not free from typographical errors; and that, while most of these were corrected in the edition of 1613, others in much greater number were nevertheless then introduced, which have since been removed. That the revision of Dr. Blaney made by collating the then current editions of Oxford and Cambridge with those of 1611 and 1701 had for its main object to restore the text of the English Bible to its original purity: and that this was successfully accomplished”. See *Differences in the KJV Editions*, p 11.

Paragraphs 7-9 of the leaflet are little more than an elaboration on Genesis 3:1 – **“Yea hath God said...?”**. The Lord Himself experienced this approach: **“Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk”** Matthew 22:15. I believe that the case presented can be answered as follows, *without* recourse to “*some incredible gymnastics*”, paragraph 11.

You make reference to God’s promise to preserve His word, e.g. paragraph 7 but you do not give ‘chapter and verse’ – see *Defending the King James Bible*, D.A. Waite, p 6-16. Yet I am sure that if asked for scripture on God’s promise, you would turn immediately to Psalm 12:6, 7:

“The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation forever” Psalm 12:6, 7.

You obviously regard Dr. Ruckman as “*a radical KJV only author*” but nevertheless I draw your attention to his *Commentary on Psalms* with respect to this passage, p 70ff. These verses indicate that even the pure “*words of the Lord*” are themselves *subject to a refining process*. They are “*purified seven times*” and note that the refining is carried out ON EARTH, *not* in heaven, where the words of the Lord are “*for ever...settled*” Psalm 119:89. Dr. Ruckman lists “*seven instalments*” in this purification process, Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Old Syriac, Old Latin, German and finally English, the AV1611, which God took “*to the uttermost part of the earth*” Acts 1:8, by means of a sea-faring nation, England.

Dr. Ruckman lists many a “*faithful translation*” last paragraph, derived from Luther, in *The Christian’s Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, p 108ff, p 129, where he answers the question “*Where was the Bible before 1611? - ALL OVER...THE CONTINENT!*”

One could discern further refining processes, first for the Bible in English, through the translations of Wycliffe, Coverdale, Rogers, which includes Tyndale’s work, Taverner, The Great Bible, the Bishops’ Bible, the Geneva Bible and finally the AV1611. Then the several major editions of the AV1611, 1611, 1613, 1629, 1638, 1701, 1762, 1769, constitute further refinement until “*the words of the Lord...tried in a furnace of earth*” now match “*thy word...settled in heaven*” Psalm 119:89, John 17:17. We will no doubt see at the Judgement Seat of Christ, Romans 14:10.

The essential points are, first, that no man who earnestly “*sought the Lord*” Exodus 33:7 would have found the scriptures inadequate for this purpose at any time in the earth’s history, in any form in which those scriptures existed. Otherwise the Lord Jesus Christ could never have issued his exhortation which historically applied only to the initial stages of the “*seven times*” of purification.

“Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me” John 5:39. See Luke 24:27, 44, 45 and 2 Timothy 3:15-17. Note that these scriptures, historically, were not as ‘perfect’ as the AV1611 because they did not include a New Testament!

Second, although the AV1611 text underwent subsequent editorial changes, the Lord never convened another English translating committee *after 1611*. The RV committee of 1881 under Westcott and

Hort was convened by *Satan*, in preparation for the age of the Laodicean Church, Revelation 3:14-22, which is nearly over and which has made God *sick* because it has forsaken **“the word of my patience”** Revelation 3:10. Note that Laodicea is *blind*, verse 17 and Psalm 119:130.

I would invite any critic of the AV1611 to give a *specific* instance of anyone who fell into error through *believing* the words in *any* edition of the AV1611. There are many accusations of ‘confusion’ and ‘unbelief’ arising from fidelity to the AV1611 but these are never substantiated. (Dr. Ruckman has an interesting anecdote on apostasy in his *Commentary on Revelation*, p 353ff.)

Moreover, I do not believe that there is any instance in church history where anyone went astray from the Lord by believing the words of scripture *as they stood in any genuine precursor of the AV1611*. This is scriptural ‘perfection’, 2 Timothy 3:17. It is God’s responsibility to advance revelation, Isaiah 46:10 and to oversee revision where necessary, e.g. by re-inserting Luke 17:36 into the Great Bible, where it had been absent in Tyndale’s New Testament, Ecclesiastes 3:14, 15. He did so from 1400 BC to 400 BC, from 50 AD to 100 AD, from 100 AD to 1611 AD and from 1611 AD to 1769 AD, in time for the most strategic event in His calendar, the world wide missionary movement of the Philadelphian Church Age. The believer’s responsibility is to believe what God has thus far revealed and not to pass judgement on it, Isaiah 66:2b, so that at his life’s end he may have faithfully **“served his own generation according to the will of God”** Acts 13:36.

To return to your question *“Where was the perfect, inerrant, preserved word of God in 1610?”*, paragraph 8, I believe that Dr. Miles Smith gives a realistic answer in *The Translators To the Readers*. He does not charge any of the translators prior to 1611 with *error* – in answer to your previous questions in this paragraph – but he does set forth the AV1611 as *finally authoritative*.

“We are so far off from condemning any of their labors that travailed before us in this kind, either in this land or beyond sea, either in King Henry’s time, or King Edward’s (if there were any translation, or correction of a translation in his time) or Queen Elizabeth’s of ever-renowned memory, that we acknowledge them to have been raised up of God, for the building and furnishing of his Church, and that they deserve to be had of us and of posterity in everlasting remembrance.

“Truly (good Christian Reader) we never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark”.

The heading *“The KJV translators suggest thousands of corrections”*, paragraph 10, is misleading, together with the statement that *“[the 1611 translators] did not believe they had picked exactly the right word or phrase in every case. They included the following in the margin: 4,223 more literal meanings, 2,738 alternative translations and 104 variant readings”.*

The marginal insertions show simply that the AV1611 translators were honest researchers. They provided thorough documentation of their findings, acknowledging, for example, that translation from one language to another does not consist of a rigid, one-to-one correspondence. They showed that they had a variety of textual sources, which were not uniform – *though not necessarily in error*. They also showed where the translation evidently demanded an idiomatic, rather than literal rendering, of which Dean Burgon commented *“the idiomatic rendering of a Greek author into English, is a higher achievement by far”*. See *The Revision Revised*, p 155. Of their endeavours in this respect, the Trinitarian Bible Society, which is decidedly *not* *“KJV only”*, stated in *Fruit Among The Leaves*, Quarterly Record, July-September 1980, No. 472 that *“In most cases the reading in the text of the Authorised Version is superior to the alternative given in the margin”*. Significantly, this TBS article does not explicitly identify any readings in the text, which it believes to be *inferior* to those in the margin.

Neither has the Author of the Book, in over 350 years, regardless of what the translators might have believed or not believed.

You make reference at the end of this paragraph to the marginal note in the AV1611 that Luke 17:36 “*is wanting in most of the Greek copies*” – as if to imply that its insertion in the AV1611 text is some kind of ‘textual emendation’. According to J.A. Moorman, of Shropshire, whose work *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* was published in 1988, 13 years ago, it is nevertheless found in “*many others*”, in addition to the 20 or so that he actually identifies. The verse is also extant in several of the ancient versions, including the Old Latin and the Peshitta Syriac and in several of the Fathers, starting with Tatian in 172 AD. It therefore has an unbroken and widespread testimony as scripture almost as far back as the Apostolic Age and it has *remained* in the AV1611 text since 1611. Moorman has this incisive comment, p 28.

“When a version has been the standard 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 editions 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 toward God’s promises of preservation to believe that the Greek and not the English had strayed from the original!”

You conclude your leaflet under the heading of “*Imperfections in the KJV*” of which 32 are addressed, including 23 verses in which the expression “**God forbid**” occurs in an AV1611. Is it not strange that these “*imperfections*”, such as “**Easter**” for “*Passover*” in Acts 12:4, have been presented repeatedly over the years as ‘errors’ in the AV1611? Yet they are so obvious it is hardly plausible that *all* the translators and subsequent editors overlooked them in *all* the editions of 1611, 1613, 1629, 1638, 1701, 1762 and 1769, when many other much less obvious modifications were made. It is also very strange that God has honoured none of the ‘improvements’ in over 350 years – until one considers the versions following the AV1611 that introduced them:

Table 1

‘X’ Marks the Spot - “Imperfections” in the AV1611, ‘Corrected’ by Modern Versions

John 1:32-1 Peter 1:11: the Spirit as *“it”, “itself”* to *“he”, “himself”*
 Acts 12:4: *“Easter”* to *“Passover”*
 Genesis 44:7-Galatians 6:14: *“God forbid”* to e.g. *“Never may that happen”*, NWT, Romans 6:15
 Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1: *“the great God and our Saviour”* to *“our great God and Saviour”*
 Acts 1:20: *“bishopricks”* to *“office”* or similar
 Acts 19:37: *“churches”* to *“temples”*

Verse ↓	RV	JB	NWT	NIV	NKJV
John 1:32					X
Romans 8:16	X	X		X	X
Romans 8:26	X	X		X	X
1 Peter 1:11				X	X
Acts 12:4	X	X	X	X	X
Genesis 44:7		X	X	X	X
Genesis 44:17		X	X	X	X
Joshua 22:29		X	X	X	X
Joshua 24:16		X	X	X	X
1 Samuel 12:23		X	X	X	X
1 Samuel 14:45		X	X	X	X
1 Samuel 20:2		X	X	X	X
Job 27:5		X	X	X	X
Luke 20:16			X	X	
Romans 3:4		X	X	X	X
Romans 3:6		X	X	X	X
Romans 3:31		X	X	X	X
Romans 6:2		X	X	X	X
Romans 6:15		X	X	X	X
Romans 7:7		X	X	X	X
Romans 7:13		X	X	X	X
Romans 9:14		X	X	X	X
Romans 11:1		X	X	X	X
Romans 11:11		X	X	X	X
1 Corinthians 6:15		X	X	X	X
Galatians 2:17		X	X	X	X
Galatians 3:21		X	X	X	X
Galatians 6:14	X	X	X	X	
Titus 2:13	X	X		X	X
2 Peter 1:1	X	X	X	X	X
Acts 1:20	X	X	X	X	X
Acts 19:37	X	X	X	X	X
‘Improvements’	22 %	91 %	84 %	97 %	94 %

If one surveys the RSV, NASV, NEB, LB, GNB and Ne’s 21st Edition in addition to the 5 versions tabulated above, one finds that 8 of the total of 11 support the ‘improvement’ in Galatians 6:14. The NEB and LB agree with the NKJV in conforming to the AV1611 reading. On the basis of the ‘majority text’ therefore, perhaps these lines should also be suitably ‘improved’?

*Forbid it, Lord, that I should boast
 Save in the death of Christ my God:*

*All the vain things that charm me most,
I sacrifice them to His blood*

To take these “*imperfections*” in turn, the AV1611 sometimes refers to the Holy Spirit as “*it*” or “*itself*” because the Lord Jesus Christ likened the ministry of the Spirit to a neuter force, the wind.

“The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is everyone that is born of the Spirit” John 3:8.

Romans 8:16, 26, 1 Peter 1:11 all describe the ministry of the Holy Spirit within the believer. In these verses, the Spirit bears witness to the adoption of the believer by the Father, supports the intercession for the believer by the Lord Jesus Christ, Hebrews 7:25 and testifies to the sufferings of the Lord Jesus Christ on behalf of the believer. Use of the neuter gender in these verses simply ensures that the emphasis is on the other Persons of the Godhead, the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, according to what the Lord Jesus Christ Himself said:

“Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you the things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you” John 16:13, 14.

The Spirit glorifies the Father and the Son in Romans 8:16, 26 and 1 Peter 1:11 and therefore “***he shall not speak of himself***”.

John 1:32 speaks of “***the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove***”. This is the manifestation of the Son of God to Israel, John 1:33, 34 and in the parallel passage, Matthew 3:16, 17, the Spirit glorifies both the Father and the Son. Once again, therefore, “***he shall not speak of himself***”. Moreover, Revelation 4:5 shows that the manifestation of the Spirit of God in heaven is actually neuter, even though 1 John 5:7 reveals that the Holy Ghost is nevertheless the third Person of the Godhead. John 1:32 associates the Spirit with heaven and therefore rightly calls for a neuter pronoun, according to what the Spirit Himself revealed in an AV1611.

The TBS publication *The Spirit of God*, Article No. 20, provides helpful insight into Greek and English pronouns, if you can obtain it. It also provides an historical explanation of why ostensibly neuter objects are often apparently invested with masculinity in an AV1611, e.g. Genesis 1:11. Deuteronomy 20:19 gives the *scriptural* explanation. The TBS article states: “*It should...be remembered that the Greek language has nouns of three genders, and the name of the Holy Spirit in Greek is not masculine, but neuter, and the pronouns relating to the Spirit in Greek are consequently all neuter pronouns, so in rendering them in English “it” and “itself” the translators were unquestionably grammatically precise and correct*”.

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 St. Peter*”. See Woodrow, *Babylon Mystery Religion*, p 86ff, 142ff.

Some years ago I carried out a study of the Passover, which I believe explains the reference to “***the feast of unleavened bread...called the Passover***” Luke 22:1. The essential point is that the actual feast of the Passover precedes “***the days of unleavened bread***” Acts 12:3, so that “*Passover*” as found in the modern translations is an incorrect translation. See below for a summary:

*“2 Chronicles 30:18, 35:17, Ezra 6:19-21 also reveal that Israel “**did...eat the passover**” before they “**kept the feast of unleavened bread seven days**”. This is important because when Israel ate the passover, they were commanded to “**let nothing of it remain until the morning**” Exodus 12:10. Exodus 34:25 states “**neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of the passover be left unto the morning**” and Numbers 33:3 refers to “**the fifteenth day of the month; on the morrow after the***

passover". Exodus 34:25 is the first explicit reference to **"the feast of the passover"** and shows that it coincides with **"the feast of unleavened bread"** on 15th Nisan but must terminate at or before 6:00 a.m. on Nisan 15th. By contrast, **"the feast of unleavened bread"** continues **"until the one and twentieth day of the month at even"** or 6:00 p.m. at the end of 20th Nisan, seven days in total, according to Exodus 12. However, Exodus 12:17 and Leviticus 23:6 attach a special significance to the meal of Nisan 15th between 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. as the actual **"feast of unleavened bread"** coinciding with **"the feast of the passover"**.

*"One is therefore able to interpret Luke 22:1 correctly, **"Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover"**. Luke 22:1 clearly refers to the meal of Nisan 15th and corresponds to Matthew 26:2, Mark 14:1, John 13:1. As Dr. Ruckman points out, Jesus did not eat this feast, although He did eat **"this passover"**, which took place before He was to suffer, Luke 23:11, 15. See also Matthew 26:17-19, Mark 14:14, 16. **"This passover"** took place on **"the day of the preparation"** Matthew 27:62, Mark 15:42, Luke 23:54, John 19:14, 31, 42, when the Lord instituted **"the new testament"** Matthew 26:28, Mark 14:24, Luke 22:20, 1 Corinthians 11:23-26, which was to come into effect when **"Christ our passover is sacrificed for us"** 1 Corinthians 5:7. **"This passover"** was therefore a preparation for the Lord to suffer for sins, 1 Peter 3:18, as was His anointing, Matthew 26:6-13, John 12:1-8. See also Dr. Ruckman's Commentary on Matthew pages 584, 594, 596. The actual **"feast of the passover"** had yet to take place. See John 18:28, 39, Luke 23:25. These verses match the chronology of Matthew 26:2, Mark 14:1, John 13:1".*

Concerning the idiomatic expression **"God forbid"**, I believe that Dr. Ruckman has an excellent analysis in his book *How to Teach the Original Greek*, p 33-34:

*"The expression "me genoito" is a fairly common Pauline locution" (Carson, The King James Version Debate, p. 92). This is translated by the "King's men" as **"God forbid"** (Rom. 3:4, 1 Cor. 6:15). On the grounds that the word "God" is not found in any Greek text...Carson says the NIV rendering translates the expression PERFECTLY (ibid). How does this Jesuit, Dark Age revision translate "me genoito"? It says, "not at all" the first time (Rom. 3:4), but "never" the second time (1 Cor. 6:15)."*

"Well, is "oudepo", "me pote", "oudepote" ("NEVER") found anywhere, in any Greek text used by the NIV? No, it isn't. They added "never" after saying you couldn't add "God." Did they translate the Optative (genoito)? No, they didn't even attempt to. They just ignored it...so, presuming himself to be the final authority, (Carson) says the NIV catches the expression "PERFECTLY."

"It does? Well, WHO is it that lets things "be, or not be?" WHO is it that can let a thing happen, or prevent it from happening? Are we to assume a converted Orthodox Jewish rabbinical scholar (Phil. 3) wouldn't have THAT in mind when he said "Let it not be!"?..."

"If you were a Bible-believing Christian, you would know it was a prayer as well as a denial. Paul is asking God to forbid such a thing from happening. (This is where the NIV got "NEVER" from). God is going to forbid it from "being" (happening). But without God as the source for letting some things happen, while stopping other things from "becoming," the expression is not translated at all. It is missing its most essential element: THE ONE WHO FORBIDS."

You state that the AV1611 misses *"the diety (sic) of Christ in Titus 2v13 and II Peter 1v1"* because it reads **"God and our Saviour Jesus Christ"** instead of *"our God and Saviour Jesus Christ"*. The reason given for this change is not scripture as such but the post-1611 *"Granville Sharp Rule"*. According to the leaflet therefore, the believer must ultimately rely on *scholarship*, not scripture, in order to ascertain **"the words of the Lord"** Psalm 12:6, in spite of what the Lord Jesus Christ said:

"I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight" Luke 10:21.

Inspection of Nestle's 21st Edition and Ricker Berry's Edition of Stephanus' 3rd Edition suggest that literal renderings of the Greek text would be *"the great God and Saviour of us Jesus Christ"* and *"the*

God of us and Saviour Jesus Christ” in these two verses respectively. The AV1611 translators obviously associated the expression “*of us*” with “*Saviour*” rather than “*God*” in 2 Peter 1:1. I believe that they were right to do so, for the following reasons.

1. Dr. Mrs. Riplinger states in *New Age Versions*, p 370, “*2 Thessalonians 1:12, 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.”*”
2. Dr. Ruckman adds in *The Christian’s Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* p iii that “*Any fool could have seen the same construction in Isaiah 45:21.*”
3. 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 – in compliance with New Age dogma. 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.

You object to changes inserted into the 1611 AV1611 by the translation’s overseer, Archbishop Bancroft, citing Paine, *The Men Behind the KJV* and McClure, *Translators Revived*, in support because they endorse the protests of the author of the AV1611 Preface, Dr. Miles Smith, against these changes. These were notably the application of ““*the glorious word bishopric*”” to Judas, Paine p 128 and “*the name [church] to a building [and] ...to the idols’ temples*”, McClure p 221.

The leaflet strongly infers that God could not possibly use such a “*prejudiced man*” as Bancroft, whose “*obviously wrong actions*” resulted in “*the insertion of these episcopally biased words*” such as “***bishoprick***” Acts 1:20 and “***churches***” Acts 19:37.

Yet the Lord has not seen fit to eliminate this ‘Episcopal bias’ after nearly 400 years, even though Bancroft died in 1610, before the actual publication of the AV1611, McClure p 219. (The latter also notes that the AV1611 “*is certainly very far from being a sectarian version*” p 220.) Neither has He bothered to sanitise the unbelievably crude expression found in 1 Kings 14:10, 16:11, 21:21, 2 Kings 9:8, or the shocking vulgarism that occurs not once but twice, in the AV1611, in 2 Kings 18:27 and Isaiah 36:12, well-known to British squaddies of successive generations.

A little careless, wouldn’t you say?

Is it fair to inveigh against Bancroft? One thinks of an irascible, beer-drinking German who declared the letter of James to be “*an epistle of straw*”, Grady, *Final Authority*, p 64 and of a despotic, self-indulgent monarch who divorced no fewer than five of his wives, of whom he beheaded two. One also thinks of a seemingly petulant monarch who denounced the Geneva Bible as the worst of all English Bible translations and threatened to harry the Puritans out of the land.

How could God possibly use such men, to launch a Reformation, cast off papal domination, set up the Bible in every parish church and sanction the Book that brought about the greatest spiritual revival, moral re-awakening, intellectual and material progress ever?

How does Bancroft compare with Noah, Genesis 9:21, Moses, Numbers 20:11, Samson, Judges 16:1, Samuel as a parent, 1 Samuel 9:3, David, 2 Samuel 11:27, Solomon, 1 Kings 11:4, Daniel, Daniel 2:46, Peter, Barnabus, Galatians 2:11-14, Paul, Acts 15:39, Acts 21:4-14, Timothy, 2 Timothy 1:8, John, Revelation 19:10, 22:8? Could God use any of these men? Did God use any of these men? Consider the following scriptures.

“God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican” Luke 18:12, or possibly Archbishop. One might think that the following verse must refer to a real spiritual giant, until one examines the context. Yet God used Pharaoh’s stubbornness as adroitly as He used Bancroft’s.

“Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth” Romans 9:17.

Despite Bancroft’s autocracy, haven’t genuine civil and religious liberties always eventually followed in the wake of the AV1611? Consider the words of one man, who was faithful to the AV1611 according to Gustavus Paine, p 181 and with his fellow soldiers “*pushed it forward*”, ‘episcopal bias’ and all. This suggests that they may even have become “*‘KJV only’ perpetrators*”.

“Have a care of the whole flock. Love the sheep. Love the lambs. Love all; tend all; cherish and countenance all in all things that are good. And if the poorest Christian, the most mistaken Christian, shall desire to live peaceably and quietly under you: I say if any desire but to live a life of godliness and honesty; let him be protected.” Oliver Cromwell, from *Oliver Cromwell*, by Sir Charles Firth, p 362.

Closer consideration of Acts 1:20 and 19:37 suggests that the alleged ‘bias’ may well be very much “*the over-ruling providential hand of God*” for the purpose of guiding the Bible believer into *all* truth, John 16:13. Paine states, p 70 that “*We must credit the valiant, ambitious Bancroft with being able to choose and manage firmly. All looked up to him, even those who deplored him and winced at his methods*”. Yet Bancroft’s obstinacy, if that is what it was, served a shrewd purpose and strongly hints that “**he that is higher than the highest regardeth**” Ecclesiastes 4:8b.

1 Timothy 3:1-7 sets out the qualifications for “**the office of a bishop**”. Verses 1, 4, 5 together with 1 Peter 5:2 indicate that this office refers to that of a pastor of a local assembly, *not a diocese*. There are no ‘diocesan bishops’ in the AV1611, *nor are there any ARCHbishops*, because the Lord Jesus Christ is said to be “**the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls**” 1 Peter 2:25. Retention of the old ecclesiastical terms for the AV1611 therefore resulted in a very *non Anglican* translation!

John 6:70 reveals that Judas was “**a devil**”, not *the* devil but “**a devil**”. Yet he could live by faith, preach the kingdom – and the ‘fundamentals’ – conduct a healing ministry, conduct a deliverance ministry and in all respects fulfil the demanding responsibilities of an itinerant evangelist, Matthew 10:7-10. Jesus, Peter, Paul, John and Jude all warned of such individuals, who would multiply in the last days, Matthew 24:24, 25, 2 Thessalonians 2:9, 10, 2 Peter 2:1, 1 John 2:18-20, Jude 3, 4. *Acts 1:20 reveals that they could even rise to the rank of bishop*. Hasn’t there been a surfeit of these individuals in the Anglican Church in recent times? Consider Charles Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol and Chairman of the 1881 Revision Committee, Joseph Lightfoot, Brooke Foss Westcott, David Jenkins, all Bishops of Durham, Edward Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury and several of his successors who have actively sought reunion with Rome.

Isn’t it possible that their subversion was aided and abetted by Christians who neglected the import of Acts 1:20 and the explicit warning of the Lord Jesus Christ, as they both stand in *all* editions of the AV1611? (Some of the above named were not nearly so conscientious as Judas.)

“Behold, I have told you before” Matthew 24:25.

Acts 19:37, as it stands in *any* edition of the AV1611, is especially significant for “**the last time**” 1 John 2:18. Revelation 3:20 is aimed evangelistically – and rightly – at the unsaved individual but historically, doctrinally and prophetically the passage is addressed to a church, Revelation 1:11, 3:14. Laodicea is the only church with a reference to “**the door**”, *a part of a building*, mentioned twice in verse 20. Clearly the Body of Christ in the last time will be pre-occupied with wealth and property, verse 17-20, not “**the true riches**” Luke 16:11. It will have modelled itself after the manner of “**the churches**” of Acts 19:37, which had accumulated vast riches (worth stealing!), were obsessed with “**the great goddess Diana**” Acts 19:35 and by whom “**the craftsmen**” were highly esteemed, Acts 19:38, Revelation 18:22.

Can you think of any “**churches**” that might answer that description? Hint: check Woodrow, p 17.

No wonder a converted priest once said “*The greatest book written against the Roman Catholic church was not written by a converted priest; it was written by God*”, from *History of the New Testament Church*, Volume 1, by Dr. Ruckman, p 351.

The final “*imperfection*” in the AV1611 that the leaflet highlights is the apparent difficulty of understanding some passages such as 2 Corinthians 6:11-13. This is not really a valid criticism.

“What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter” John 13:7

“Even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written to you; As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction” 2 Peter 3:15b, 16.

“What God says is true whether my senses corroborate it or not...though I do not fully comprehend it...I shall know it all in the life to come” Martin Luther, from *History of the New Testament Church*, Volume 1, p 361.

“If I understood all about the Bible I’d know somebody wrote it who didn’t have any more sense than I have!” Sam Jones, from *History of the New Testament Church*, Volume 2, p 111. When Jones preached “*“gambling disappeared, loud profanity on the streets was heard no more, and the barrooms were run out of the country”*” *ibid*.

Where a passage is difficult to understand, there is no need to remain in wilful ignorance, 1 Corinthians 14:38 – Paul is here being sarcastic. The scripture gives clear guidance:

“Yea, if thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; if thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures; Then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God” Proverbs 2:3-5.

“If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him” James 1:5.

Briefly, I believe that Paul is exhorting his readers in 2 Corinthians 6:11-13 to be honest and open with him as he has been with them because he is affectionately devoted to them, as he was to the Philippians, Philippians 1:7 and the Thessalonians, 1 Thessalonians 2:8. Such intimacy will help to prevent them from being led astray either by unbelievers or the devil. See 2 Corinthians 6:14-18 in the context and 11:2, 3. The only word in the passage that may cause misunderstanding is “*bowels*” but it is clear that Paul uses this term figuratively to emphasise the degree of fellowship that should characterise the body of Christ, Philippians 2:1, Philemon 12. As Paul said in 1 Corinthians 12:25, using another anatomical illustration “*that there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another*”. The only study aid that one really needs in this case is the comparison of scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13.

The final paragraph of the leaflet poses the question “*what is the word of God today?*” and fails to answer it. It merely reiterates the ‘scholarship only’ position that the actual word of God is “*the original*”, which of course no longer exists. No scriptures are cited to support this view – and no such scriptures exist.

The quotation from Dean Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, p 335, to the effect that supernatural protection of Biblical manuscripts “*against depraving influences...was never promised*” simply means that “*The Church...hath been from the beginning the ‘Witness and Keeper of Holy Writ’*”, p 334. Burgon explains that it is the Church, the body of believers, under the guidance of “*“the Spirit of Truth”*”, according to John 16:13, which he cites, that “*hath nevertheless...been perpetually purging herself of those shamefully depraved copies which once everywhere abounded within her pale*”. In other words, preservation of Holy Scripture was not ‘miraculous’, like changing water into wine, John 2:1-10 but providential, with the Lord working through “*faithful men*” 2 Timothy 2:2. The quotation does not of itself imply that God cannot work through His Church to compile a perfect Bible, according

to the purification process described earlier and in order to protect His people from a succession of 'Protestant popes' eager to perform *"the deeds of the Nicolaitans"* Revelation 2:6.

Such a Book was also compiled to usher in and sustain the great age of revival work and world-wide missionary endeavour that followed the publication of the AV1611 and brought to a fruitful climax the Philadelphian Church Age, Revelation 3:7-13. That age was terminated by the very nation that had taken God's Book *"to the uttermost part of the earth"* Acts 1:8 when she forsook the Book that God had given to her. She is still reaping the consequences of her perfidy and in all likelihood will do so sevenfold, Psalm 79:12.

I conclude with the following admonitions, *"In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established"* 2 Corinthians 13:1b

"Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines, [Gen. 26:15] neither prefer broken pits before them with the wicked Jews, [Jer. 2:13]. Others have laboured, and you may enter into theirs; O receive not so great things in vain, O despise not so great salvation!" Dr. Miles Smith, *The Translators to the Readers*.

"Where the Bible says one thing and scholarship says another, scholarship can go plumb to the devil" Billy Sunday, *History of the New Testament Church*, Volume 2, p 110.

"The craving to alter the Word of God is ACCURSED; this is the crime of the present day; the Lord preserve us from it" Charles Haddon Spurgeon, *Problem Texts* by Dr. Ruckman, p 209.

"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" from John Bunyan, The Immortal Dreamer, by W. Burgess McCreary, copyright 1928, Gospel Trumpet Company, cited in the Bible Believers' Bulletin, March 1994.

Yours sincerely

Alan O'Reilly

Copy: Michael Clark, C/- *The Covenant Publishing Company Limited*

Dr. Dennis Lloyd, C/- *The Stand*

Mr. Phil Robinson, C/- *PBI, Miami*