

*The Glorious  
Gospel Truths  
of  
John 3:16*

by David Shanks

The  
Perversion &  
Subversion of  
John 3:16

**The Perversion And Subversion Of John 3:16  
&  
*The Glorious Gospel Truths of John 3:16***

**By David Shanks**

**John 3:16 (KJV) <sup>16</sup>For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.**

**Dedication**

**This book is dedicated to: the Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God “who loved me, and gave himself for me.”**

**Copyright © 2009 by David Shanks**

**ISBN: 978-0-615-45217-3**

Permission is freely granted to use material in this book provided it is properly cited. Please note, this permission does not include material that is footnoted or directly quoted from other sources. This book contains a host of guest authors who provide much of the real expertise behind the thoughts contained herein. Our prayer is that God will grant a special blessing to each of those who were gracious in granting us special permission to use their material. However, permission must be secured from those sources to use and cite their work. In the event you have questions, contact:

**David Shanks, Publisher**  
**167 Leonard Road**  
**Telford, Tennessee 37690**  
**Email: [davidshanks@isp.com](mailto:davidshanks@isp.com)**  
**Phone: 423-257-5515 or 423-741-0443**  
**Website: [www.john316truth.com](http://www.john316truth.com)**

**All Bible version references are cited or noted with standard abbreviations.**

Manufactured in the United States of America

**Section I—Proofs of the Perversion & Subversion**

**Introduction: (click on blue to link to chapters or use bookmarks).....iv**  
**Chapter 1: A Personal Testimony and A Personal Revelation.....1**  
**Chapter 2: The Perversion.....16**  
**Chapter 3: Why Did This Happen?..... 26**  
**Chapter 4: Proof Studies “Only Begotten”—The Doctrinally**  
     **Correct Translation.....34**  
     **Proof 1: The Writer’s Greek Study..... 34**  
     **Proof 2: Morris..... 34**  
     **Proof 3: Criswell..... 34**  
     **Proof 4: Holland.....36**  
**Chapter 5: Proof Studies Continued.....39**  
     **Proof 5: Tim Warner.....39**  
     **Proof 6: Mark Oaks.....42**  
**Chapter 6: Proof Studies Continued.....45**  
     **Proof 7: McTernan & Holman..... 45**  
     **Proof 8: Ruckman..... 54**  
**Chapter 7: Proof Studies Continued.....56**  
     **Proof 9: G.A. Riplinger..... 56**  
     **Proof 10: Thayer’s Lexicon..... 62**  
**Chapter 8: Proof Studies Continued.....63**  
     **Proof 11: By The Writer..... 63**  
     **Proof 12: G.A. Riplinger..... 63**  
     **Concluding Thoughts and More Greek.....68**

**Section II—Doctrinal Perversions Verses Glorious Truths of John 3:16**

**Chapter 9: Bible Principles Of Interpretation And Translation.....76**  
     **Principle 1: God’s Word Written To The World..... 78**  
     **Principle 2: The Bible Is The Christian’s Guide..... 79**  
     **Principle 3: Every Word In The Bible Is Critical..... 80**  
**Chapter 10: Bible Principles Of Interpretation & Translation**  
     **Continued..... 82**  
     **Principle 4: The Word Of God Will Not Pass Away..... 82**  
**Chapter 11: Bible Principles Of Interpretation & Translation**  
     **Continued..... 90**  
     **Principle 5: “Interpretation” Can Be Rendered “Translation”..90**  
     **Principle 6: The Word Of God Is Perfect & Without Error... 91**  
     **Principle 7: The Bible Interprets Itself.....92**  
     **Principle 8: The Word Of God Is Simple..... 93**  
**Chapter 12: Bible Principles Of Interpretation And Translation**  
     **Continued..... 96**  
     **Principle 9: Precision Of The Biblical Language..... 96**

<b>Chapter 13: Bible Principles Of Interpretation And Translation</b>	
<b>Continued</b> .....	100
<b>Principle 10: Verb Tenses Are Doctrinally Critical</b> .....	100
<b>Principle 11: “The Law Of First Mention”</b> .....	101
<b>Principle 12: “Rightly Dividing The Word”</b> .....	102
<b>Chapter 14: “What Think Ye Of Christ” Or The Doctrine Of</b>	
<b>Christ</b> .....	105
<b>Chapter 15: “Begotten” &amp; Its Relationship To The Physical Birth</b>	
<b>Of Christ—A Glorious Gospel Truth</b> .....	111
<b>Chapter 16: The View That “Begotten” Refers to the Doctrine of the</b>	
<b>“Eternal Generation” of Christ</b> .....	122
<b>Chapter 17: Doctrinal Perversion—John 1:18 and The “Only Begotten</b>	
<b>God” Issue</b> .....	130
<b>Chapter 18: “Begotten” Related to Glorious Gospel Doctrines—</b>	
<b>Introduction</b> .....	136
<b>Chapter 19: “Begotten” Related to Glorious Gospel Doctrines</b>	
<b>Continued—Fourteen Doctrinal Issues</b> .....	141
<b>Chapter 20: John 3:16 &amp; Its Role In Refuting Ancient Heresies</b> .....	159
<b>Chapter 21: John 3: 16 &amp; Glorious Doctrinal Truths Related To</b>	
<b>Salvation</b> .....	167
<b>Chapter 22: Conclusion Concerning Doctrinal Perversions of John</b>	
<b>3:16—“The One vs. The Holy One” Issue</b> .....	185
<b><u>Section III—History of Truth &amp; Subversion</u></b>	
<b>Chapter 23: Methods Of Translation—Legitimate And Illegitimate</b> ..	187
<b>Chapter 24: How Did This Happen? A Short History of Ancient</b>	
<b>Perversion</b> .....	194
<b>Chapter 25: A Short History of Bible Preservation</b> .....	214
<b>Chapter 26: Modern Bibles, the Dark Secret - Part 2</b> .....	234
<b>Chapter 27: Quick Reference of Versions And Their Relation To</b>	
<b>Ancient Texts</b> .....	245
<b>Chapter 28: Q And A—Answers To The Perversions and KJV Critics—</b>	
<b>Questions 1 to 8</b> .....	255
<b>Chapter 29: Q And A—Answers To The Perversions and KJV Critics—</b>	
<b>Questions 9 to 17</b> .....	265
<b>Chapter 30: Q And A—Answers To The Perversions and KJV Critics—</b>	
<b>Questions 18 to 21</b> .....	276
<b>Chapter 31: The King Of The King James Version</b> .....	288
<b>Chapter 32: Concluding Thoughts: Perverted Bibles &amp; A</b>	
<b>Perverted Salvation</b> .....	295
<b>Footnotes</b> .....	310
<b>Recommended Reading</b> .....	318

### Technical Information & Book Format

The writer has taken certain liberties in the formatting of this book. They are as follows:

- ◆ Bible verses, when used inside the paragraphs by the author, are generally in bold to place emphasis on the word of God.
- 📖 When Bible verses are used as a reference outside of paragraphs by the author, you will find **Bold Book and Chapter labels for each verse** followed by the entire verse and bulleted with a Bible graphic as used in this section. Again, this is for emphasis.
- ◆ In the case of the set apart verses, many times certain words will be in **bold** for emphasis. **In other words the bold is mine.** The *italics* in the **KJV** text belong to the **KJV** rendering.
- ◆ The Greek words have been transliterated—in most cases. In other words, the Greek letters have been changed to English letters. The book is written to the layman, as well as the pastor, and using the Greek letters would serve no benefit and slow the reader.
- ◆ Also included are “**Proof Documentation from the Reference Desk**” textboxes to provide quick references for some of the more difficult documentation. They will be designated **RD#\_** in the text box for the term “Reference Desk.”
- ◆ Footnotes are found at the end of the book. Exception: the inclusion of guest authors’ footnotes are found at the end of their respective sections.
- ◆ Insomuch as possible, the formatting and presentation style of guest authors was retained herein.
- ◆ A few passages have been repeated in more than one section or chapter herein. The purpose is to reinforce certain points—a method used frequently in the Bible.
- ◆ Note the recommended reading section at the end of the book.

## **Introduction**

### **Important—Read this Section**

**The writer believes that the KJV is the perfectly preserved word of God for us in English. Specifically, the KJV is a preserved copy of the inspired, inerrant and infallible word of God. In addition, this writer believes the word of God is the sole and final authority for Christian faith, doctrine, and practice.**

The perversion and subversion of John 3:16 reveals a rancid, putrid cancer in the Christian realm today. The Bible is being rewritten and reinterpreted in the new versions. Ancient heresies cloaked in a new garb have found a new venue. A battle for true Biblical Christianity rages out of sight and mind of the average Christian. Make no mistake! The heart and soul of true Christianity is at stake.

This book documents, without a doubt, the most important Christian issue in our time. It is time for Bible believing Christians to return to our true Biblical heritage and take a firm stand with our traditional conservative Biblical faith.

This book contains a host of guest authors who provide the real expertise behind the thoughts contained herein. The writer has endeavored to provide a book format that will provide the person in the pew as well as the pulpit with maximum benefit. Where the material of a guest author was used, every effort was made to maintain the same format of that author.

As the Bible says, “ye are entered into their labours” and that is exactly what this writer has done. A hearty thanks to each guest author and you have the promise of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself where He said “my reward *is* with me.” My prayer is that God will bless each ministry in a special way for their bountiful and gracious contributions to this effort.

The word of God is much more important than the thoughts or words of the writer. Without the word of God, my words are sheer vanity. Read and reread the verses until they are fully grasped. These will lead to the true value of this book.

Again, the writer believes that the KJV is the perfectly preserved word of God for us in English. Specifically, the KJV is a preserved copy of the inspired, inerrant and infallible word of God. In addition, this writer believes the word of God is the sole and final authority for Christian faith, doctrine, and practice.

The premise of this book is: The perversion and subversion of John 3:16 and other critical passages provide irrefutable proof that these new versions are contaminated with doctrinal error that stem from roots of biblical apostasy and heresy.

# **The Perversion And Subversion Of John 3:16 & The Glorious Eternal Truths of John 3:16**

## **Section I—Proofs of the Perversion & Subversion**

### **Chapter 1: A Personal Testimony and A Personal Revelation**

The perversion and subversion of John 3:16 reveals a rancid putrid cancer in the Christian realm today. The Bible is being rewritten and reinterpreted in the new versions. Ancient heresies cloaked in a new garb have found a new venue. A battle for true Biblical Christianity rages out of sight and mind of the average Christian. Make no mistake, the heart and soul of true Christianity is at stake. A few pastors understand the issues. Many do not. And many of the ones who do understand the issues will not fight this fight because they deem compromise better than schism in the body of Christ. Pastors, laymen, and laywomen must weigh in and wade into the battle. This book documents the issues and the battle.

The issues are simple, yet, profound. This book would not be carried in most Christian bookstores because of the controversial subject nature and the damage it does to many popular Christian publications. You need to know about the perversion and subversion of John 3:16 and other critical passages. **This book documents, without a doubt, the most important Christian issue in our time.** It is time for Bible believing Christians to return to our true Biblical heritage and take a firm stand with our traditional conservative Biblical faith.

**The premise of this book is: The perversion and subversion of John 3:16 and other critical passages provide irrefutable proof that these new versions are contaminated with doctrinal error that stem from roots of biblical apostasy and heresy.**

The new versions of the Bible have perverted and subverted John 3:16. They twist and emasculate the very word of God. Yet, multitudes of professing Christians unwittingly and unknowingly follow the perverted schemes of Satan. If you love God, love the word of God, and believe in Christ as the only begotten Son of God, who loved you and died for you and redeemed you, you need to read on.

There are quite a number of excellent books written about versions of the Bible. This book is an effort to do two things different from the majority of other books that deal with the Bible version issue. First, this book is written so laymen as well as pastors can grasp the issues. It is my prayer that this book will receive wide spread acceptance by laymen. Again, the message of this book needs to be in the hearts of God's people from the pulpit and the

pew. And again, we exhort pastors and evangelists who serve God with the highest calling upon the face of this earth to prayerfully consider this work and fight to preserve God's word from the corruption documented herein.

The second thing this book does is to concentrate on one verse and show the doctrinal havoc inflicted on the word of God by the changing of a single critical word. In addition, this book stands alone as the most complete doctrinal exposition of John 3:16 of which the writer is aware. The glorious gospel truths of John 3:16 are clearly revealed.

This little study is not about me. However, friends and proofreaders felt that my testimony provided an excellent framework for introducing the issues considered in this book. At 27 years of age I trusted the Lord Jesus Christ as my personal savior. Convicted of my sin, I set up an appointment with Dr. Gene Lasley of Buffalo Ridge Baptist Church in Gray, Tennessee. I was a professing Christian with a Methodist background and knew there was a spiritual need in my life. My desire was to "get right with God" and the Methodist term was "rededication". Methodists, in "my theology" at the time, were saved or lost depending upon the way they were living at the time. As a Methodist, you needed a savior, but you also had to keep your own salvation through your own works.

Upon entering Pastor Lasley's office—he was taking care of some church business at the time—his Bible was open to **Ephesians 2:8 through Ephesians 2:9 (KJV)**. **"<sup>8</sup>For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: <sup>9</sup>Not of works, lest any man should boast."** The verses were underlined. After noting the open Bible and the above passage lying on Pastor Lasley's desk, I picked up the Bible and read these verses carefully a couple of times. Through a divine miracle these two verses stuck in my mind.

In conference with Pastor Lasley, he asked, "Have you ever trusted the Lord?" My answer was "yes". At the age of 12, I had attended a confirmation class at the Jonesborough Methodist Church and at the end of the class made a profession of faith. At the profession of faith "ceremony" each candidate was asked, "Do you accept Jesus Christ as your personal savior?" My answer was "yes"! That afternoon, I was baptized by immersion. In all of this, my mood and intentions were certainly sincere. I also felt good and was happy about the whole affair.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Methodist pastor was saved. He presented the gospel and the truth in the class. He was sincere.

However, the Holy Ghost had not done a work in my heart. This was not the fault of the Holy Ghost. God works in His time and at a time when we will listen. My profession was a form and a fashion. At that time in my life, there was no reality of the sinfulness of sin, no need for a savior, and no heart understanding of the atoning work of Christ.

Back to the meeting with Pastor Lasley, I prayed a prayer of rededication but there was still something missing, and the Holy Ghost was still dealing with my heart. On the way down the highway, **Ephesians 2:8 and 9** came to mind “**For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: <sup>9</sup>Not of works, lest any man should boast.**” The only other verse in the Bible that I knew (other than “Jesus wept” and perhaps a couple more) was **John 3:16**, “**<sup>16</sup>For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.**”

The Holy Spirit helped me to connect the “faith” of **Ephesians 2:8** and the “belief” of **John 3:16**. These are one and the same. Salvation was not of my doing but a free gift to those who do nothing more or nothing less than believe and trust in Christ. Christ finished His work on the cross for me...and you... and whosoever that will believe. My salvation was settled and based upon what Christ graciously did for me on the cross and upon my very simple trust in Christ. And yes, Christ will do the same for all who will trust in Him.

A doctrinal note is needed here. All that come to Christ in true faith come with a heart of repentance under the convicting hand of God. However, any sinner that knows he or she is a sinner and genuinely desires forgiveness from a Holy God can have that forgiveness and be saved. That sinner only needs to trust His Son who loved him and died for him. You see only the Holy Ghost can show a man that he is a sinner and that is His job according to John 16:8. The order is “**repentance toward God and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ.**” **See Acts 20:21.** Now if you are saved, you and I can sing together:

To God be the glory, great things He has done;  
So loved He the world that He gave us His Son,  
Who yielded His life an atonement for sin,  
And opened the life gate that all may go in.

O perfect redemption, the purchase of blood,  
To every believer the promise of God;  
The vilest offender who truly believes,  
That moment from Jesus a pardon receives.

*Refrain*

*Praise the Lord, praise the Lord,  
Let the earth hear His voice!  
Praise the Lord, praise the Lord,  
Let the people rejoice!*

*O come to the Father, through Jesus the Son,  
And give Him the glory, great things He has done.—By Fannie Crosby*

That afternoon, I went home and began to study the Bible. Pastor Lasley had given me Clarence Larkin's doctrinal study book *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth*. At that time, there were four versions of the Bible in the house trailer that I rented. In the first few days, every reference verse studied from Larkin's book was traced in all four versions. It did not take long before it became clear to me that the KJV was right, and each of the other versions had problems.

Make no mistake, any Christian that will take time to examine verses on a verse-by-verse basis and compare the KJV Bible to the other versions will easily find major problems in the other versions. Those problems do not exist in the KJV. This book documents the reasons for these problems in the new translations.

When a person is saved, the Holy Ghost indwells the believer. The Holy Ghost has rightly been called the "Divine Interpreter." The Holy Spirit gives each believer a divine instinct that helps reveal the truth of the Word of God to the believer. Please understand, that divine instinct will tell you the Bible means just what it says! During the first few days of Bible study, the following truths were confirmed to my heart. You will note that there is a host of Bible verses quoted herein. My only purpose is to properly expound the word of God, and note that the Word of God is major in every case and this writer is minor. May we magnify the Word of God? The Word of God must increase while we must decrease. Read and yes, reread the verses in this book. Mark them in your Bible. Note the context and note the following verses from the word of God about the word of God and its divine features.

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

 **Psalms 119:105** Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.

 **Psalms 119:89** For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven.

 **Psalms 119:152** Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that **thou hast founded them for ever.**

 **Psalms 119:160** Thy word is true from the beginning: and **every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever.**

 **Isaiah 40:8** The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but **the word of our God shall stand for ever.**

 **Isaiah 55:11** So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.

- 📖 **Matthew 24:35** Heaven and earth shall pass away, but **my words shall not pass away.**
- 📖 **John 17:17** Sanctify them through thy truth: **thy word is truth.**
- 📖 **2 Tim 2:15** Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.
- 📖 **2 Tim 3:16** All scripture **is given by inspiration of God**, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:
- 📖 **1Peter 1:23** Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the **word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.**
- 📖 **1Peter 1:25** But the word of the **Lord endureth for ever.** And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.
- 📖 **2 Peter 1:21** For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake *as they were* moved by the Holy Ghost.

There is a divine accuracy in the Word of God. God says what He means and means what He says. The Word of God teaches us (as stated above) that the word of God is inspired.

The modern interpretation and theology and yes, teaching practice, is that God inspired his Word but did not preserve it and that we must search through volumes of Bible versions and commentaries to find the truth.

The clear Bible teaching is that the word of God is God's word and written to the whole world of whosoever wills. The Bible teaches that God will preserve His word. He has done so in the past and will do so in the future. The KJV, used for centuries now, has been blessed by God and contains that divine accuracy that makes it the true word of God.

If the word of God is the word of God and is divinely and precisely accurate for all matters of faith and practice, then all passages must agree. As new translations came out, I developed my own list of several test passages to test the versions but only one set of test passages will be noted here. It was easy to compare John 1:12-13 with John 3:16.

- 📖 **John 1:12 through John 1:13 (KJV)** <sup>12</sup>But **as many** as received him, to them gave he power to become the **sons of God**, *even* to them that believe on his name: <sup>13</sup>Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.
- 📖 **John 3:16 (KJV)** <sup>16</sup>For God so loved the world, that he gave **his only begotten Son**, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

Since any and every believer who has received Christ, as savior becomes a "son" of God by faith, then Jesus could not be the "only" son of

God as stated in many new versions. This would be a direct contradiction. However, through this line of thought, He could be (and is) the “only begotten Son” of God. The term “one and only son,” as used in some versions in John 3:16, would also be found to be in direct contradiction with John 1:12-13.

Let us apply this same line of thought to the word “unique” when used in place of “only begotten.” In a real sense all “sons” would be “unique.” This too created an inaccuracy and contradiction. The obvious exposition of truth is that the “uniqueness” of Christ is found in the fact that he was “begotten” through the divine conception of the Holy Spirit. Thus an inaccurate Bible and one in direct contradiction with itself, could not be trusted and could not be a true or pure Bible. This error is not found in the KJV and when properly interpreted you will not find any error in the KJV.

In my mind, these new version bibles were discarded as unreliable. However, these new versions were not condemned. My thoughts were, “these were just versions and men make mistakes.” The KJV was the best. I stated over and over again that “I was a proponent of the KJV.” Left unsaid was that I did not endorse or oppose other versions. In my early studies, it was abundantly clear that the Bible was precise and correct. In my mind, the accuracy of the Bible was to be compared to a mathematical equation, a chemical formula, or a human DNA string. To change any single minute element or bit would be to change the whole. And this, as you shall see, is absolutely true!

Looking back, my total ignorance was unbelievable. The writer had overlooked how the serpent came to Eve and deceived her by perverting and subverting the word of God in the transgression and the fall of man. Also, look at these direct warnings from the word of God.

 2 Corinthians 2:17 (KJV) <sup>17</sup>For we are not as **many, which corrupt the word of God:...**

 2 Corinthians 4:2 (KJV) <sup>2</sup>But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor **handling the word of God deceitfully**; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man’s conscience in the sight of God.

 Ephesians 4:14 (KJV) <sup>14</sup>That we *henceforth* be no more children, tossed to and fro, and **carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive**;

God has given a warning to His people and this writer failed to take heed. God said that, “**many... corrupt the word of God.**” It is also clear that there were those who were guilty of “**handling the word of God deceitfully.**” God warns us to not be “**carried about with every wind of**

doctrine, by the sleight of men, *and* cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.”

As we will see in this study, these versions are not just translations but interpretations. The KJV translators translated. If the Bible is the Word of God, it must be accurate in every word, thought, deed, and verb tense. Listen to what the Lord Himself said.

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

The KJV is right, accurate, and dependable. The purpose of this simple study is to state: **The perversion and subversion of John 3:16 and other critical passages provide irrefutable proof that these new versions are contaminated with doctrinal error that stem from roots of biblical apostasy and heresy. They cannot be trusted for serious study or casual reading.**

My Christian life in many aspects has been a most miserable failure. Look at what Paul said in:

 **Romans 7:14 through Romans 7:25 (KJV)** <sup>14</sup>For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. <sup>15</sup>For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. <sup>16</sup>If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that *it is* good. <sup>17</sup>Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. <sup>18</sup>For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but *how* to perform that which is good I find not. <sup>19</sup>For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. <sup>20</sup>Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. <sup>21</sup>I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. <sup>22</sup>For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: <sup>23</sup>But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. <sup>24</sup>O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? <sup>25</sup>I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.

The Christian simply has two natures. The above is just one of many Bible passages that discuss these two natures. The first nature (the old nature), we inherited from Adam, our forefather. The second nature (the new nature), was imparted to us in the process of the new birth. These natures are

constantly at war. Our new nature only wins when we trust Christ—that is living by faith—for the victory.

As a new convert, this passage was a mystery and difficult to understand. Now it is quite clear. Each of us can say with the songwriter...

Prone to wander, Lord, I feel it,  
Prone to leave the God I love;  
Here's my heart, O take and seal it,  
Seal it for Thy courts above.  
O that day when freed from sinning,  
I shall see Thy lovely face;  
Clothed then in blood washed linen  
How I'll sing Thy sovereign grace;  
Come, my Lord, no longer tarry,  
Take my ransomed soul away;  
Send thine angels now to carry  
Me to realms of endless day. By Robert Robinson

However, let us never compromise any aspect of God's Holy Word. Let us never accept an interpretation from some man who, inspired by the devil, feels the need to change the Word of God. The Word of God is the "engraphed Word" which is able to save our souls. It is the gospel—God's Spell or God's word—that is the "power of God unto salvation." Surely, we fail the God we love. However, we can, at the very least, believe God's word and deny these new counterfeit Satanic versions. This study will show, beyond any shadow of doubt, that these versions are perverted and deliberately subverted.

There is now one more personal experience that should be related here. My niece was married in Waterford, Michigan. My wife and I traveled with my mother and father-in-law to Waterford for the wedding. The wedding was on Sunday, May 16, 2004. My niece and her future husband were attending Faith Baptist Church in Waterford, and our family attended the early morning service held by Pastor Ray Thomas. We were all weary and quite frankly, I did not expect to get much from the service.

Pastor Ray Thomas did a five-minute Bible study during the offertory and before the regular preaching service. The study was on two Bible verses and their rendering in various versions. Pastor Thomas focused on two Old Testament verses that prophesied and looked forward to the crucifixion of Christ. These KJV verses were compared to multiple other versions. Pastor Thomas used a power point on a large mega screen. The study is inserted for your review below. Pastor Thomas pointed out that in the two study verses, the new versions do not reveal the cross. Read on for a simple but profound

lesson and then this chapter will be ended with a couple of concluding thoughts.

**THE BIBLE VERSIONS –  
WEIGHED IN THE BALANCE**  
**Dan.5:27 – *TEKEL*; Thou art weighed in the balances,  
and art found wanting.**

**LESSON #10**

**by Ray Thomas**

---

**THE CRUCIFIXION IN BIBLE PROPHECY<sup>1</sup>**

- The K.J.V. translators used a translating method called, “formal equivalency” – word for word.
- Most modern version translators use a translating method called, “dynamic equivalency” which is “translating thoughts not words.”

**1. What’s wrong with “dynamic equivalency”?**

*Isa. 55:8, 9* – For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.

*Isa. 65:2* – I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh in a way that was not good, after their own thoughts;

*Mic. 4:12* – But they know not the thoughts of the LORD, neither understand they his counsel: for he shall gather them as the sheaves into the floor.

- Jesus’ crucifixion was prophesied 1000 years before His birth.  
*Ps. 22:16* – For dogs have compassed me: the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet.
- This was a time when crucifixions were unknown. Executions then were by stoning.

**2. Can you find the cross in the Moffatt’s version?**

---

Ps. 22:16 – Moffatt’s Trans. – my hands and feet are all disfigured.

**3. Can you find the cross in this translation?**

Ps. 22:16 – American Translation – For dogs have surrounded me, A gang of villains encircles me. My hands and feet are crippled.

**4. Can you find the cross in this translation?**

Ps. 22:16 – New American Bible – Many dogs surround me; a pack of evil doers closes in on me. So wasted are my hands and feet.

**5. Can you find the cross in this translation?**

Ps. 22:16 – Revised English Bible – Hounds are all about me; a band of ruffians rings me round, and they have bound me hand and foot.

**6. Can you find the cross in this translation?**

Ps. 22:16 – New Jerusalem Bible – A pack of dogs surrounds me, a gang of villains closing in on me as if to hack off my hands and feet.

**7. Can you find the cross in this translation?**

Ps. 22:16 – Good News Translation – An evil gang is around me; like a pack of dogs they close in on me; they tear at my hands and my feet.

**8. Can you find the cross in this translation?**

Ps. 22:16 – New Revised Standard Version – For dogs are all around me; a company of evildoers encircles me. My hands and feet have shriveled;

- The only other O.T. Scripture that speaks of the crucifixion is Zech. 13:6, 7.

Zech. 13:6, 7 – And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends. Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the LORD of hosts: smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered: and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones.

- The wounds in His hands speak of the cross.  
Zech. 13:6, 7 – **NASV & Margin** “And one will say to him, ‘What are these wounds between your arms?’ Then he will say, ‘Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends.’ “Awake, O sword, against My Shepherd, And against the man, My Associate,” Declares the LORD of hosts. “Strike the Shepherd that sheep may be scattered; And I will turn My hand against the little ones.’”
9. **Can you find the cross in this translation?**  
Zech. 13:6, 7 – **NIV** - If someone asks him, ‘What are these wounds on your body?’ he will answer, ‘The wounds I was given at the house of my friends.’ “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, against the man who is close to me!” declares the LORD Almighty. “Strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered, and I will turn my hand against the little ones.
  10. **Can you find the cross in this translation?**  
Zech. 13: 6, 7 – **RSV** – And if one asks him, ‘What are these wounds on your back?’ he will say, ‘The wounds I received in the house of my friends’” “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, against the man who stands next me,” says the LORD of hosts. “Strike the shepherd, that the sheep may be scattered; I will turn my hand against the little ones.
  11. **Can you find the cross in this translation?**  
Zech. 13: 6, 7 – **NRSV** - And if anyone asks them, “What are these wounds on your chest?” the answer will be “The wounds I received in the house of my friends.” “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, against the man who is my associate,” says the LORD of hosts. Strike the shepherd, that the sheep may be scattered; I will turn my hand against the little ones.
  12. **Can you find the cross in this translation?**  
Zech. 13: 6, 7 – **AMP** – “And one shall say to him, What are these wounds on your breast – between your hands? Then he will answer, Those with which I was wounded [when disciplined] in the house of my (loving) friends. Awake, O sword, against My shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered; and I will turn back My hand and stretch it out again upon the little ones of the flock.”
  13. **Can you find the cross in this translation?**

Zech. 13: 6, 7 – **TLB** – “And if someone asks, “Then what are these scars on your chest and your back?” he will say, ‘I got into a brawl at the home of a friend!’ “Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, the man who is my associate and equal,” says the Lord Almighty. “Strike down the Shepherd and the sheep will scatter, but I will scatter, but I will come back and comfort and care for the lambs.”

#### 14. Can you find the cross in this translation?

Zech. 13: 6, 7 – **The Message** – “And so where did you get that black eye? They’ll say, ‘I ran into a door at a friend’s house.’”

#### 15. Was it essential that Jesus die by crucifixion?

*I Corinthians 15:3 KJV* – For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures;

(used by permission.) *End Pastor Ray Thomas lesson.*

Now, as you see, the cross cannot be found in these two referenced verses of these new versions. The obvious question is, “Why can the cross not be found in the referenced verses of these new versions?” Any novice with any true Biblical sense can look at those passages and the context and know something scandalous is going on. The new versions had to have deliberately hid the reference to the cross. Pastor Thomas did not say this. Pastor Thomas simply said, “Christians, you should hang on to your King James Bibles.” This writer wanted to know the how and why of these perverted passages. Look at **Psalms 22:16**.

*Psalms 22:16 (KJV)* <sup>16</sup>**For dogs have compassed me: the assembly of the wicked have enclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet.** J. Vernon McGee says, “This psalm is called the Psalm of the Cross. It is so named because it describes more accurately and minutely the crucifixion of Christ than does any other portion of the Word of God. It corresponds, of course, to the twenty-second chapter of Genesis and the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.”<sup>2</sup>

May I say that J. Vernon McGee was not the first to preach and teach these concepts? And you should know that Psalm 22 has been called the “Psalm of the Cross” for centuries now. Again, any Christian would have to be completely ignorant not to know the context of Psalms 22. The only translation above that properly portrays the crucifixion of Jesus is “**they pierced my hands and my feet**”.

Now we will deal with the next verse. *Zechariah 13:6 through Zechariah 13:7 (KJV)* <sup>6</sup>And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends. <sup>7</sup>Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the LORD of hosts: smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered: and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones. To stay consistent, J. Vernon McGee will be quoted from again.

The next two verses are startling. In fact, the critics have tried to eliminate them from the text because they say that it is shocking to find this prophecy given at this time. And it is! That is the wonder of it. Certainly it is no excuse to reject it; it is there to alert us. I should mention that there is a difference of opinion as to who is addressed in this verse. I believe that it is Christ.

**And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends [Zech. 13:6].**

Wounded in the house of my friends” has been translated by some of the higher critics as “wounded in the house of those who loved me.” Well, they didn’t love Him the first time He came—they hated Him. Scripture says that they hated Him without cause. “He came unto his own, and his own received him not” (John 1:11). But to as many as received Him at that time He gave the authority to become sons of God. Well, when the Spirit is poured out, they (that is, the remnant) are going to receive Him. And they will wonder, saying, “Where did you get those wounds in your hands?” He will answer, “I was wounded here when I came the first time.” He came to His own people, the Jewish race (remember that the woman of Samaria recognized Him as Jew). These were His people, and only a remnant received Him at that time. And, actually, it will be only a remnant who will receive him at His second coming, although I think it will be a much larger remnant. “And one shall say unto him” probably refers to the spokesman for the remnant, just as Peter spoke for the other apostles when he said to Jesus, “... Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God” (Matt. 16:16).

There is a song in which Jesus is called “the Stranger of Galilee.” I don’t know about you, but I don’t like that song. He is not the stranger of Galilee to those who know Him. When He came the first time He was the stranger of Galilee to His own people, but when He comes the second time He will not be the stranger of Galilee to them. Certainly He is not the stranger of Galilee to Christians in this

age in which we live, and I don't think we should sing that song. To *know Him* is life eternal. The apostle Paul at the end of his life wrote, "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death" (Phil. 3:10). But it is true that they did not know Jesus when He came the first time."<sup>3</sup> (used by permission.)

The fact that these verses clearly prophesy and reference the crucifixion should not and would not be a mystery to any Christian who has even a minimal knowledge of the Bible. The cross and crucifixion of Christ has been preached from these verses for centuries. Yet, we find these verses clearly perverted in these modern translations.

Immediately at the end of the short five minute lesson by Pastor Thomas, there was no doubt in my mind that something was wrong and there was a deliberate perversion and subversion of the KJV Bible and the very word of God. The Holy Ghost had given me a divine revelation—the same way he gives all revelations today—that is by revealing a truth from His word. My goal was to find out the what, why, and how of this perversion. It took a few weeks. After reading a sack of books (many of which are herein referenced), the reason was clear. Read on for the answer, and as Paul Harvey would say, "For the rest of the story."

And just a couple of notes are necessary before we move on. The perversion of the above two verses should make any Christian get rid of these new versions. The perversions above are not just wrong and innocent mistranslations. They have a purposeful slant and that slant is wrought in a purposeful hate of Christ and His atoning work on the cross.

Permit me one word of self-defense. The author again is a simple layman who has taught the Bible for almost 30 years and filled the pulpit on many occasions. The author is not a conspiracy theorist.

I do not consider myself to be a cave man, nor from the dark ages. At the time of this writing, my wife Pam and I live with our daughter on a small farm in east Tennessee. We have computers connected to the Internet, five TV's, eight phones, three cars, one truck, and one four wheel drive something or other. All are on loan from God. My employer is an employment and training company of which I serve as the executive director—a job that God has given me. And my wife is an ex-first grade school teacher whose students excelled on their first year competency tests. And that is a rare feat in our area!

And last, I am a conservative and a traditional missionary Baptist who believes in the fundamentals of the faith. Our family could be considered an average "modern" family. However, when it comes to the Word of God, modern does not mean better.

Before we continue, this writer felt it was necessary to get a brief simple case for the KJV on the table. The following is a super simple summary of the writer's reasons for this study.

**Easy reference of practical reasons this writer uses the KJV**

1. The Holy Spirit used the KJV to convict me of my sin and to lead me to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ.
2. The Holy Spirit used the KJV to bring each member of my family to a saving knowledge of Christ.
3. All of my personal Christian friends and godly pastors, of whom I am familiar with their testimonies, came to Christ through the KJV.
4. The King James Version was translated by the most qualified group of Biblical translators (54 in number) ever assembled in history, with the most tedious effort ever documented in history and under the direction of a godly King. (documented herein)
5. The ancient manuscripts used to translate the KJV were far superior to the ancient manuscripts used in these new versions. (documented in various chapters in this book)
6. The scholars that begin this flood of revisions to the KJV were not evangelical Christians and in many cases showed no evidence of a “new birth” experience. In addition and as a general rule they did not bring the traditional doctrinal tenets of Bible inspiration, preservation and purity to the table in their studies. In fact, these apostate scholars introduced to Christianity a naturalistic and unscientific unpractical translation science that said the Bible should be treated as any other secular book. Thus this scholarship of unbelief completely disregarded the divine inspiration and preservation of the Bible. (documented in various chapters in this book)
7. The Holy Spirit used the KJV in the “revival age” of the Church. (not documented—do your home work)
8. For 400 years the KJV was (and still is) viewed as the word of God and is still the undisputed standard for Bibles. (well documented in herein)
9. The churches that do not use the KJV have some area (sometimes many areas) of compromise or liberalism. This comes from personal experience and is not documented in this book. This tenet would make an excellent book and is covered in some degree by other writers.
10. The true churches with which this writer is familiar—that is Holy Ghost filled, soul winning, sin fighting and killing, solid traditional churches who hold to the fundamentals of the word of God—without exception use the KJV.

**May God open your hearts and minds as you continue this study.**

## Chapter 2: The Perversion

***John 3:16 (KJV)* For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.**

Inspired by God, penned by John the Beloved Disciple and the Revelator, we find the heart of the Bible in John 3:16. Yes, dissect this verse and we lay bare the very heart of God. Every Christian missionary work surely has John 3:16 as its message to be delivered. The above verse as quoted in the King James Version (KJV) is the most familiar, most memorized, and most quoted passage of any piece of literature in the history of mankind.

But... John 3:16 has been changed in a host of new versions. These new up-to-date modern versions are here to provide us with an improvement. They claim an easier reading and yet doctrinally accurate revision to our old archaic “only begotten” as rendered in the KJV. Look at the following versions. **Note: the bold in the text belongs to this writer.**

***The Holy Bible-International Standard Version*** “For this is how God loved the world: He gave his **unique** Son so that everyone who believes in him might not perish but have eternal life”

***The Holy Bible—the New International Version*** “For God so loved the world that he gave his **one and only** Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life.

***The Message: New Testament*** by EUGENE H. PETERSON “This is how much God loved the world: He gave his Son, his **one and only** Son. And this is why: so that no one need be destroyed; by believing in him, anyone can have a whole and lasting life.”

***The New Revised Standard Version Of the Bible*** “For God so loved the world that he gave his **only** Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life.”

***Holman Christian Standard Bible*** ©Broadman & Holman Publishers, Nashville, TN, web: [www.broadmanholman.com](http://www.broadmanholman.com) “For God loved the world in this way: He gave His **One and Only** Son, so that everyone who believes in Him will not perish

but have eternal life.”

- Note above on “one and only”—“or one of a kind, or incomparable, or only begotten, the greek word can refer to someone’s only child such as Luke 7:12; 8:42; 9:38. It can also refer to someone’s special child as in Hebrews 11:17.

It is easy to note that these versions have changed “only begotten” to “one and only”, “only”, or “unique”. These translations are wrong—translated wrong by men with the wrong motives and in spite of the defiant defense of these translators to the contrary—these new versions are wrong doctrinally.

Now, if God is truly God and the Creator of the heavens and the earth and able to keep them in place, God is able to write a book, give it to man and preserve it. And yes, that it just what God did in the KJV. In addition, God promised He would do just that in His holy word. These new versions in their interpretation of John 3:16 are...

1. the altered interpretations of men and thus not true translations
2. doctrinally inaccurate

This book battles for the traditional orthodox interpretation of “only begotten” from two irrefutable proof lines: the first is the accuracy of textual translation and the second is doctrinal purity. And clearly, this will be proven to any reasonable, God fearing Christian who loves the Lord more than the rudiments of this world.

The author is a simple layman and writes in layman’s terms to anyone who loves the Lord and the Word of God and hates to be tricked and deceived by anyone and especially by Satan or any of his imps. However, this book quotes from a multitude of prominent (true time-tested giants of the faith) Greek scholars and reference works to authenticate the KJV translation of John 3:16. In addition, this work will document the continual miss-translation of John 3:16 in spite of the serious doctrinal errors and implications of the deletion of “begotten” from John 3:16. It is unbelievable that the deletion of “begotten” has become common practice in the pulpits of today, in Christian books, and in the aforementioned Bibles. It is also unbelievable that pastors and teachers do not have the spiritual discernment and insight to refute this grave error.

The concepts are not difficult but the subject requires some elaborate documentation. However, the rest of the book is incredibly simple.

## The Perversion and Subversion Documented

First, let us begin with a simple lesson in the Greek. You need to know that the author knows nothing more than how to use a Strong's Concordance and/or Thayer's Dictionary. These two Bible helps tell us where to find and how to define the words in the Bible. They give the word in the form of the original language (Greek or Hebrew). They transliterate (change the Greek or Hebrew letters to English) the word and then provide a definition.

The KJV words "only begotten" are found in one compound Greek word "monogenes." Strong's Concordance gives the definition of "monogenes" as "only born, that is, sole:—only (begotten, child)." "Monos" means sole or single and "genes" means "to cause to be" or "generate." Complete documentation is found in **RD#1**. Strong's Concordance is by far the most popular Greek Dictionary in use today.

### Proof Documentation from the Reference Desk RD# 1

The words "only begotten" are found in one compound Greek word. The Greek word is Strong's #G3439, and is defined by Strong's as follows. Note: the Greek words are transliterated as stated in the preface—that is the Greek letters are omitted and the English letters inserted.

**G3439 monogenes--** From G3441 and G1096; **only born, that is, sole:—only (begotten, child).**

Now almost anyone without any Greek knowledge can recognize that the Greek word "monogenes" is a compound word—that is "a word made up of two or more distinct words, either in a solid or hyphenated form (*doorkeeper, jack-in-the-pulpit.*)" This definition comes directly from Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Also note, that the above definition refers to two Greek words-- G3441 and G1096. Now we will run the Strong's references on each.

**G3441= monos--** Probably from G3306; remaining, that is, **sole or single**; by implication mere:—**alone, only, by themselves.**

**G1096= ginomai** A prolonged and middle form of a primary verb; **to cause to be ("gen" -erate)**, that is, (reflexively) to *become (come into being)*, used with great latitude (literally, figuratively, intensively, etc.):—arise be assembled, be (come, -fall, -have self), be brought (to pass), (be) come (to pass), continue, be divided, be done, draw, be ended, fall, be finished, follow, be found, be fulfilled, + God forbid, grow, happen, have, be kept, be made, be married, be ordained to be, partake, pass, be performed, be published, require, seem, be showed, X soon as it was, sound, be taken, be turned, use, wax, will, would, be wrought.<sup>1</sup> **Note: [the bold emphasis is mine]**

Today, we hear so many quote from the “Greek.” Most laymen do not know that there is more than one version of the Greek. For instance, the Greek version used to translate the Catholic *Jerusalem Bible* is different from the Greek version used to translate the KJV.

In **RD#2**, you will find John 3:16 in three formats. In **RD#2** you will find two Greek versions and the KJV from the computer program E-Sword. All have Strong’s reference numbers attached. The Greek versions in **RD#2**

### Proof Documentation from the Reference Desk RD# 2

Here are two Greek versions and the KJV from the computer program E-Sword.<sup>2</sup> All have Strong’s reference numbers attached. These Greek versions provide documentation and proof that that the Greek word in all versions is the transliterated word “monogenes” and is translated by the KJV as “only begotten.” The key word “monogenes” is highlighted in bold and the words are not transliterated here as stated in the preface. Just note that and move on. The key here is, the two Greek versions contain the Greek word “monogenes.”

(GNT-TR+) ουτως<sup>3779</sup> ADV γαρ<sup>1063</sup> CONJ ηγαπησεν<sup>25</sup> V-AAI-3S ο<sup>3588</sup> T-NSM θεος<sup>2316</sup> N-NSM τον<sup>3588</sup> T-ASM κοσμον<sup>2889</sup> N-ASM ωστε<sup>5620</sup> CONJ τον<sup>3588</sup> T-ASM υιον<sup>5207</sup> N-ASM αυτου<sup>846</sup> P-GSM τον<sup>3588</sup> T-ASM **μονογενη**<sup>3439</sup> A-ASM εδωκεν<sup>1325</sup> V-AAI-3S ινα<sup>2443</sup> CONJ πας<sup>3956</sup> A-NSM ο<sup>3588</sup> T-NSM πιστευων<sup>4100</sup> V-PAP-NSM εις<sup>1519</sup> PREP αυτον<sup>846</sup> P-ASM μη<sup>3361</sup> PRT-N αποληται<sup>622</sup> V-2AMS-3S αλλ<sup>235</sup> CONJ εχη<sup>2192</sup> V-PAS-3S ζωνη<sup>2222</sup> N-ASF αιωνιον<sup>166</sup> A-ASF

(GNT-WH+) ουτως<sup>3779</sup> ADV γαρ<sup>1063</sup> CONJ ηγαπησεν<sup>25</sup> V-AAI-3S ο<sup>3588</sup> T-NSM θεος<sup>2316</sup> N-NSM τον<sup>3588</sup> T-ASM κοσμον<sup>2889</sup> N-ASM ωστε<sup>5620</sup> CONJ τον<sup>3588</sup> T-ASM υιον<sup>5207</sup> N-ASM τον<sup>3588</sup> T-ASM **μονογενη**<sup>3439</sup> A-ASM εδωκεν<sup>1325</sup> V-AAI-3S ινα<sup>2443</sup> CONJ πας<sup>3956</sup> A-NSM ο<sup>3588</sup> T-NSM πιστευων<sup>4100</sup> V-PAP-NSM εις<sup>1519</sup> PREP αυτον<sup>846</sup> P-ASM μη<sup>3361</sup> PRT-N αποληται<sup>622</sup> V-2AMS-3S αλλ<sup>235</sup> CONJ εχη<sup>2192</sup> V-PAS-3S ζωνη<sup>2222</sup> N-ASF αιωνιον<sup>166</sup> A-ASF

(KJV+) For<sup>1063</sup> God<sup>2316</sup> so<sup>3779</sup> loved<sup>25</sup> the<sup>3588</sup> world,<sup>2889</sup> that<sup>5620</sup> he gave<sup>1325</sup> his<sup>848</sup> **only begotten**<sup>3439</sup> Son,<sup>5207</sup> that<sup>2443</sup> whosoever<sup>3956</sup> believeth<sup>4100</sup> in<sup>1519</sup> him<sup>846</sup> should not<sup>3361</sup> perish,<sup>622</sup> but<sup>235</sup> have<sup>2192</sup> everlasting<sup>166</sup> life.<sup>2222</sup>

Note there are two Greek versions. GNT simply means “Greek New Testament.”

1. The first is the Textus Receptus (GNT-TR+) and this Greek version was used to translate the KJV... and
2. The second is the corrupt (as will be well documented later in this book) Westcott and Hort (GNT-WH+) version. and
3. The third is the KJV (KJV+). The “+” shows that Strong’s numbers are added for reference.

As stated before, all use Strong’s numbering system to refer to the Greek word and definition in STRONG’S EXHAUSTIVE CONCORDANCE by JAMES STRONG.

provide documentation and proof that the Greek for our text is the same in all Greek versions and is the transliterated word “monogenes.” “Monogenes” is translated by the KJV as “only begotten.” The variation in Greek versions is an issue when dealing with many texts **but there is no issue here in dealing with John 3:16.**

When a person talks about the Greek to a layman, the layman will might say, “That is Greek to me.” Actually, there are hundreds of English words that are in common usage today which have Greek origins. And in this case, we are fortunate that the Greek word “monogenes” translated in the KJV as “only begotten” happens to contain syllables we know in English.

Our modern English today is a mixture of German, Italian, Latin, Greek as well as a host of other languages. With all this kinship to other languages and the largest vocabulary in history available to us today, it should not be a mystery that we can easily understand and be familiar with a whole array of Greek words and meanings.

In **RD#3**, you should simply note that our English language has multiplied thousands of roots that go back to the Latin and Greek. Thus, **you do not have to be a scholar** to discover the meaning of words in Greek or Latin. These overly zealous pseudo-intellectuals want you to believe that you do not have enough wits about you to understand simple words and some very simple concepts about the Bible. Remember, the Bible talks about the group who “professing themselves wise became fools.”

### **Proof Documentation from the Reference Desk RD# 3**

The following quoted from the Microsoft Encarta Encyclopedia documents connections and origins of our English to other languages .

“Latin is a member of the Italic subfamily of the Indo-European languages; among non-Italic Indo-European languages, it is related especially closely to Sanskrit and Greek and to the Germanic and Celtic subfamilies.”<sup>3</sup>

“English belongs to the Anglo-Frisian group within the western branch of the Germanic languages, a subfamily of the Indo-European languages. It is related most closely to the Frisian language, to a lesser extent to Netherlandic (Dutch-Flemish) and the Low German (Plattdeutsch) dialects, and more distantly to Modern High German.... Old English, a variant of West Germanic, was spoken by certain Germanic peoples (Angles, Saxons, and Jutes) of the regions comprising present-day southern Denmark and northern Germany who invaded Britain in the 5th century ad; the Jutes were the first to arrive, in 449, according to tradition. Settling in Britain, the invaders drove the indigenous Celtic-speaking peoples, notably the Britons, to the north and west.”<sup>4</sup>

**From Microsoft Encarta--© 1993-2003 Microsoft Corporation.**

These are simple words with simple concepts. These are not hidden truths but truths intended for the world “God so loved.” Look again at the word “monogenes”. That word looks like two words or a compound word. We use the prefix “mono” in a host of every day words.

“Mon” and “mono” are equivalent in our English. Consider these words and no doubt you know their meaning—monogamy, monogram, and monochrome. “Mono” simple means “one, single or alone” and the documentation is found in **RD#4**.

#### Proof Documentation from the Reference Desk **RD# 4**

**Definition of “mono”—mono-** or **mon--pref.**<sup>5</sup> 1. One; single; alone: *monomorphic*. 2. Containing a single atom, radical, or group: *monobasic*. 3. Monomolecular; monatomic: *monolayer*. [Middle English, from Old French, from Latin, from Greek, from monos, *single, alone*. See men-<sup>4</sup> in Indo-European Roots.] **Source:** *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition, Copyright © 2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company.*

If you look up the syllable “gen” on line, you will find “gen” is not a word but a simple syllable. However, the references will yield words like generate, gene, Genesis, genetics, genealogy, gendered, etc. The complete definition of “generate” is found in **RD#5**. The word “generate” as you would suspect has the idea of producing, engendering, or procreation. In the chart, you will note that our dictionary refers you to the Latin and yes, Latin has strong and direct ties to the Greek Language.

#### Proof Documentation from the Reference Desk **RD# 5**

**Definition of generate**<sup>6</sup>—gen-er-ate (P) Pronunciation Key (jn-rt) tr.v. gen-er-at-ed, gen-er-at-ing, gen-er-ates--To bring into being; give rise to: *generate a discussion*. To produce as a result of a chemical or physical process: *generate heat*. To engender (offspring); procreate. Mathematics. To form (a geometric figure) by describing a curve or surface. Computer Science. To produce (a program) by instructing a computer to follow given parameters with a skeleton program. Linguistics. To construct (a sentence, for example), as in generative grammar. [Latin *generre, genert-*, to produce, from *genus, gener-*, birth. See *gen-* in Indo-European Roots.] **Source:** *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition, Copyright © 2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company.*

Now if we look at the syllable “gen” in the Webster’s 1828 Dictionary and complete documentation is found in **RD# 6**. You will find that all of these words have the concept of begetting, procreating, and producing. This

dictionary is particularly valuable because its word meanings exactly match the King James definitions. The 1828 dictionary is not substantially different

**Proof Documentation from the Reference Desk RD# 6**

Note the words that begin with the syllable “gen” in the Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. This dictionary is particularly valuable because its word meanings exactly match the King James definitions. The 1828 dictionary is not substantially different from today’s dictionaries and the root meanings are exactly the same. We find the following words defined:<sup>7</sup>

**GEN'ERATE**, v.t. [L. genero. See Gender.]

1. To beget; to procreate; to propagate; to produce a being similar to the parent. Every animal generates his own species. 2. To produce; to cause to be; to bring into life; as great whales which the waters generated. 3. To cause; to produce; to form.

**GEN'ERATED**, pp. Begotten; engendered; procreated; produced; formed.

**GEN'ERATING**, ppr. Begetting; procreating; producing; forming.

**GENERA'TION**, n. The act of begetting; procreation, as of animals.

1. Production; formation; as the generation of sounds or of curves or equations.

2. A singlesuccession in natural descent, as the children of the same parents; hence, an age. Thus we say, the third, the fourth, or the tenth generation.

Gen.15.16. 3. The people of the same period, or living at the same time. O faithless and perverse generation. Luke 9. 4. Genealogy; a series of children or descendants from the same stock. This is the book of the generations of Adam. Gen.5. 5. A family; a race. 6. Progeny; offspring.

**GEN'ERATIVE**, a. Having the power of generating or propagating its own species. 1. Having the power of producing. 2. Prolific.

**GEN'ERATOR**, n. He or that which begets, causes or produces.

1. In music, the principal sound or sounds by which others are produced. Thus the lowest C for the treble of the harpsichord, besides its octave, will strike an attentive ear with its twelfth above, or G in alt., and with its seventeenth above, or E in alt. Hence C is called their generator, the G and E its products or harmonics. 2. A vessel in which steam is generated.

**GENER'IC** or **GENER'ICAL**, a. [L. genus.] Pertaining to a genus or kind; comprehending the genus, as distinct from species, or from another genus. A generic description is a description of a genus; a generic difference is a difference in genus; a generic name is the denomination which comprehends all the species, as of animals, plants or fossils, which have certain essential and peculiar characters in common. Thus Canis is the generic name of animals of the dog kind; Felis, of the cat kind; Cervus, of the deer kind.

**GENER'ICALLY**, adv. With regard to genus; as an animal generically distinct from another, or two animals generically allied.

**GENEROS'ITY**, n. [L. generositas, from genus, race, kind, with reference to birth, blood, family.]

*(Continued on page 23)*

*(Continued from page 22)*

1. The quality of being generous; liberality in principle; a disposition to give liberally or to bestow favors; a quality of the heart or mind opposed to meanness or parsimony. 2. Liberality in act; bounty. 3. Nobleness of soul; magnanimity. [This is the primary sense, but is now little used.]

**GEN'EROUS**, a. [L. *generosus*. See *Gender*.] 1. Primarily, being of honorable birth or origin; hence, noble; honorable; magnanimous; applied to persons; as a generous foe; a generous critic. 2. Noble; honorable; applied to things; as a generous virtue; generous boldness. It is used also to denote like qualities in irrational animals; as a generous pack of hounds. 3. Liberal; bountiful; munificent; free to give; as a generous friend; a generous father. 4. Strong; full of spirit; as generous wine. 5. Full; overflowing; abundant; as a generous cup; a generous table. 6. Sprightly; courageous; as a generous steed.

**Source: the American Student's Package computer program by Christian Technologies Inc.**

from today's dictionaries and the root meanings are exactly the same.

Now, with the small amount of documentation found here, you can see that it does not take a Greek scholar to translate the word "monogenes". From this little study, this author would translate "monogenes" as...

- ◆ only begotten or
- ◆ only generated or
- ◆ only procreated or
- ◆ only born

The point is this. There are a multitude of possible translations for "monogenes" that are accurate and transfer the true sense of John 3:16 without bastardizing the Bible in the same manner as these previously mentioned ungodly translations. **The author will offer proof after proof throughout this book of the inaccuracy of these new versions and of the deliberate doctrinal perversion of these new versions.** In addition, we will explain why the word "begotten" is absolutely foundational in dealing with the major doctrines of the Bible. Is the word of God important enough for you to know the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. If so, read on.

**Henry Morris from the Institute for Creation Research comments on the translation of "only begotten" as follows:**

**GOD'S ONLY BEGOTTEN SON- BTG No. 108a December 1997 by Henry M. Morris © Copyright 2004 Institute for Creation Research. All Rights Reserved.**

The Greek word for "only begotten" is monogenes, the very form of which clearly denotes "only generated." As monotheism connotes only one God and monosyllable means a word of only one syllable, so monogenes means only one genesis or only one generated—or, more simply, only begotten. It does not mean "one," or even "one and only." It is worth noting that, although Christ is called the Son, or Son of God, frequently in the New Testament, He is never (in the Greek original) called the "only" son of God.

The fact is, that to call Him the only Son of God would make the Bible contradict itself, for He is not the only Son of God, and certainly not the "one and only" Son of God. Angels are several times called the sons of God (e.g., Job 38:7) since they had no fathers, being directly created by God. Likewise, Adam was called the son of God (Luke 3:38), because he was directly created. The same applies even to fallen angels (Genesis 6:2), and even to Satan (Job 1:6), because they also were created beings. The term is also used in a spiritual sense, of course, for those who have become "new creations" in Christ Jesus by faith (II Corinthians 5:17; Ephesians 2:10; etc.). In this sense, we also are "sons of God" (e.g., I John 3:2) by special creation—not physically but spiritually.

But it is never applied in this sense to Christ, for He is not a created son of God (as the Jehovah's Witnesses and other cultists teach), but a begotten Son of God—in fact, the only begotten Son of God. He never had a beginning, for He was there in the beginning (John 1:1). In His prayer to the Father in the upper room, He spoke of "the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (John 17:5).<sup>8</sup> (used by permission.)

The proper and accurate translation for the word "monogenes" is "only begotten." And "only begotten" just happens to be the beloved and traditional translation. In addition:

1. The translation of "monogenes" as "unique" is not accurate.
2. The translation of "monogenes" as "only" is not accurate.
3. The translation of "monogenes" as "one and only" is not accurate.

Words fail to describe how hideous these new translations are. These translations commit blasphemy. These translations are damnable, deplorable, and deceitful and can be used to perpetuate the worst of heresies. These heresies are the very heresies that the word of God was divinely and

---

specifically given to combat. To adopt and use these translations is to commit high treason against the “only begotten” Son of God.

For years, I would say that no one who did not love God and the word of God would take the time to study, translate, and comment on the word of God. I gave them the benefit of the doubt and assumed they had good intentions. I was wrong, deceived and failed to properly understand and apply the very basics taught in the first few passages of Genesis. The devil is on the attack as his ministers appear as “ministers of light”. We will talk more about these wicked translations and interpretations later.

**The premise of this book is: The perversion and subversion of John 3:16 and other critical passages provide irrefutable proof that these new versions are contaminated with doctrinal error that stem from roots of biblical apostasy and heresy.**

## Chapter 3: Why Did This Happen?

This study will prove—absolutely, positively prove—the new versions have perverted John 3:16. These versions may well have perpetuated the biggest lie on Christianity since the dark ages. And yes, there have been a multitude of lies, heresies, and bad doctrine in the Christian ranks since that time. However, this perversion strikes at the heart of Christian doctrine and perverts true Biblical Christianity.

What is absolutely unbelievable is how many Christian writers, pastors, teachers, deacons, and church leaders have endorsed the new versions. Many of these men are well respected and the very leaders of our evangelical Christian community.

The deception is so wide that whole churches and yes, even dominations have accepted these new versions that pervert and subvert John 3:16. There is no doubt that many understand something is wrong but do not speak out. But every Christian should wonder, “Why did this happen?” There is also another question that you should ask, “How did this happen?” and we will deal with this question in an upcoming chapter. But here we will deal with the question, “Why did this happen?”

**First, the devil has always been out to pervert the word of God.** Look at the serpent, inspired and perhaps even incarnated by Satan, as he sleazily shines his false light in the Garden of Eden.

 **Genesis 3:1 through Genesis 3:6 (KJV)** <sup>1</sup>Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? <sup>2</sup>And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: <sup>3</sup>But of the fruit of the tree which *is* in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. <sup>4</sup>And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: <sup>5</sup>For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. <sup>6</sup>And when the woman saw that the tree *was* good for food, and that it *was* pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make *one* wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.

The serpent casts doubt on the word of God. Listen as the serpent speaks, “Yea, hath God said?” The serpent then accuses God of lying and denies the word of God... “Ye shall not surely die.” Then, the serpent damns the hearer with his deception.

Surely every faithful Sunday school child is familiar with this story.

Satan used his best tactic first in the Garden of Eden. And you can be sure that Satan will continue to use this tactic until he is cast into the Lake of Fire.

**Second and next, false intellectualism and over interpretation of the word of God has been rampant in Christendom throughout Christian history and continues today.** Quite frankly, many pastors esteem their education over the word of God and interpret the word of God in light of their education rather than the clear contexts and teachings of the word of God. The word of God was written for the common man. Through the history of Christendom (true and counterfeit Christianity), writers have taken small clear-cut passages and wrote volumes of circle logic, gibberish, and comments of their opinions. They failed in many and most cases to use the simple Bible method of studying the Bible by comparing scripture with scripture. The Bible says:

 **2 Peter 1:20 through 2 Peter 1:21 (KJV)** <sup>20</sup>Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. <sup>21</sup>For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake *as they were* moved by the Holy Ghost.

Read the writings of Saint Augustine or John Calvin. They are held in high esteem in many (maybe most) Christian schools and seminaries. Yes, you will find some truth and a whole bunch of conjecture, half-truths and some total heresy. Most Christians do not know their history. John Gill was called to pastor the Strict Baptist Church in 1720, which he continued to pastor for 51 years. Eventually the Strict Baptist Church would evolve into the Metropolitan Tabernacle, which would be ministered by Charles Spurgeon for over 35 years. You can buy printed commentaries of Gill and pay a small fortune for them. They have recently been published in some shareware programs and are assessable in that format. Take a moment to read Gill's comments on John 3:16.

John 3:16 - For God so loved the world,... The Persic version reads "men": but not every man in the world is here meant, or all the individuals of human nature; for all are not the objects of God's special love, which is here designed, as appears from the instance and evidence of it, the gift of his Son: nor is Christ God's gift to every one; for to whomsoever he gives his Son, he gives all things freely with him; which is not the case of every man. Nor is human nature here intended, in opposition to, and distinction from, the angelic nature; for though God has showed a regard to fallen men, and not to fallen angels,

and has provided a Saviour for the one, and not for the other; and Christ has assumed the nature of men, and not angels; yet not for the sake of all men, but the spiritual seed of Abraham; and besides, it will not be easily proved, that human nature is ever called the world: nor is the whole body of the chosen ones, as consisting of Jews and Gentiles, here designed; for though these are called the world, Joh 6:33; and are the objects of God's special love, and to them Christ is given, and they are brought to believe in him, and shall never perish, but shall be saved with an everlasting salvation; yet rather the Gentiles particularly, and God's elect among them, are meant; who are often called "the world", and "the whole world", and "the nations of the world", as distinct from the Jews; see Rom 11:12, compared with Mat 6:32. The Jews had the same distinction we have now, the church and the world; the former they took to themselves, and the latter they gave to all the nations around: hence we often meet with this distinction, Israel, and the nations of the world; on those words,...”<sup>1</sup>

John Gill completely reverses the meaning of John 3:16. Although not specifically mentioned above, Gill advocates for the sick doctrine of double predestination. That is—the belief that some are predestined to hell with no hope and some predestined to heaven and the fate of each is unalterable. Gill writes all of this just to simply say—God loves only the ones He has predestined for heaven or “the objects of God's special love” and this verse only applies to the chosen. Listen to the following perverted quotes of Gill.

“not every man in the world is here meant,...”  
 “or all the individuals of human nature;...”  
 “for all are not the objects of God's special love...”  
 “nor is Christ God's gift to every one;...”  
 “which is not the case of every man.”  
 “Nor is human nature here intended,...”  
 “yet not for the sake of all men,...”  
 “it will not be easily proved, that human nature is ever called the world: nor is the whole body of the chosen ones,...”  
 “and God's elect among them, are meant; who are often called "the world", and "the whole world",...”

Think of it! All of this perverted rubbish to explain that God did not

simply mean exactly what He said in John 3:16. Gill a scholar in many aspects and considered one of “The Divines” of yesteryear could not see the simple truth that Christ died for all mankind. Gill offers no scriptural back up for his statements in his comments on this passage because a multitude of verses clearly refute his conjecture. This kind of perversion is arrogant, wicked, and sick beyond belief. Yet, the works and writings of Gill are considered a prize possession in many seminary circles.

Edwin H. Palmer is “the executive secretary of the New International Version of the Bible (NIV) and general editor of the NIV Study Bible.” He is also the author of *The Five Points of Calvinism*. In this book, advocating for double predestination, Mr. Palmer paraphrases John 3:16 like this:

“It was just because God so loved the world of elect sinners that He sent His only begotten Son that the world might be saved through Him (John 3:16-17).”<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Palmer’s God could create the heavens, fling the stars in their precision orbs, form the earth, and write the DNA of man. However, Mr. Palmer’s poor ole God could not even write His most notable verse and make it understandable to the common man. In the previous paragraph quoted above and in his book, Mr. Palmer says, “Since the objects of the Father’s love are particular, definite, and limited, so are the objects of Christ’s death. Because God has loved certain ones and not all, . . .”<sup>3</sup>

Why did God just not tell us He did not love all of us and make it plain in John 3:16? Why on earth would God put “whosoever” in this verse? Was it to deliberately deceive us? Maybe God did not have the nerve to tell millions he predestined them to hell. Maybe God was ashamed of His actions. I speak foolishly.

Mr. Palmer, “the executive secretary of the New International Version of the Bible (NIV) and general editor of the NIV Study Bible” has sick and perverted view of God. It is absolutely nauseating that thousands of pastors carry this NIV garbage into the pulpits and quote this corrupt garbage Sunday after Sunday. Many mean well, do not believe in “double predestination,” yet unwittingly expose their congregations to strain of viruses that is corrupting every sphere of modern Christianity. Oh! By the way, Mr. Palmer adds to John 3:16 in the above quote. He is not done changing John 3:16 and as we will see when he removes “begotten” from John 3:16 in the NIV.

Yes, John 3:16 was written for the whole world and to the whole world. The verse is simple and straightforward. God is God, and the God of love and integrity. God is honest, and His word is true. The devil, not God, is the master deceiver. The devil is the one who will say one thing and mean another.

In case you think this is something new, the Bible warns us numerous times of these over interpretations and false intellectualism.

 **Jude 1:14 through Jude 1:19 (KJV)** <sup>14</sup>And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, <sup>15</sup>To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard *speeches* which ungodly sinners have spoken against him. <sup>16</sup>These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; **and their mouth speaketh great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration because of advantage.**

<sup>17</sup>But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; <sup>18</sup>How that they told you there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts.

<sup>19</sup>These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit.

 **2 Peter 2:10 through 2 Peter 2:19 (KJV)** <sup>10</sup>But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government. Presumptuous *are they*, selfwilled, **they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities.** <sup>11</sup>Whereas angels, which are greater in power and might, bring not railing accusation against them before the Lord. <sup>12</sup>But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, **speak evil of the things that they understand not;** and shall utterly perish in their own

corruption; <sup>13</sup>And shall receive the reward of unrighteousness, *as they that count it pleasure to riot in the day time. Spots they are and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you;*

<sup>14</sup>Having eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin; beguiling unstable souls: an heart they have exercised with covetous practices; cursed children: <sup>15</sup>Which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam *the son of Bosor*, who loved the wages of unrighteousness;

<sup>16</sup>But was rebuked for his iniquity: the dumb ass speaking with man's voice forbad the madness of the prophet. <sup>17</sup>These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest; to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever. <sup>18</sup>**For when they speak great swelling words of vanity,** they allure through the lusts of the flesh,

*through much wantonness,* those that were clean escaped from them who live in error. <sup>19</sup>While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage.

 **Romans 1:22 through Romans 1:25 (KJV)** <sup>22</sup>Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, <sup>23</sup>And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. <sup>24</sup>Wherefore God also gave them

up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: <sup>25</sup>**Who changed the truth of God into a lie**, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.

📖 **Colossians 2:8 (KJV)** <sup>8</sup>**Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit**, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.

📖 **1 Timothy 6:20 (KJV)** <sup>20</sup>O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, **avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called:**

📖 **2 Corinthians 2:17 (KJV)** <sup>17</sup>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.

📖 **Jeremiah 23:36 (KJV)** <sup>36</sup>And the burden of the LORD shall ye mention no more: for every man's word shall be his burden; **for ye have perverted the words of the living God**, of the LORD of hosts our God.

**Third, the arrogance and pride of man (even the saved man) makes him susceptible to the deceit of the devil.** Money and power will corrupt because they conceive pride in the heart of men. Pride can affect the pulpit and the pew. History abounds with men blindly following men for the purposes of gain. Look at Corinthians...

📖 **1 Corinthians 3:1 through 1 Corinthians 3:4 (KJV)** <sup>1</sup>And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, *even* as unto babes in Christ. <sup>2</sup>I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able *to bear it*, neither yet now are ye able. <sup>3</sup>For ye are yet carnal: for whereas *there is* among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? <sup>4</sup>**For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?**

There is not one Christian that has reached the place of complete sanctification. Look at what John had to say about this matter.

📖 **1 John 1:8 through 1 John 1:10 (KJV)** <sup>8</sup>If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. <sup>9</sup>If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us *our* sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. <sup>10</sup>**If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.**

Even the saved born again Christian can fall away from the complete knowledge of their salvation. Consider the book of Galatians, which was

written to combat this problem.

 **Galatians 1:6 through Galatians 1:9 (KJV)** <sup>6</sup>**I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you** into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: <sup>7</sup>Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. <sup>8</sup>But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. <sup>9</sup>As we said before, so say I now again, If any *man* preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.

 **Galatians 5:1 through Galatians 5:9 (KJV)** <sup>1</sup>Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. <sup>2</sup>Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. <sup>3</sup>For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. <sup>4</sup>**Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.** <sup>5</sup>For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. <sup>6</sup>For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love. <sup>7</sup>Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth? <sup>8</sup>This persuasion *cometh* not of him that calleth you. <sup>9</sup>A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.

**Fourth, the greed of man continues to perpetuate these new versions.** Copyright laws require substantial changes in one work from another in order to justify and receive the copyright. The new Bibles (if you can call them that) use corrupt manuscripts and in many cases are actually revisions and interpretations rather than translations. This is a simplification but nevertheless true. The point is that every new version generates millions in revenue for the publishers. The old political adage “follow the money” applies in religion as well as politics.

When the new versions emerge, the pride cited above takes over. Christians seem to always look for something new and take pride in being the first—thus the rush to buy the latest Bible. Yes, many Christians are just like the heathen at Mars Hill. You should remember the following passage.

 **Acts 17:18 through Acts 17:21 (KJV)** <sup>18</sup>Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans, and of the Stoicks, encountered him. And some said, What will this babbler say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection. <sup>19</sup>And they took him, and brought him unto Areopagus, saying, **May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is?** <sup>20</sup>For thou

bringest certain strange things to our ears: we would know therefore what these things mean. <sup>21</sup>**(For all the Athenians and strangers which were there spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing.)**

Listen to the song *I Love to Tell the Story* and note the contrast to the above attitude.

I love to tell the story of unseen things above,  
Of Jesus and His glory, of Jesus and His love.  
I love to tell the story, because I know 'tis true;  
It satisfies my longings as nothing else can do.

I love to tell the story; more wonderful it seems  
Than all the golden fancies of all our golden dreams.  
I love to tell the story, it did so much for me;  
And that is just the reason I tell it now to thee.

I love to tell the story; 'tis pleasant to repeat  
What seems, each time I tell it, more wonderfully sweet.  
I love to tell the story, for some have never heard  
The message of salvation from God's own holy Word.

I love to tell the story, for those who know it best  
Seem hungering and thirsting to hear it like the rest.  
And when, in scenes of glory, I sing the new, new song,  
'Twill be the old, old story that I have loved so long.

*Refrain*

*I love to tell the story, 'twill be my theme in glory,  
To tell the old, old story of Jesus and His love.*

This old song and the old, old story certainly do not apply to much of Christian thinking today. This old song seems to have lost its application to modern Christianity. A host of Christian speakers and preachers are traveling across the country, and you must purchase a ticket to get a seat to hear them speak. Surely, this is not Christ-like or Biblical. The gospel should be free for all.

## **Chapter 4: Proof Studies (#’s 1 to 4) “Only Begotten”— The Doctrinally Correct Translation**

### **Previous Studies, Criswell and Holland**

Many of these studies repeat thoughts, ideas, and proofs. However, each new study will build upon previous studies, and each will add new thoughts and new dimensions to this study. Do not give up on the book because of the repetition and the fact a few passages are difficult to read. The material here is given as proof positive that our premise is right.

We shall see that those who would pervert the word of God argue from an arrogant attitude. Their hyper-intellectualism (they think) allows them to set in judgment over the word of God and act as its correctors. It is sickening to hear them say, “It is regrettable the KJV translates this passage as such and such” or “a better rendering would be...” or “in the Greek, it really means...” and we could go on and on. My purpose is, as simple layman, to powerfully refute these new versions using sound Biblical principles, a host of well-educated and intellectual giants as witnesses, and the preponderance of the evidence. We will start with a repeat of my previous study.

#### **Proof Study 1—My previous simple Greek lesson**

The first study is a repeat of our simple lesson in the Greek starting on page 22 in chapter two. You may want to review or continue.

#### **Proof Study 2—Repeat of Henry Morris comments**

We should continue our study here by repeating Henry Morris from the Institute of Christian Research and you will find his view on page 27 in chapter 2. You may want to review or continue.

#### **Proof Study 3—Dr. W.A. Criswell**

**Dr. W. A. Criswell, “Mr. Southern Baptist,” and the man who influenced Baptists, and in my opinion, the entire realm of Christianity more than any man in the past century declares his position on “monogenes” in the following sermon. The Internet will give you hundreds of his sermons in a host of different formats and a bio. Dr. Criswell passed away a few short years ago and leaves us with an unbelievable legacy, a rich array of literature, and a tremendous**

testimony for God.

**CHRIST, THE WORD OF GOD, Dr. W. A. Criswell  
John 1:1-3, 04-01-85**

I have to close—may I do it with just one other observation about John in his presentation of the Lord Jesus? He speaks of His incarnation, in a marvelous word. In this first chapter: “In the beginning was *ho logos*, the Word.” Then, in the fourteenth verse, he will say: “And the Word,” the Lord God Christ, “was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father..)” Ancient Greek manuscripts are like this: “The glory of the only begotten God, full of grace and truth.”

Then he will repeat that again: “No man hath seen God at any time. The only begotten of the—the only begotten Son—he hath declared him.” That word is *monogenes*—only begotten—and John loved it. For example, in John 3:16 you have it: “God so loved the world he gave his *monogenes*...”

The only begotten Son of God—in Christ we have God made flesh—we have God Incarnate! Would you like to see God? Look at Jesus. Would you like to know God? Know the Lord Jesus! Would you like to love God? Then love the Lord Jesus! Would you like to follow the Lord God? Follow the Lord Jesus! Would you like to shape your life and the will of God? Do it in the great words and commandments of the Lord Jesus—the God-man! John would say the *monogenes*. The Incarnation of God is found in the Lord Jesus.

When I was a boy, they discovered Carlsbad Caverns in southeastern New Mexico. And I made a trip down there from the panhandle of Texas to look at that marvelous discovery. That's the first time I ever saw a stalagmite—those calcite columns that reach upward from the ground. It was the first time I ever saw a stalactite—those calcite columns that reach down from the ceiling toward the earth.

And as I walked through that tremendous miraculous natural phenomenon, as I looked, there was one of those tremendous stalagmites reaching up from the ground that had met a great stalactite coming down from above; and they had

met. And there was a great column, a mighty column, where the two had met—from the ground reaching up and from heaven reaching down. And then, after years, they have called that great column “The Rock of Ages.” And they’ll turn out the lights and a guide will sing the Rock of Ages.

The God-man, Christ Jesus—our humanity reaching up toward heaven and God’s hand reaching down toward earth—and they are co-joined in the incarnation of Jesus, our Lord Christ.

**If Jesus Christ is a man,  
 And only a man,  
 I say that of all mankind  
 I will follow Him  
 And Him will I follow always.  
 But if Jesus Christ is a God  
 And the only God,  
 I swear I will follow Him  
 Through heaven and hell,  
 The earth, the sea, and the air.**

Christ, the Word, the Incarnation, the expression, the revelation of God--and our Lord—oh that we just know You better! How we could exalt Thy glorious name and love and serve Thee more!

Bless these students, and bless these families, and people, and all of us, as we gather this pre-Easter week, to sit at Thy feet dear Jesus—and to offer to Thee the worship and adoration of our souls—in Thy wonderful and saving and loving name! Amen!<sup>1</sup> (used by permission)

#### Proof Study 4—Dr. Thomas Holland

The following is an excerpt from Dr. Thomas Holland’s *Crowned With Glory*, ©2000, and used with permission.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Holland is an excellent defender of the KJV and *Crowned With Glory* brings some excellent thoughts to the table. I fully recommend the book. The following excerpt is on target (the dead center of the bull’s eye) with the premise of this book. Dr. Holland deals with the translation of John 1:18 in this passage. The same principles apply as to John 3:16. However an additional textual problem exists here. Read on and you will find there is

**no end to the perversion when these corrupted versions deal with the doctrines of our Lord Jesus Christ.**

John 1:18 - "only begotten Son"

*"No man hath seen God at any time; the **only begotten Son**, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."*

There are really two problems here, although only one appears on the surface. Should the proper translation be "only begotten Son" or should it be as the *New American Standard Version* renders it, "only begotten God"? This particular problem is not translational but textual because there is a difference in the Greek texts underlining these two translations. However, there is another problem that has to do with the Greek word *monogenes*. Both the *King James* and the *New American Standard* correctly translate it as *only begotten*. There is a growing movement to understand this word as *unique*, *one of a kind*, or simply *only*. We will deal with this difference first.

Many of the current handbooks on Greek syntax state that *monogenes* should **not** be translated as *only begotten*.<sup>266</sup> Instead, they take the word to mean *only* or *unique*. If this were true, the translation of the KJV would not be alone in its "error" for this is the translation of the *New American Standard Version*, the *New King James Version*, and several other translations of the twentieth century.

The problem here is a misunderstanding of the Greek language (both Koine and Modern). The word *monogenes* does mean *one* or *unique* in the sense that an only child is the only one of his parents. It does not mean unique, as in *special*, such as in the phrase, "his work is very unique." Here the Greek would be *monadikos*, not *monogenes*. As we examine the New Testament we find the word *monogenes* used eight times (not counting its usage here in John 1:18). In every case it is used to describe a relationship between a parent and child (Luke 7:12; 8:42; 9:38; John 1:14; 3:16, 18; Hebrews 11:17; 1 John 4:9). Since this is how the Holy Spirit uses the word in the New Testament, we must accept this definition when reading John 1:18.<sup>267</sup>

The evidence establishes that Jesus Christ, although God (John 1:1), is also the only begotten Son of God. None

other can claim hold to this title. Those who accept Christ as their personal Savior are spiritually born of God and are called His sons (John 1:12). But no human can lay claim to the title of *only begotten Son*. This phrase has not only to do with Christ's virgin birth, but also His eternal place within the Trinity.

<sup>266</sup>See Newman and Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1980), 24. Also, Moulton and Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1930), 416-417. However, others recognize that *monogenes* means *only begotten*. See Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Milford, MI: Mott Media, 1977 ed.), 417-418. Moulton, *The Analytical Greek Lexicon Revised* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978 ed.), 272. And, Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (London: SPCK, 1952) 37-51, 135-141, 151-156.

<sup>267</sup>It has further been established that the word *monogenes* has as its root word *genos*. Again, some have suggested that this root word means *kind* or *type*. This is true, but in the sense that those who are born of a given parentage are a certain type or kind. The Greek word *genos* appears twenty-one times in the New Testament. It is translated as *kind, nation, stock* (of Abraham), *nation, offspring, kindred, generation, and country* in the KJV, demonstrating the word has to do with descendents. The New International Version translates it as *born* in Mark 7:26, and the New American Standard Version translates it as *birth* in Acts 4:36. (used by permission)

## Chapter 5: Proof Studies (#'s 5 & 6) Continued— Tim Warner and Mark Oaks

### Proof Study #5—Tim Warner

The article entitled “The Gnostic & Arian Corruption of John 1:18” by Tim Warner - Copyright © June 2001 repeats several ideas stated before herein.<sup>1</sup> However, Mr. Warner gives us an excellent format for his presentation. His thoughts are well organized and well aligned. In addition, he adds some new information. We have copied only the portion of the article that touches on our main thesis. This book deals briefly with the Gnostic and Arian heresies in later chapters. However, you need to read Mr. Warner’s entire article because, quite frankly, he does a much better job than this book when dealing with the Gnostics and Arians.

As everyone knows by now, the author is a Baptist and makes no bones about it. Tim Warner who founded *The Pristine Faith Restoration Society* is not in the Baptist camp but their society holds to orthodox Christian positions in the fundamentals of the faith. This was copied from the website <http://studytoanswer.net/> by Timothy W. Dunkin. Read Tim Warner’s interpretation of “monogenes.” The footnotes for this portion of the article are found at the end of this section.

#### "Monogenes" means "only begotten" because:

1. "Genomai" is the root verb. From this verb several other words are derived. This root verb is used in Scripture in a variety of ways, but always related to "coming into being." Our English word "generate" is related to it. "Genomai" is used by John in the context of John 1 in reference to the creation being "made" (vss. 1,2), believers "becoming" the sons of God (vs. 12), and the Word "becoming" flesh (vs. 14). So, the basic idea of this entire family of words that flow from this verb is "to come into being" or to "come about."

2. "Genos" is one of the nouns that is derived from the root verb "genomai." This noun is related to the basic idea of "coming into being," but has a much more specific meaning regarding those who have come into being, people or animals, through procreation in nature. (As words branch out from the root word they become more specific and less inclusive in meaning). "Genos" is used in a variety of ways, but most commonly of relatives or descendants of people. When used of animals, it has "species" in view in the same way that Genesis refers to animals reproducing "after their kind."

Genos is found 20 times in the NT as follows. Matt. 13:47, Mark 7:26, Mark 9:29, Acts 4:6, Acts 4:36, Acts 7:13, Acts 7:17, Acts 12:26, Acts 17:28, Acts 17:29, Acts 18:2, Acts 18:24, 1 Cor. 12:10, 1 Cor. 12:28, 1 Cor. 14:10, 2 Cor. 11:26, Gal. 1:14, Php. 3:5, 1 Pet. 2:9, Rev. 22:16.

Here is the breakdown and number of times each English word is used

in the KJV.  
offspring - 3  
kindred - 3  
stock (family - NKJV) - 2  
born - 2  
generation - 2  
nation - 2  
country - 1  
countrymen - 1  
kind - 4

All of these words carry the idea of descent or offspring. Even "country" or "countrymen" had the idea of physical relationship because back then people did not usually move away from home like we see today. A "country" and "countrymen" were usually of the same clan and ancestry, just like the whole Jewish nation traced its heritage back to Jacob and his 12 sons.

Even in the 4 cases where "genos" is translated "kind," it still has in view "families." In Matt. 13:47 it is referring to species of fish, which in the animal kingdom refers to "offspring." The other three cases where it is translated "kinds" all refer to "languages." And languages were unique to tribes or offspring or race! Paul uses "genos" figuratively to mean "families" of languages.

So, we see that in every single instance of "genos" in the Bible, the idea of "offspring" (either literally or figuratively) plays a part in the meaning. "Genos" does not mean simply "kind" in the sense of one object differing from another of a different kind. "Genos" is never used literally of inanimate objects! It is only used (in a literal sense) of living beings that have come into being through some kind of ancestry. In the few remaining cases where it is used figuratively, "family" (a word that literally refers to offspring) could be substituted in the text for the idea in English.

The idea of "kind" simply as one type of thing as opposed to another is the Greek word "pan" #3956. This word is used where differences of type or of characteristics are meant (not related to offspring or ancestry). "Genos" on the other hand refers to "kinds" only in the sense of tracing ancestry, or heredity, or genealogy.

**3.** "Genos" (noun) has a sister verb #1080 "gennao" that is derived from it. They are like twins, a verb and a noun, with "ginomai" being the

parent. Like "genos," "gennao" carries the more specific meaning of "offspring" into a verb form. This verb form of "genos" is translated "begat," and is used in a multitude of verses exclusively of giving birth, particularly in the genealogies of Matthew and Luke.

4. "Mono-genes" is simply a compound of "monos" (only) and "genos" (offspring). This is the literal meaning. And as Thayer's says, "monogenes" is used exclusively of an only-child's relationship to his parents in the Bible.

5. That the literal meaning of "monogenes" is how John 1:18 was understood by the Greek speaking early Church is proven by the early Latin translations, beginning from the 2nd century, and including the Vulgate (5th century). "Uni- genetus" is the Latin word used by these Greek and Latin speaking translators to convey the meaning of "monogenes." And there is no question that the Latin word has the idea of offspring, ie. an only born child.

6. The English versions prior to Westcott's & Hort's 1881 Greek text translate "monogenes" as "only begotten." Only a few modern versions based on the Westcott & Hort text seek to redefine "monogenes" as "one and only," or "one of a kind." The only reason for this is to get around the huge theological problem introduced into the text by the corrupt reading of "only begotten God" in John 1:18. Even the NIV's "God the One and Only" is a pitiful rendering of "monogenes theos." The NIV's rendering completely eliminates "genos" from the compound word! It reads as though the text actually said "tou monos theos" (the only God) as in John 5:44, 1 Tim. 1:17 & Jude 1:25. And it translates what is clearly as adjective ("only begotten", modifying the noun "Son") as though it was a noun, capitalizing the word "One."

7. The usage of "monogenes" by the Early Church Fathers, as referring to Christ's birth or being generated offspring from the Father, clearly shows that the English words "only begotten" or "only born" convey the proper understanding of the Greek word. Here are a few samples:

*"but we confess that the Father is from none, and that **the Son is begotten of the Father**. Yes, it may be said, but why then does he leave the Father, and speak concerning the Son? Why? because the former was manifest to all, if not as Father, at least as God; but **the Only-Begotten** was not known; and therefore with reason did he immediately from the very beginning hasten to implant the knowledge of Him in those who knew Him not."*{32}

*"For since he is about to teach that this "Word" is the only-begotten Son of God, in order that no one may imagine that His generation is passable, by giving Him the appellation of "The Word," he anticipates and removes beforehand the evil suspicion, showing that the Son is from the Father, and that without His suffering (change), "{33}*

*"For the Birth which He speaks of here is not that according to essence, but according to honor and grace. Now **if the Son is so born** also, in what shall He be superior to men so born? And **how is He Only-begotten?**" {34}*

*"After this he pursues the same thought. No one (he says) could allege, that he had another son, and expected the promise to be fulfilled from him, and therefore confidently offered up this one. "And" (his words are) "he offered up his only-begotten, who had received the promises." Why sayest thou "only-begotten"? What then? Of whom was Ishmael sprung? I mean "only-begotten" (he would say) so far as relates to the word of the promise. Therefore after saying, "Only-begotten," showing that he says it for this reason, he added, "of whom it was said, In Isaac shall thy seed be called," that is, "from" him. Seest thou how he admires what was done by the Patriarch? "In Isaac shall thy seed be called," and that son he brought to be sacrificed." {35}*

*"but the true Son of God, **forasmuch as he is begotten of the Father,** is properly denominated **the only-begotten** and beloved of the Father." {36}*

It is plain from these quotations that the Early Church Fathers who were much more familiar with the Greek language than modern scholars, understood "monogenes" to refer to offspring. Even the Nicene Creed gives this meaning.

- 32. Chrysostom, St. **John**, II, VII
  - 33. Chrysostom, St. **John**, II, VII
  - 34. Chrysostom, St. **John**, XXVI, I
  - 35. Chrysostom, On Hebrews, XXV, III
  - 36. Socrates, Book II, Ch XXI
- (used by permission)

### **Proof Study 6—Mark Oaks**

**Mark Oaks is an ordained Southern Baptist minister and has served as a pastor for several years. Mark is the founder of an online webpage entitled *The Bible Church, Home of Expository Bible Studies* at the website address <http://www.bibleword.org/>. Pastor Oaks deals with the issue of "only begotten" in his "Our Beliefs" section. In my opinion,**

**this shows a great amount of wisdom and some tremendous spiritual insight. The following is a brief introduction of Pastor Oaks by himself from *The Bible Church, Home of Expository Bible Studies* website (<http://www.bibleword.org/mark.shtml>) and then we have some excellent comments from his “Our Beliefs” section.**

My credentials are that I have been called by God to preach and teach His Word. I am a diploma graduate of the Institute of Biblical Studies (a Baptist institution) and I have a Master's Degree in Theology from Andersonville Theological Seminary. I have been accepted and enrolled in a Doctoral Program (Theology). I am currently the pastor at Pleasant Home Baptist Church, a Southern Baptist Church in Milton, Florida.

***The Bible Church, Home of Expository Bible Studies***

“I am the Way the Truth and the Life: no man cometh unto the Father but by Me.” Jesus Christ, John 14:6

**Our Beliefs**

We believe in salvation through faith in Jesus Christ and that His blood was shed and His body broken for all in vicarious atonement for our sins. Vicarious atonement means that He went to the cross and died in our place, as our substitute. There is nothing we can do to "earn" our salvation. Jesus Christ accomplished that work for us on the cross. We do not merit salvation; it is the gift of God through Jesus Christ. As the Apostle said, **"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God:"** (Eph 2:8)

Salvation is through faith and not through works.

We believe that Jesus Christ is the Only Begotten\*\* (therefore NOT created) Son of God, God's Anointed, the Messiah. He was God incarnate (in the flesh) when He trod this earth and He was killed on a Roman cross and was raised on the third day and glorified and is now sitting at the right hand of God making intercession for us.

Jesus Christ is God, the Second Person of the Trinity or the Triune God, Who is God the Father, God the Son (or Word), and God the Holy Spirit. This is not three gods, But God Himself manifested in

three different persons. Jesus Christ is eternal, from everlasting to everlasting, having no beginning and no end.

Jesus Christ was conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of a Virgin, Mary, the espoused of Joseph.

The Bible is the inerrant (or without error) and complete Word of God. It was written over a period of 1500 years and by 36 authors. Each author was inspired of God to write the EXACT words of God, and in the original languages it is accurate to the letter. We believe in the verbal and plenary inspiration of the Word of God and the divine preservation of the Scriptures throughout history. Here are a few verses supporting this statement:

NOTE: Some translations of the Bible use the phrases, "one and only" and "only" instead of "only begotten", when they render the Greek word monogene (μονογενη, John 3:16, Hebrews 11:17, 1 John 4:9), monogenes (μονογενης, John 1:18, 3:18), or monogenous (μονογενους, John 1:14) into English. All three spellings, monogene (μονογενη), monogenes (μονογενης), and monogenous (μονογενους), are variations of the same word, monogenes (μονογενη). Taking the word apart, we get monos and gene (genes, genous). Monos (μονος) means solely, single, only, etc. gene (genes, genous) is from the word genos (γενος), "to become offspring" or "to be born." Literally the word monogen(e,s,ous) means sole born, or only born. Only born or begotten is the only meaning we can arrive at from this word and its etymology. How anyone could render the word monogenes as "one and only" is hard to understand (unless there is a hidden agenda involved).

What is the difference you may ask? It is simply this. Jesus is not the one and only Son of God. God has many sons. Jesus is the only one that is born of the actual seed of God. The other sons are either adopted or created. Angels were created. They are referred to as sons of God (Job 1:6 , Job 2:1 , Job 38:7) . Christians are the sons (children) of God by adoption. (Rom 8:15 , Gal 4:4-5) . While God has many sons, he has only One Who was begotten of Him and is the Son of God by blood. So the modern translations are wrong when they call Jesus the One and Only Son of God. Jesus is the Only Begotten Son of God.<sup>2</sup> (used by permission)

## **Chapter 6: Proof Studies (#'s 7 & 8) Continued— McTernan, Holman and Ruckman**

### **Proof Study 7—John McTernan and John Holman**

**The following are two super-good direct to the point articles by John McTernan from the Branch of David Website. John now operates *Defend and Proclaim the Faith Ministries*. Here is his bio from his website.**

John McTernan, founder of *Defend and Proclaim the Faith Ministries*, has spent thousands of hours with Jews and Muslims debating and corresponding in defense of the Gospel. During numerous appearances on television, radio and in seminars, he has publicly defended Israel in light of Biblical prophecy. His current best selling book is *As America Has Done To Israel*.

Since 1975, he has been involved with the Pro-Life movement and is currently a Pro-Life leader in central Pennsylvania. And, in the early 1980's, he co-founded International Cops for Christ where he serves as an ordained chaplain and evangelist.

John holds a B.S. from Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, Virginia, and an honorary PhD in Biblical Studies from Calvary Christian College. He served 26 years as a Federal Treasury agent before retiring in 1998.

He is author of the acclaimed book *God's Final Warning to America*, and co-author of the bestseller *Israel: The Blessing or the Curse*. From his experience debating, John wrote the *Only Jesus of Nazareth* series. This series includes: *Only Jesus of Nazareth Can Sit on the Throne of David* and *Only Jesus of Nazareth Can Be Israel's King Messiah*. Additionally, he has written several tracts, including *Muhammad or Jesus: The Prophet Like Unto Moses*, and *The Koran vs the Bible*.

John is married and the father of four children and five grandchildren. He resides in central Pennsylvania.

### **DEFENDING THE HOLY BIBLE--The Only Begotten Son of God**

Many beliefs are common to Christianity, regardless of individual denominations. In fact, these beliefs are central elements and tenets of our faith in the Lord Jesus. To have assurance of an eternal life with God, these are the core doctrines or beliefs: the virgin birth of Jesus of Nazareth, His death on the cross for sin, and

His shed blood to pay the penalty for sin. The resurrection of the Lord Jesus and His bodily second coming are also critical beliefs.

These doctrines are essential for eternal life. But there is one doctrine that all the others rest upon. It is the rock bottom, foundation of the Christian faith: Jesus of Nazareth is the only begotten\* Son of God. Without this core belief, all the others are meaningless. Christianity stands upon the person of Jesus of Nazareth as the only begotten Son from eternity past and into the future forever. He is unique because He is the only begotten Son of God.

Any tampering with this doctrine touches the very foundation of our faith. There are five verses from the Holy Bible, Authorized King James Version (KJV) which show clearly that Jesus is the only begotten Son of God. These verses follow:

John 1:14 And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

John 1:18 No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.

John 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

John 3:18 He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

1 John 4:9 In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him.

These verses reveal that the Lord Jesus was begotten of the Father. He was from the bosom of the Father. You must believe on the name of the ONLY BEGOTTEN SON OF GOD for eternal life. He was sent into this world from heaven as the only begotten Son of God. Your eternal life depends on the belief that Jesus is the only begotten Son of God. The importance of this doctrine cannot be overstated.

The Bible reveals God has other sons. For example, believers in Jesus are called the sons of God but through adoption. Adam was called the son of God. God gave the angels the title of the sons of God. Israel became God's son, and Solomon sat on the throne of Israel as the son of God. However, the Lord Jesus remains distinguished from all these sons of God. He is singular and unique as the only begotten Son of God with the Father from eternity. He has a different relationship with the Father. Any tampering with the Lord as the only begotten Son of God would just make Him one of many sons of God in the Bible. A verse to show this follows:

Galatians 4:5 To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. (6) And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.

Today the very foundation of our faith is under direct attack. Most of the modern Bible translations\*\* have altered this doctrine and shaken the very foundation of Christianity, and this attempt to undermine our faith appears to be largely ignored. The modern translations have replaced "only begotten" with words that change the person of the Lord Jesus and thus the foundation of the faith.

The New International Version (NIV) is one of the most popular translations today. It has completely altered the "only begotten Son" to terms that are false or misleading. The NIV is typical of most of the modern translations. The terms now used in place of "only begotten" are "One and Only" and "only Son." The verses from the NIV follow:

John 1:14 The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the One and Only, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth (NIV)

John 1:18 No one has ever seen God, but God the One and Only, who is at the Father's side, has made him known (NIV)

John 3:16 For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life. (NIV)

John 3:18 Whoever believes in him is not condemned, but whoever does not believe stands condemned already because he has not believed in the name of God's one and only Son (NIV)

1 John 4:9 This is how God showed his love among us: He sent his one and only Son into the world that we might live through him. (NIV)

What does "One and Only" mean? One and only what? The Lord Jesus is not God's only Son. This is false as God has many sons. He is God's only begotten Son and is thus unique. You can see how the modern translations have tampered with the very foundation of Christianity. Using the NIV alone, you cannot even prove that the Lord Jesus is the only begotten Son of God! Therefore, the NIV fails to prove the very foundation of the faith.

In John 1:14,18 the words "begotten and Son" are left out, while John 3:16,18 and 1 John 4:9 are false as they remove "only begotten" and say "God's only Son." These translations are illegitimate. The modern versions have to be rejected as they are deficient and lack the ability to even prove the very foundation of the faith. These translations lead believers away from the person of the Lord Jesus.

The NIV makes a second outrageous error. The KJV accurately reports that Lucifer fell from heaven. The NIV removed the name Lucifer and replaced it with "morning star." Morning star is one of the titles for the Lord Jesus. He is the bright and morning star! The new translations remove Lucifer and replace him with a title for the only begotten Son of God. Lucifer is out of the Bible while the Morning star fell from heaven. It doesn't get any worse than this!

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

Isaiah 14:12 How you have fallen from heaven, O morning star, son of the dawn! (NIV)

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

There are numerous other errors in these translations, but these two errors alone are enough to reject them. It is time the true believers come back to God's word in English, the KJV. We must stop using these dangerous translations. Pastors should reject them and not teach from them. Seminaries and colleges need to be challenged as to why they promote these false translations. Spiritual power hemorrhages from believers as they read these translations. They can lack both inner spiritual power as well as the proper Scriptures needed to defend the faith.

The Bible warns that even in the apostle's day there were people who would corrupt the word of God. The corruption continues to our day. We have to guard against those who may alter God's word and stand against this. We cannot sit by and let the foundation of the faith be washed away. We need to stand against this subtle attack on God's word. **"For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God..." 2Cor 2:17.**

I debated many Muslim apologists and had numerous encounters with those who intended to tear down the Christian faith. On several occasions, the NIV was used against me to attack the fact that the Lord Jesus is the only begotten Son of God! The unbelievers use "Christian Bibles" to attack the very foundation of the Christian faith! They cannot assault Jesus being the only begotten Son of God with the KJV, but they can with the modern translations.

Could you use your Bible to prove the foundation of the faith? Could you stand before a Muslim missionary with your Bible? If not, throw it away and use the real word of God. These false translations cannot stand up against the unbelieving apologists who know what is in them. I know for I have defended the faith against these apologists.

The translators of the KJV did not invent the term "only begotten Son of God" to describe the Lord Jesus. John Wycliffe in 1382 was the first to translate the Bible into English. He translated all these five verses as "only begotten." All the Bibles until modern times translated the verses as "only begotten" as well.

The KJV was the Authorized translation until recently. The removal of "only begotten" is recent. There is no history for this switch. The term "only begotten" has been used in the English

Bibles for over 600 years. The following is John 3:16 as it actually appeared in the first English Bible:

For God louede so the world, that he yaf his `oon bigetun sone, that ech man that bileueth in him perische not, but haue euerlastyng e lijf. (Wycliffe 1382)

If you are using one of these "modern" translations, now is the time to discard it. Ask God to cleanse your mind of the false doctrines that have spiritually weakened you. God has to cleanse your mind of many other false teachings in these translations.

In addition to these problems the modern translations pose, it is virtually impossible to memorize the NIV and the other modern translations. Immediately begin to read and study the Holy Bible (KJV), and you will see how easy it can be to memorize God's word. "Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee." Psalm 119:11.

If you have never trusted God's only begotten Son for eternal salvation, now is the time. God requires that you repent of sin and confess the Lord Jesus as your Savior. This confession means you believe that He died on the cross and shed His blood for your sin. He bodily rose from the dead and will bodily return in great glory. You have to believe He is the only begotten Son of God to have eternal life with God.

John 3:17 For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. (18) He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

\* Begotten means to father

\*\* Modern translations which alter the "only begotten Son" include: NIV, Living Bible, Revised Standard, The Message, New Living, Contemporary English Version, Worldwide English. The New King James and New American Standard do not alter "only begotten Son" but are not recommended for other reasons.<sup>1</sup> (Used by Permission)

By John McTernan, PO Box 444, Liverpool, PA 17045  
(717) 329-0470 Email: [McT911@aol.com](mailto:McT911@aol.com),  
Website: <http://www.defendproclaimthefaitth.org/>

**The following article adds some excellent thoughts to the premise of this book by a different author but from the above website. These comments act as a continuation of the above article. The author is John Holman. John Holman, is a member of International Cops for Christ and a graduate of Williamsport Area Community College. John has spent decades researching cults, false religions and the corruption of the HOLY BIBLE. John uses his knowledge to witness to thousands utilizing modern media and street preaching. John has been imprisoned for being a missionary to the unborn in central Pennsylvania. John is married and lives in central Pennsylvania.**

John stated in his e-mail to me, “The corruption of the HOLY Bible is at the core of the weakness of the church. I have spoken to multitudes of Pastors concerning this problem.” In conversation with me John told me that he had challenged these pastors to refute the following article. John has had no takers.

### **HISTORICAL FACTS CONCERNING THE HOLY BIBLE**

The following is a brief look at the history of the Holy Scriptures. I suggest that the reader do their own research to confirm the following facts according to 2nd Tim 2:15. Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

2nd Cor 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.

1. There are two different text types from which all Old Testament translations have been done. The first one being the Masoretic Hebrew text also known as the traditional Hebrew text that was used for the translation of the Holy Bible commonly known since 1929 as the King James Authorized Version. The modern translations (approximately 140 different versions) being translated from different combinations of the Biblia Hebraica; Dead Sea Scrolls; Samaritan Pentateuch; ancient scribal traditions, variant Hebrew reading in the margin of the Masoretic Hebrew text; Septuagint (Greek OT); Vulgate; Syriac Peshitta; Targums; Juxta Hebraica.

2. There are two different text types from which all New Testament translations have been done. The first is the Textus Receptus (TR),

also know as the Majority Greek text or known as the Traditional Greek text that was used to translate the Holy Bible (commonly known as the King James Authorized Version). The modern translations (approximately 140 different versions) being translated from the Hort and Westcott (H&W) Greek text type also know as the Nestle/Aland Greek text

3. The Masoretic Hebrew text used to translate the Holy Bible (KJV) is the text that was kept and guarded by the Jews and used by the Church since its beginning. The scripture validates the traditional Hebrew text in Romans 3:1 What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? and Romans 3:2 Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles (word of God) of God.

4. The new version translators consult texts that are not Hebrew such as the Septuagint, Vulgate, etc.

5. The Greek Text (TR) used to translate the Holy Bible (KJV) is in agreement with more than 99% of over 5,000 existing Greek manuscripts and is the text type used by the Church since its beginning.

6. The Greek Text (H&W) used to translated modern versions agrees with less than 1% of existing Greek manuscripts and was created in the 1870's using essentially two corrupted Greek manuscripts.

7. The Holy Bible (KJV) translators translated the Hebrew and Greek using Elizabethan English for the purpose of exact translation. Using Elizabethan English enabled the translators to use exact words by translating verbs as verbs, nouns as nouns, etc. Modern translations use dynamic equivalents that are not accurate.

8. The modern translations have omitted and changed many words and verses in the Holy Bible. The modern Bible versions contain heresy and blasphemy. Examples: 1st John 5:7 is missing in the NIV. 1st John 5:7; For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. 1st John 5:7 is essential when witnessing to most cultists. Rev 13:1 is a gross error committed in the NIV which has substituted the dragon standing upon the sand of the sea for the Apostle John. Is 14:12;

How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!  
how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the  
nations! The modern versions mistranslate this verse  
substituting "morning star" for "Lucifer" even though the Hebrew  
word for star is not in the text. Jesus Christ is the "morning star".  
Rev 22:16; I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these  
things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and  
the bright and morning star. The modern versions commit  
blasphemy by substituting the Lord Jesus for Lucifer.

According to the NIV translators in 2nd Sam 21:19 David did not  
kill Goliath, Elhanan did. Even those that are not students of the  
Bible know that this is an error.

9. The Holy Bible reads in John 7:8 Go ye up unto this feast: I go  
not up yet unto this feast: for my time is not yet full come.

The NIV reads in John 7:8 You go to the Feast. I am not yet[1]  
going up to this Feast, because for me the right time has not yet  
come."

Footnote 7:8—Some early manuscripts do not have yet.

As we know Jesus did go up to the feast. Why would anyone  
suggest that He did not go, thereby making him out to be a liar.

10. Read the following verses to see how serious God takes His  
word and how it is handled.

Luke 4:4 And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man  
shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.

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

Psalms 138: 2 I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy  
name for thy lovingkindness and for thy truth: for thou hast  
magnified thy word above all thy name.

Proverbs 30: 5 Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them  
that put their trust in him. 6 Add thou not unto his words, lest he  
reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.

Revelation 22:18 For I testify unto every man that heareth the words  
of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things,

God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: 19 And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.<sup>2</sup> (used by permission)

By John Holman

### **Proof Study 8—The Elijah of our day, Dr. Peter S. Ruckman**

**Dr. Peter S. Ruckman, a preacher that will remind you of Elijah, gives us some excellent comments on John 3:16 from his straight shooting book *Bible Babel*. Dr. Ruckman has written a host of books that support the KJV and is an excellent preacher. He illustrates his sermons with massive chalk illustrations. Dr. Ruckman brings to the battle the right attitude we need in this fight for the soul of the Christian Church. You may remember the old expression, “Never bring a knife to a gunfight.” When Dr. Ruckman unloads he resembles a cannon going off and he skillfully shoots holes in the paper-thin arguments of these new translators and their versions. The following is from his website (<http://www.kjv1611.org/PSR.htm>).**

**Dr. Peter S. Ruckman** received his Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Alabama and finished his formal education with six years of training at Bob Jones University (four full years and two accelerated summer sessions), completing requirements for the Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy degree.

Reading at a rate of seven hundred words per minute, Dr. Ruckman had managed to read about 6,500 books before receiving his doctorate, and he still reads an average of a book each day. Dr. Ruckman stands for the absolute authority of the Authorized Version and offers no apology to any recognized scholar anywhere for his stand. In addition to preaching the gospel and teaching the Bible, Dr. Ruckman has produced a comprehensive collection of apologetic and polemic literature and resources supporting the authority of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures.

**Now the comments on John 3:16 by Dr. Peter S. Ruckman from his book *Bible Babel*.**

Where the new versions insist in certain places that Jesus Christ

was only “a” son of God, the AV bursts in and says, “**THE**” Son. If the scholars, with their vicious, immoral, bigoted, biased attack on the Greek, translated “only” son (John 3:16), the *King James Bible* comes to their aid, and in the interest of objective, accurate, translating renders, “**only BEGOTTEN.**” The word in the Greek monogenh (pronounced, “mono-ge-nay”), and it would not take a college freshman to tell that this is a compound word, and could not possibly be translated correctly by the word “only.” *Thayer’s Lexicon*, which propagates this unworthy and unscholarly reading, would never have subscribed to the error if Thayer had not leaned on the authority of the secular, pagan Greek grammarians for his comment. The scholars have a nasty habit of quibbling about “accuracy,” and then, when faced with the problem of “accurately” translating a word that states that God BEGAT Jesus Christ, all “accuracy” suddenly disintegrates.

How unlike this hypocrisy is the straight forwardness of the AV. In every passage dealing with the deity of Jesus Christ and the preeminence of Jesus Christ, the AV gives a ringing testimony. Here is a partial list from the Old Testament: Genesis 3:15; Genesis 49:10; Zechariah 9:9; Job 19:25-26; Psalm 22:16-17; Isaiah 7:14; Isaiah 53:3-12; Isaiah 9:6; Jeremiah 31:22; Daniel 9:25-27; Micah 5:2, Zechariah 12:10.<sup>3</sup>

(used by permission)

## **Chapter 7: Proof Studies (#'s 9 & 10) Riplinger and this writer**

### **Proof Study 9—G.A. Riplinger, author of “New Age Versions”**

**These new version translators argue that the new versions are from older and better manuscripts that were not available to the KJV translators. They say these new version translations come from the “oldest and best manuscripts.” This book briefly deals with the origins of ancient manuscripts and their reliability starting in Chapter 9. However, G.A. Riplinger in her book *In Awe of thy Word* destroys the argument of the “oldest and best manuscripts” and drives home our premise that “only begotten” is the historically correct and the long-time traditional interpretation.**

The argument of the enemies of “only begotten” is that Jerome rendered the Greek “monogenes” as “unigenitus” (the equivalent of “only-begotten”) in the Old Latin and it was carried over to the King James. The enemies of “only begotten” call this rendering “unfortunate.” Jerome (347--420), a canonized Saint and Doctor of the Roman Catholic Church is best known as the translator of the Bible from Hebrew and Greek into Latin. Jerome's edition of the Bible, the *Vulgate*, is still an important text of the Roman Catholic Church. Jerome's *Vulgate* contained numerous textual corruptions. He translated from the corrupt Alexandrian text type. Jerome adhered to the false teaching of asceticism and believed the state of celibacy to be spiritually superior to that of marriage. He also taught that Mary was a perpetual virgin. His life is well documented. Again, Jerome has some questionable aspects in plenty of his renderings and this leaves him open for criticism. The misleading indication is that Jerome led the way in the way in the “only begotten” interpretation. Ah! But here, he is right. And we shall soon see that a whole bunch of other languages, agreeing with the Greek, rendered the equivalent of “only begotten.”

G.A. Riplinger has been accused of faulty documentation. I have read Riplinger's works and the works of her critics. G.A. Riplinger puts her critics to shame with her scholarship, documentation and fine wit. The problem is that the critics of G. A. Riplinger have, in many cases, no documentation. We will take some quotes from chapter 28, page 1048, of *In Awe of thy Word*. And yes, *In Awe of thy Word* would be an excellent study tool that you should put in your arsenal to fight for the word of God.

### **Where was the Bible before the English King James Bible of 1611?**

How do we know which type of Bible God gave to “all

nations under heaven” (Acts 2)? Why do a few of the KJV readings differ from those in some *currently* printed editions of the Greek *Textus Receptus*? These questions can be answered by looking at the Bibles that the KJV translators had access to, those that were *used* around the world before the King James Bible.

God has graciously given this author one of the scarce remaining original editions of the twelve language polyglot Bible printed at Nuremberg, Germany in A.D. 1599. It contains the Gospels in Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, English, German, Danish, Bohemian, and Polish. Its previous owner was A. Gifford D.D., co-founder of the British Museum. Its price tag was well worth the secrets it revealed. It demonstrates the perfect agreement of the English King James Bible with all pure Bibles from other languages. It is perhaps the most important polyglot Bible in print because it was printed twelve years *before* the KJV and five years before the KJV’s translation work began.”<sup>1</sup>

**Editor’s Note: Now G.A. Riplinger embarrasses those who would make any type of argument against “only begotten” as the right and long standing interpretation of “monogenes.” Look at *In Awe of thy Word* in the next section where it deals with the interpretation of “monogenes” in John 1:14 and 18. Note, these same arguments are valid and will forever be valid for John 3:16.**

The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, in Matthew 1, begins by saying, “Abraham begat Isaac.” It is followed by thirty-eight other ‘begats’ denoting ancestry. In John 1:14 and 18, Jesus is described as the “only begotten of the Father” and the “only begotten Son.” All pure Bibles in the world have “the only begotten,” exactly as the KJV does. They contain either the word ‘only’ or the word ‘one’ (i.e. ‘*uni*,’ ‘*ein*’ etc.) *joined* to the word ‘begotten’ (‘*genito*,’ ‘*borne*’ etc.), just as the Greek text does.

The TNIV, NIV and Catholic versions deny that Jesus Christ is God’s begotten Son. The TNIV and NIV double the ‘only’ portion by saying, “One and Only.” No Greek manuscript or foreign edition in history doubles this. This is pure invention by the NIV and TNIV committees. Is this done so that their readers will not notice the omission of the second word “begotten”? These versions create a contradiction by calling Jesus “the one and only” Son; *Christians* are called the sons of God (John 1:12, 1 John 3:1, 2). The term

“begotten” cannot mean ‘one and only’ because Isaac was called Abraham’s “only begotten son” (Heb. 11:17, 18), yet he had another son, Ishmael. Isaac was called “only begotten son” because only his ‘genealogy’ or genes were lawfully recognized and pure; Ishmael was illegitimate.

New versions deny the virgin birth by omitting “begotten Son” in John 1:18. Some substitute ‘God’ for “Son,” teaching the Arian heresy of a created ‘God’; the twins, the TNIV and Catholic version, cunningly omit “begotten,” denying the virgin birth.<sup>2</sup>

**Editor’s Note: Watch for the notes on these new versions in the tables from G.A. Riplinger.**

<b>1599 Nuremberg Polyglot Bible</b>	<b>Where was the Bible before the KJV of 1611? John 1:14</b>
<b>Greek 1599</b>	<b>Same as KJV and others (monogenes; mono means ‘only’; genes means ‘begotten’)</b>
<b>KJV</b>	<b>only begotten</b>
<b>English 1599</b>	<b>onely begotten</b>
<b>Danish 1599</b>	<b>fom en Enborne</b>
<b>Bohemice 1599</b>	<b>gednorozeneho</b>
<b>Spanish 1599</b>	<b>Vuigenito</b>
<b>German 1599</b>	<b>eingebornen</b>
<b>Italian 1599</b>	<b>vnigenito</b>
<b>Latin 1599</b>	<b>unigeniti</b>
<b>NIV</b>	<b>One and Only _____</b>
<b>TNIV</b>	<b>one and only _____</b>
<b>Catholic Version</b>	<b>only _____</b>
<b>See errors in the HCSB, ESV, NLT, NRSV, RSV, NCV, etc. Footnote<sup>3</sup></b>	

<b>1599 Nuremberg Polyglot Bible</b>	<b>Where was the Bible before the KJV of 1611? John 1:18</b>
<b>Greek 1599</b>	<b>Same as KJV and others (monogenes; mono means 'only'; genes means 'begotten')</b>
<b>KJV</b>	<b>only begotten Son</b>
<b>English 1599</b>	<b>onely begotten Sonne</b>
<b>Danish 1599</b>	<b>den Enborne Son</b>
<b>Bohemice 1599</b>	<b>Gednorozeny Syn</b>
<b>Spanish 1599</b>	<b>Vnigenito hijo</b>
<b>German 1599</b>	<b>eingeborne Son</b>
<b>Italian 1599</b>	<b>Figliuolo unigenito</b>
<b>Latin 1599</b>	<b>unigenitus filius</b>
<b>NIV</b>	<b>God the One and Only</b> (omits 'begotten' and 'Son,' denying the virgin birth)
<b>NASB</b>	<b>only begotten God</b> (replaces 'Son' with 'God,' promoting the Arian heresy of a created 'God')
<b>Jehovah Witness Version</b>	<b>the only-begotten god</b> (In keeping with their false doctrine, they omit 'Son,' thereby denying the virgin birth, the deity of Christ, and the Trinity.)
<b>TNIV</b>	<b>one and only [Son]</b> (omits 'begotten' denying the virgin birth)
<b>Catholic Version</b>	<b>the only _____ Son,</b> (omits 'begotten,' denying the virgin birth)
<b>See errors in the HCSB, ESV, NLT, NRSV, RSV, NCV, etc. Footnote<sup>3</sup></b>	

**Editor’s Note:** We will continue with a couple of additional charts from pages 715 and 716 of *In Awe of thy Word*. Again “only begotten” is the right and long standing interpretation of “monogenes” and here Gail Riplinger is tracing the line of English/Anglo Saxon Bibles that clearly document this tenet.

By abandoning the word “begotten” perverse versions, like the NIV, desert the virgin birth; the TNIV keeps their adopted, not begotten [Son] in custody, bracketed in a little cell block [ ].

<b>“And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us...the only begotten of the Father...” John 1:14</b>	
<b>Anglo-Saxon pre-A.D. 700</b>	<b>an-cennedes one begotten*</b>
<b>Wycliffe 1389</b>	<b>oon bigetun</b>
<b>Tyndale 1526-1534</b>	<b>only begotten</b>
<b>Geneva 1560-1599</b>	<b>onely begotten</b>
<b>Bishops’ 1568</b>	<b>only begotten</b>
<b>KJV</b>	<b>only begotten</b>
<b>NIV</b>	<b>the One and Only _____</b>
<b>TNIV</b>	<b>one and only [Son] _____</b>
<b>See errors in the HCSB, ESV, NLT, NRSV, RSV,NCV, etc.</b>	

\*See Campbell, pp. 282, 22.  
Footnote<sup>4</sup>

**Editor’s Note:** Continue to watch for the notes on these new versions in the following table.

<b>“No man hath seen God at anytime; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him” John 1:18</b>	
<b>Anglo-saxon pre-A.D. 700</b>	<b>an cenneda suna only begotten Son</b>
<b>Wycliffe 1389</b>	<b>oon bigetun sun</b>
<b>Tyndale 1526-1534</b>	<b>only begotten sonne</b>
<b>Geneva 1560-1599</b>	<b>onely begotten Sonne</b>
<b>Bishops’ 1568</b>	<b>onely begotten sonne</b>
<b>KJV</b>	<b>only begotten Son</b>
<b>NIV</b>	<b>God, the One and Only _____ (Omits ‘Son’ and ‘begotten’)</b>
<b>NASB</b>	<b>only begotten God (Omits ‘Son’; teaches Arianism)</b>
<b>Jehovah Witness Version</b>	<b>only begotten god (Omits Son; teaches Arianism)</b>
<b>NKJV note</b>	<b>God (teaches Arianism’s ‘created God’)</b>
<b>Catholic Version</b>	<b>only Son _____ (Omits ‘begotten’ denying the virgin birth)</b>
<b>TNIV</b>	<b>the one and only [Son] _____ (Omits ‘begotten’ denying the virgin birth)</b>
<b>See errors in HCSB, ESV, NLT, NRSV, RSV, NCV, etc.</b>	

Footnote<sup>5</sup>  
(used by permission)

---

**Proof Study 10—Thayer's Lexicon and "monogenes" by the writer**

A host of new revisionists (copy cats of these new versions and not real translators) have come out trying to justify the perversions of John 3:16. What is unbelievable is that many of these have written articles and position papers to justify these new versions. These are fly by nights (like myself), and again, are not real translators. These go much beyond the actual translators in an effort to sell their perverted point of view. In order to close this chapter properly, we must look at the point of view of these who pervert and subvert John 3:16. First we will go to Thayer's Lexicon. Thayer says "monogenes" means:

- 1) single of its kind, only
  - 1a) used of only sons or daughters (viewed in relation to their parents)
  - 1b) used of Christ, denotes the only begotten son of God<sup>6</sup>

Now these pseudo translators will use #1 above and state that the rendering of "one and only" is accurate because Thayer says, "single of its kind." They fail to mention that 1a or 1b is a necessary element to define #1. Now when you define #1 in light of 1a and 1b, you are right back in perfect alignment with the KJV. At this point, you need to know that my preference is *Strong's Concordance* when dealing with the definition of "monogenes." However, Thayer, as you see, agrees with our premise.

**The defining doctrine of the Bible is the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.** In order to be honest then, these pseudo-translators, if they are to write a complete treatise, would need to cover in detail what Thayer said about the definition of the word "monogenes." They do not. Most look to an abbreviated computer addition of Thayer's definition and do not do their homework. However, online at the **Blue Letter Bible** website, Thayer gives his total definition and attests to "monogenes" as a clear-cut and direct reference to the incarnation. Here is the quote, "He [Christ] is so spoken by John...because by the incarnation... in him he is of nature or essentially Son of God."<sup>7</sup> Some of the Greek words are left out. However, this is the exact meaning and in context of the definition that Mr. Thayer is conveying in that passage.

## Chapter 8: Proof Studies (#'s 11 & 12) Continued— by the writer and G.A. Riplinger

### Proof Study 11—The NIV fallacy in dealing with “monogenes” by the writer

Again, numerous books and articles have been published in an effort to get the general Christian public to accept the perverted NIV version. However, after all the jabber, the NIV translators give themselves away. Here is an exact quote from *The Making of the NIV*, “Literally *monogenes* means ‘sole descent.’”<sup>1</sup> The NIV translators admit here that they do not translate the word “monogenes” literally, which violates the principles of interpretation of the Bible. In order for me to be honest here, the NIV translators never claim to translate literally, but use their “dynamic equivalence” which allows for their own interpretations in any way they see fit. Let’s be clear. The NIV translators mistranslate “monogenes” and they know it and admit it. Eight pages in *The Making of the NIV* are dedicated (with a pack of slight of hands and miss-directions) in order to justify their position and to hide their wicked and deplorable perversion. See Chapters 9 to 13: “Bible Principles Of Interpretation And Translation” and Chapter 23: “Methods Of Translation—Legitimate And Illegitimate” of this book for a more detailed but brief explanation of the methods of translation. Read on. The next paragraph is absolutely critical.

The NIV claims a “heightened christological perspective”<sup>2</sup> in context with the book of John. They do not like the translation for “monogenes” as “only begotten” (quoting directly from *The Making of the NIV*) “particularly because it leaves open the possibility of an etymological emphasis on *genes* (the idea of generation)...”<sup>3</sup> Bless the Lord! Oh my soul! John wants to impart the idea of generation—not “the false doctrine of eternal generation which we cover later”—but the idea that Christ was “begotten” or generated through the virgin birth and thus became God incarnate. Let me repeat. **The defining doctrine of the Bible is the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.** This will be thoroughly documented in the upcoming chapters. You should know that the first despised and most hated doctrine of the Bible is the incarnation. If the doctrine of incarnation could be found to be false, all other doctrines related to redemption and the blood atonement would fall.

### Proof Study 12—The scathing response of G.A. Riplinger to James White

**The adversaries of the rendering of “only begotten” argue on the basis of the usage of “monogenes” in Greek literature of a secular nature.**

**This argument is bogus as we shall see. James White supports these new versions in his book *The King James Only Controversy*. Mr. White is articulate and makes his points with skill and finesse. However, he continually majors on the minor and misses the main point. Mr. White weighed in on his view of "monogenes" and refuted G.A. Riplinger and her views as stated in *New Age Bible Versions*. G.A. Riplinger published her response to Mr. White in the following and Riplinger certainly wins the case.**

White lies again saying I claim "Palmer denies the role of the Holy Ghost in the Incarnation..." Nowhere in *New Age Bible Versions* do I make *any* comments at all about Palmer's notions about the incarnation. In fact, Palmer's quotes, seen in the book, do not mention or discuss the incarnation.

*New Age Bible Versions* is a study in semantics (the meaning of words). It devoted several pages to an analysis of the word 'begotten' and 'beget'. In trying to assess *why* the NIV would *not* fully translate the word *monogenes* (only begotten), the views and writings of several NIV translators were reviewed. The writings of Edwin Palmer reveal that he believes the term "begotten" refers to the Father begetting the Son in *eternity past*, as shown on p. 339. White's mad rush through the book missed this quote, evidently. Here, Palmer even notes that it is strange that the Bible doesn't *also* note that "the Holy Spirit was begotten by the Father." Palmer definitely has unique views about the word begotten. The definitive treatise on *monogenes*, by Buchsel, disagrees with Palmer and agrees with me, saying John 1:14 and 1:18 do *not* discuss any "eternal begetting".

The issue at hand is not *who* is correct, but what do NIV translators believe about the Greek term *monogenes* and the English word 'begotten'. (Paralleling Joseph Smith's quote next to Palmer's simply proves that *both* have views relating to the word 'beget' which *exclude* the Holy Ghost and thereby disconnect the *term* from the incarnation, as has historically been understood. See *Adam Clarke's Commentary, The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, et al.) The law of first mention *and* the context of John 1:14,18 would lead *anyone* to note that the first use of 'beget' (Gen. 4:18) and 'begotten' (Gen. 5:4 and John 1:14) indicate it refers to *flesh*.)

White's own ignorance of such theological discussions leads him to make quantum leaps of logic and READ INTO the book notions and words that ARE NOT THERE. White erects straw men, then cites quotes by Palmer on the incarnation to dismantle *his own* contrived misreading of my book. Interestingly, however, it should

be noted that in Palmer's quotes *about* the incarnation, he NEVER uses the term 'begotten' because he does *not* connect this word with the incarnation like most Christians do. That's WHY the NIV omits 'beget' from the Bible! The **BOLD MISREPRESENTATION** is White's; *New Age Bible Versions* does not assert that "Palmer denies the role of the Holy Ghost in the Incarnation." See you in "court" (Esther 6:4--7:10).

### THE PALMERWORM DEVoured THEM (AMOS 4:9)

"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 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 Hymms **or** they are *sympathetic* to such ideas. (The "begotten God" seen in John

1:18 in the NASB comes directly from lexical support from the occult tome *The Trimorphic Proitenoia!*)

Anyone who has spent years studying the *resources* used to *generate* the definitions seen in Greek lexicons will get a chuckle out of White's comment: "I explained that she was in error regarding the meaning of *monogenes*, and explained the actual meaning of the term." Even Longenecker *admits* the translation of *monogenes* [only begotten] and *huios* [Son] "have become bones of contention among Christians."

*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*. 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'.)

White may not understand my response in *Which Bible Is God's Word*, but Buchsel does, and agrees with *me*. He says, "Though many will not accept this; he here understands the concept of sonship in terms of begetting."<sup>4</sup> (used by permission)

**Editor's Note: Buchsel's entire article entitled "Büchsel on μονογενής" can be found online at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/monogenes.html>. The address is a link to the *Bible Research* webpage.**

### Proof Studies—Concluding Thoughts and More Greek

Please permit this writer to revisit James White and Gail Riplinger and part of their public audio sparring as published by *Alpha and Omega Ministries* on YouTube and listed as "Gail Riplinger verses James White, 1993, KRDS Radio Part III." Here are two short recorded segments.

**Riplinger:** I don't point out what some of these people say or what some of these people believe unless there's evidence of it in the new versions. And we have to look back and say why did you take out the only begotten son when the Greek there "monogenes" and you've had Greek background, you know genes means begotten...

**White:** No ma'am you're in error about that. The term "mongenes," "monos" meaning only. The error you are making is that "genes" comes from "gennao" which means to beget. It doesn't. It comes from "genos" which means "kind" which is why it means "unique or one of a kind." That is the consistent usage or the phrase "monogenes" throughout the New Testament.<sup>5</sup>

Well, this writer decided to check the consistent usage of the word "genos." Technically, this writer understands, Mr. White quotes the consistent usage of "monogenes" not "genos." However, it is interesting to know the meaning of "genos" in the New Testament and its translation of "kind" to get the grasp of the issue. In the KJV, "Genos" is translated into English in the following manner.<sup>6</sup>

offspring - 3  
 kindred - 3  
 stock - 2  
 born - 2  
 generation - 2  
 nation - 2  
 country - 1  
 countrymen - 1  
 kind - 4

And this writer wanted to know how the NIV translated the Greek work "Genos."

offspring - 3  
 people - 3  
 born - 1  
 children - 1  
 family - 2  
 native - 2  
 sorts - 1  
 countrymen - 1  
 kinds - 3  
 kind - 1  
 (un-translated) - 2

Riplinger is right and White fails in his manipulation. There are 3 things apparent here.

1. "Genos" is always translated "offspring, kindred, stock, generation, nation, country, countrymen, and born" in the KJV when referring to a

specific person or people. Note: “Genos” always refers to family, parent-child, birth/nativity or nationality relationships when referring to people. “Genos” is translated “kind” or “sorts” exclusively when used of fish, demons and tongues in the KJV and NIV. From White’s argument and his consistent usage tenet, only begotten could be translated “only offspring.” And yes, Christ is the “root and offspring of David.”

2. Adding the “mono” adjective to “genes” does not change the family relationship to “kind.”
3. These new version translators scold the KJV translators for translating the same Greek word into many English words. However, the KJV translates “genos” into 9 English words and NIV translates “genos” into 10 English words and then leaves “genos” un-translated on two different occasions. Remember, that Strong, Thayer and others list “**ginomai**” as the root word for “begotten” and not “**genos.**” The point here is, that in any case, “monogenes” should legitimately be translated as “only begotten” or its equivalent and the “kind” translation is not legitimate.

**Concluding Thoughts and More Greek**—At this point, this writer felt the need to look into the Greek with my super limited knowledge to double check the “consistent usage” of “monogenes.” Here is a summary of the dictionary and lexicon findings that point to “only begotten” as the correct interpretation of “monogenes.” Yes, some of this is tedious. However, this writer wanted to close every opening for argument and leave no doubt about the proper interpretation of John 3:16.

1. Strong’s Concordance interprets “monogenes” as “only begotten.” See Chapter 2.
2. Thayer’s Lexicon interprets “monogenes” as “only begotten.” See Chapter 7, Proof Study 10.
3. The on-line ***Greek - English Dictionary*** at [kypros.org](http://kypros.org) interprets “monogenis” (Greek = μονογενής and the Greek form of “monogenes” used in John 1:18) as only-begotten.<sup>7</sup>
4. Note again, the ***Charlton T. Lewis, Charles Short, A Latin Dictionary*** printed in 1879 interprets “monogenes” as “*onlybegotten, only,...*”<sup>8</sup>
5. ***Edwards, An English-Greek Lexicon*** by G. M. Edwards (second edition, 1914; reprinted 1930). Scanned by the Tim Spalding for AncientLibrary.com.) lists “only-begotten” as “μονογενής” which is transliterated as “monogenis” a form of “monogenes.”<sup>9</sup>

6. **The University of Chicago Library English-Greek Dictionary A Vocabulary of the Attic Language** by S. C. WOODHOUSE, M.A. Late Scholar of Christ Church, Oxford, London (1910) lists “only-begotten” as “μονογενής” (“monogenis”) exactly as above.<sup>10</sup>
7. **Perseus (on-line) Digital Library** covers the history, literature and culture of the Greco-Roman world. It is a mega resource for Greek, Latin and other literature and includes some of the above dictionaries. This resource is valid for secular and religious study. We should not have to use this resource because the Bible is a complete book which defines itself by comparing passage to passage. However, these new version scholars are constantly referring to secular usage to derive a biblical definition and usage. Oh! But note how God has used the secular to prove the preservation of His Word.<sup>11</sup>

**Liddell-Scott-Jones [LSJ] A Greek-English Lexicon** is a standard lexicographical work of the Ancient Greek language and is included in the **Perseus Digital Library**. The lexicon was begun in the nineteenth century and is now in its ninth (revised) edition. The first edition was complete in 1843. The second through sixth editions appeared in 1845, 1849, 1855, 1861, and 1869. **Liddell & Scott, Liddell-Scott-Jones, or LSJ**, is published in three sizes--condensed, intermediate and a full lexicon. It is considered by many as the world's most comprehensive and authoritative dictionary of ancient Greek and indispensable for biblical and classical studies alike. We will refer to various editions for some excellent information.<sup>12</sup>

**Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon (1889)** was consulted to define “monogenes” and found:<sup>13</sup>

**monogenês** [gignomai] *only-begotten, single, Hes., Hdt., etc.; m. haima one and the same blood, Eur.*

Here is the **1940 edition** of the full **Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon** and the full definition is given.<sup>14</sup>

**mono-genês**, es, Ep. and Ion. **mouno-**, ([genos] )

**A.** *the only member of a kin or kind: hence, generally, only, single, pais Hes.Op.376, Hdt.7.221, cf. Ev.Jo.1.14, Ant.Lib.32.1; of Hecate, Hes. Th.426.*

**2.** *unique, of to on, Parm. 8.4; heis hode m. ouranos gegonôs Pl.Ti.31b, cf. Procl.Inst.22; theos ho m. Sammelb.4324.15.*

**3.** *m. haima one and the same blood, dub. l. in E. Hel.1685.*

**4.** *Gramm., having one form for all genders, A.D.Adv. 145.18.*

**5.** *name of the foot \_\_\_ ^, Heph.3.3.*

- II. Adv. -nôs, pheretai m. en heni topôi grows *only* in one place, *Peripl.M.Rubr.* 56, cf. 11.  
 2. *in a unique manner*, Aët. 15.13,14.

This text is based on the following book(s):

Henry George Liddell. Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of. Roderick McKenzie. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1940. ISBN: 0198642261

**Editor's Notes:** What we find here is that a different emphasis is given to the word "monogenes" between 1889 and 1940. The idea of "begetting" or "generation" has to be inferred into the later definition. The reason is obvious. The Greek is being rewritten. When this writer ran the given "monogenes" references from *Perseus (on-line) Digital Library* that were included in the their "Corpus" (their term meaning "the writings of a particular kind on a particular subject." Twenty-four references were given. Nine of the twenty-four listed references were from the Bible where the translation of "monogenes" was changed from "only begotten" to "one and only." The modern references listed the *New Testament (eds. Brooke Foss Westcott, Fenton John Anthony Hort)* and *Other versions: ed. Rainbow Missions, Inc., in English*. We will find in later chapters that Westcott and Hort pair up to become the modern fathers of these new perversions.

Lexicons before 1900 translate "monogenes" as "only begotten." "Monogenes" is always speaking of a father-child relationship in the New Testament. In some instances in the KJV, "monogenes" is translated "only" instead of "only begotten". The "begetting" is clearly implied. My "only son" clearly implies my "only begotten son." A more complete explanation is given in later chapters.

Note above, one definition of "monogenes" is "one and the same blood." Read on and we will find in the upcoming chapters that the removal of "begotten" from these new versions actually denies the Biblical doctrine of the blood.

8. There is a whole "family" of Greek "gen" and "gin" words used in the Bible that relate to family, parent-child, birth/nativity or nationality relationship. The following comes from Strong's Concordance.<sup>15</sup>

- ◆ **1096 ginomai** a prolongation and middle voice form of a primary verb; to cause to be ("gen"-erate),

- ◆ **1085 genos** **1)** kindred, **1a)** offspring, family, **1c)** stock, tribe, nation, **1c1)** i.e. nationality or descent from a particular people, **1d)** the aggregate of many individuals of the same nature, kind, sort
- ◆ **1080 gennao** From a variation of G1085; to *procreate* (properly of the father, but by extension of the mother); figuratively to *regenerate*:—bear, beget, be born, bring forth, conceive, be delivered of, gender, make, spring.
- ◆ **1074 genea** – generation(s)
- ◆ **1075 genealogo** – derive descent
- ◆ **1077 genesia** – birthday ceremonies
- ◆ **1078 genesis** – birthday
- ◆ **1079 genese** – birth
- ◆ **1081 gennema** – generation, fruit
- ◆ **1083 gennesis** – a begetting, nativity, birth
- ◆ **1084 gennethos** – they (those) that are born

“Genos” as stated previously, clearly and always, refers to family, parent-child, birth/nativity or nationality relationships when referring to people.

9. This writer did an additional on-line search on the Perseus Digital Library and “begotten” was logged as the search word. The results were what we would expect. The search found several dictionaries. However, Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* or Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon* was used to derived the results below.<sup>16</sup>

- ◆ **gennêtos** [gennaô] *begotten*, **Plat.**; gennêtoi gunaikôn *born of women*, **NTest.**
- ◆ **gnêsi-os**, a, on, ( [genos] ) **A.** *belonging to the race, i. e. lawfully begotten, born in wedlock*,
- ◆ **gonos**, *that which is begotten, child, offspring, product, of plants, race, stock, descent, begetting, procreation, of plants--bearing, seed*,
- ◆ **patro-gennês**, es, *begotten of the father*,
- ◆ **theo-gennês**, es, *begotten of a god*,

Writer's Note: The tenant that “monogenes”—that is the “genes” syllable—can not mean “begotten” is given a “head wound” when you consider that “patrogenes” means “begotten of the father” and no other definition is given. The word “patrogenes” is not found in the Bible. As, we have seen, these new translators disregard the consentient usage of

words in the Bible and appeal to secular usage in Greek writings. Well, consistent use of “genes” in the Bible or in secular Greek yields “begotten.”

10. As you are aware both Thayer and Strong list the “genes” root of the word “monogenes” as **“G1096 ginomai.”** This writer was reviewing the *The Unbound Bible* online and found the “parse” of “ginomai.” When a word is “parsed”, it is broken down into its various inflections, “syntactical relationships”, tenses, genders, etc. When “ginomai,” a verb, is parsed, it takes on 88 different forms and inflections. All of these are “gen” or “gin” words. The point, here, is that all of these forms and inflections contain the thought of generation, procreation, begetting or birth.<sup>17</sup>
11. This writer accessed *The Transliterated Bible* by Russ Montney and here we can readily see the differences in the Greek words. Mr. Montney bases his work on the Byzantine Greek Text (one of the ancient pure texts) of the Bible.<sup>18</sup> This writer compares this to the *E-Sword* “Greek Textus Receptus” (from which the KJV is translated) and then Strong’s numbers are added with *Robinson’s Morphological Analysis Codes*.<sup>18</sup> The following **“only begotten” or “monogenes” Greek Table** will give you the exact forms of Greek usage of “only begotten” or “monogenes.”
- Note:** The last “M” in the morphological codes denotes the gender of the word. One morphological code explanation is given in the chart as evidence for John 1:14. In **every** case in the Bible where a derivative of “monogenes” is used, the word takes a “masculine” form. For

<b>“only begotten” or “monogenes” Greek Table</b>		
<b>John 1:14</b>	<b>monogenoos</b>	μονογενοϋς <sup>3439 A-GSM</sup> <b>A-GSM from <u>Robinson’s Morphological Analysis Codes</u></b> <b>Part of Speech:</b> Adjective <b>Case:</b> Genative (possession, "of"; also origin or separation, "from") <b>Number:</b> Singular <b>Gender:</b> Masculine
<b>John 1:18</b>	<b>monogenays</b>	μονογενης <sup>3439 A-NSM</sup>
<b>John 3:16</b>	<b>monogenay</b>	μονογενη <sup>3439 A-ASM</sup>
<b>John 3:18</b>	<b>monogenoos</b>	μονογενοϋς <sup>3439 A-GSM</sup>

“monogenes” to be translated “kind” or “unique”, the word would have to be “neuter.” This is the “consistent usage” when on the rare occasions the Bible translates “genos” as “kind” as noted above. The point here is that, there is absolutely no legitimate way that “monogenes” can be translated as “only son of its kind” or “unique” without either sheer stupidity or some “kind” of heretical mindset that would develop a bias against the long standing, traditional and correct “only begotten” interpretation.

12. How would we translate “only begotten” when we reverse the process from English back to the Greek? We have already documented that “only begotten” refers back to our Greek transliterated word “monogenes” or one of its derivatives. **Edwards, An English-Greek Lexicon, The University of Chicago Library English-Greek Dictionary A Vocabulary of the Attic Language** and **Babel Fish** at [http://babelfish.yahoo.com/translate\\_txt](http://babelfish.yahoo.com/translate_txt) provide 3 references to show that “only begotten” means “monogenes” or its equivalent.<sup>19</sup>

As you are aware, in many versions “only begotten” is translated as “unique.” Dr. Thomas Holland has previously shown us the Greek word for “unique” would be “monadikos” instead of “monogenes.” ***Babel Fish*** verifies this by yielding “μοναδικός” or transliterated “monadikos” for the English word “unique.”<sup>20</sup> Some of the old Latin translations of the Bible translate “monogenes” as “unicus” which means “one and no more, only, sole, single.” The old Latin left the “genes” part of “monogenes” un-translated in keeping with our previous discussions. The correct Latin word is “ūnigēna” or “unigenitus” and is defined as “only-begotten, only or born of one parent, of one or the same family.” “Unigenitus” is the exact Latin equivalent for “monogenes” in the Greek. Jerome in his Latin Vulgate corrects some previous Latin versions. To those who might think this a weak argument on my part, please note that the Greek is the original language and **all Greek versions** correctly use “monogenes” in describing the Son of God. My source for the above Latin definitions is **Charlton T. Lewis, Charles Short, A Latin Dictionary**.<sup>21</sup> ***Perseus (on-line) Digital Library*** also listed several other ancient Christian writers who used the word “unigenitus.”<sup>22</sup> This writer did not do and could not do the rest of the Latin research. However, there is no doubt in this writer’s mind that good and thorough research would yield the fact that God has preserved the doctrine of His “only begotten” Son in the vast bulk of Latin scripture and Latin Christian literature.

Finally and concluding, the Greek words are being re-defined today by these pseudo-scholars today. The new Greek definitions constantly major on the minor. For instance, Thayer in the first portion of the definition of “monogenes” says “monogenes” means “single of **its** kind, only.” Some of

the new translators attribute to Thayer the definition of “monogenes” as “one **of** a kind.” Note the bold words. My brother-in-law gave me a stone that grew into a willow tree and someone cut the branches around the stone. The “unique” growth looks like a “man made” tomahawk. It is “one **of** a kind.” The natural tomahawk, however, is not “of **its** kind.” There is a difference in “one **of** a kind” and “single, of **its** kind.” In addition these new translators fail to mention, “1a) used of only sons or daughters (viewed in relation to their parents)” and “1b) used of Christ, denotes the only begotten son of God.” It is amazing how different translators can take the same documentation and come out with these illegitimate views. In order for translators to take the same information and come up with different conclusions, they have to “cherry pick” the information they use.

We also have statements like this:

The Greek *monogenes* can not mean "only-begotten." If *monogenes* is derived from a root of the verb *gennao* (to beget), then the word means “only begotten.” However, The traditional view is that *monogenes* is derived from a root of the verb *ginomai* (to become), thus *monogenes* means "only existing" and hence "unique."

The problem here is that a **leap** is made **from** the idea of “to become” (Thayer’s definition is “to become, i.e. to come into existence, begin to be, receive being”) **and to** “only existing.” A fourth grader could tell you there is a difference in the phrases “to become” and “only existing.”

Thayer says that “monogenes” is used only of sons and daughters.<sup>22</sup> And when we look at the New Testament, we see that that is absolutely true of the usage of “monogenes” in the New Testament. Thus, “monogenes” is a modifier to the word son or daughter. I have one son. He is my physically begotten son by my wife, Pam. His name is John David. Just how much sense would it make for me to introduce my son by saying, “This is John David, my one of a kind son.” This “one of a kind” business could be said of an adopted son or daughter. No, I might say this is my only son. Or in case I had another adopted son, I might well introduce John David as my only born son. And yes, bless the Lord, that is just what God the Father is doing as He introduces His Son to the world as the “only begotten Son.”

Again, we have these leaps in redefining “monogenes” by a multitude of new amateur translators. We repeat. If we trace “genes” to its root, it means “begotten.”

Again, the Greek is being rewritten in like manner as we have seen in many of our liberal history books today. There is no end to the deception and the arguments perpetuated by a host of irrelevant points by these new version translators. They argue from the perspective of the usage of “monogenes” in secular literature and then apply this to the Bible. This is a hoax. When the

Greek word “monogenes” is used of things or of events, the context changes and this is not applicable and out of context to our study. The point is: God uses “monogenes” in a specific manner and this is always in reference to the incarnation when He speaks of His Son.

Oh! Yes, Pam and I do have a daughter—an only begotten daughter. Her name is Rachel and yes, you could say that she is “one of a kind!”

These 12 studies illustrate the position of this book in fine order and a great deal of thanks and gratitude is owed to these men and G.A. Riplinger for their exceedingly fine work.

When you look at the internet and modern literature in this argument, you will find opponents on each side about equally divided. However, history and the bulk of true evidence, as illustrated by G.A. Riplinger, weighs in on the side of the “only begotten” rendering. This section was tedious and detailed. The writer’s purpose was to address and combat every argument that this writer could find against “only begotten” as the correct interpretation in John 3:16.

You need to know that opponents of the “only begotten” translation have some limited (and it is just that) historical supporters and lexicons to support their position. However, when the far majority of the evidence is weighed, our position is irrefutable.

And yes, this book passed over a whole host of published articles that were well written and agree with the position of this book. Many were discarded because they repeated ideas found herein. Many were correct in dealing with our subject matter but wrong on other Bible doctrines. Many, many others were not included because of time and space issues in this book. And many did not fit this format. Over intellectualism and over interpretation were found on both sides of the issue. After waddling through these articles, it is my firm belief that they, despite their verbosity, brought nothing new to the table.

The proofs continue in Chapters 15 to 22 where this book deals with the doctrinal issues when “only begotten” is not translated correctly. First, some groundwork needs to be laid from the Bible. The Bible tells us how to interpret and translate itself. And yes, we will let the Bible speak for itself. The best, and the easiest to read and digest, is yet to come.

This book offers two complete sets of proofs to verify the translation of “only begotten” in the KJV. **(1)** The first set of proofs is found in the first eight chapters documenting the historical and time **tested “only begotten” rendering** by spiritual and intellectual giants of the faith and by sound Greek dictionaries and lexicons. **(2)** The second set of doctrinal proofs are found beginning in chapter 15. These doctrinal proofs are based on the **internal evidence from the Bible itself**. That is—the Bible must agree with itself and be in perfect doctrinal harmony.

## Section II—Doctrinal Perversions Verses

### Glorious Truths of John 3:16

## Chapter 9—Bible Principles of Interpretation and Translation

### The Bible and Inspiration

If the Bible is a perfect Book and the Book of all Books, as it certainly is, surely it would give us keys to its own interpretation and also translation. Oh! And yes, it surely does! These Bible principles are documented in the following passages. All are critically important. These principles must be established before we can clearly set forth the doctrinal problems of the new version interpretations of John 3:16. Also, this is an excellent set of principles for a new Christian to use in the establishment of a personal Bible study program. Note the **bold portions** of scripture of each passage. The emphasis is mine. **The writer believes that the KJV is the perfectly preserved word of God for us in English. Specifically, the KJV is a preserved copy of the inspired, inerrant and infallible word of God. In addition, this writer believes the word of God is the sole and final authority for Christian faith, doctrine, and practice.**

In this section, numerous verses are quoted. These are the very words of God. There is a tendency of many today to put the emphasis on what some man or author has said about the word of God. We need to let the word of God speak. My hope is to be led by the Holy Spirit to properly expound the word of God. However, God wants to speak directly to you from His word. Read and reread His words and pay little attention to mine. Let God speak.

By way of introduction, **the Word of God is inspired by God.**

 **2 Timothy 3:16 through 2 Timothy 3:17 (KJV)** <sup>16</sup>All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: <sup>17</sup>That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

As you surely know, “inspired” means “God breathed.” That is, God spoke or breathed His very words in the hearts and minds of His people, the prophets of old, the psalm writers, the gospel writers, the authors of the epistles, etc. as they penned His words. You might want to study or underline in your Bible the numerous times it says:

- ◆ “God said”—46 times
- ◆ “God called”—8 times
- ◆ “the LORD God said”—4 times
- ◆ “the LORD said”—219 times
- ◆ “the LORD spake”—144 times

- ◆ “the LORD answered”—12 times
- ◆ “the word of the LORD”—255 times
- ◆ “the voice of the LORD”—47 times
- ◆ “Thus saith the LORD”—413 times
- ◆ “the word which the LORD hath spoken”—1 time
- ◆ “I [God] have declared”—5 times
- ◆ “saith the LORD”—816 times, 413 with thus and 403 other
- ◆ “the word that came... from the LORD”—6 times
- ◆ “voice from heaven”—9 times

These are just a few. Hundreds more relay the same idea. Look for them. Look at the red-letter words in the Bible. These are the very words of Jesus. And Jesus spoke directly to man while He was upon this earth. The red letter words and the black letter words are all God’s written words to us and for us and for our admonition. And yes, we could go on and on but time and space do not permit. Yes, God gave us His word. The question is, “Can you believe it?”

### Introduction to the Principles of Interpretation and Translation

Also, by way of introduction, a man must be a true Christian to have a true and correct understanding of the word of God. It has been said and is so very true that, “The Bible is God’s love letter to His children.” The Bible was given to God’s children to give to the rest of the world. As a general rule, the unsaved person will not accept the word of God. The unsaved or non-Christian is called the natural man in the Bible. Look at what the Bible itself has to say about these matters.

 **1 Corinthians 2:13 through 1 Corinthians 2:16 (KJV)** <sup>13</sup>Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. <sup>14</sup>But **the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God:** for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know *them*, because **they are spiritually discerned.** <sup>15</sup>But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. <sup>16</sup>For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? **But we have the mind of Christ.**

Thus we see that the unsaved will not receive the word of God. And thus, the Bible is God’s word to His children first and foremost. And even the child of God must approach the word of God believing and through faith.

 **Hebrews 11:3 (KJV)** <sup>3</sup>Through faith we understand that the worlds

were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.

 **Hebrews 11:6 (KJV)** <sup>6</sup>But **without faith it is impossible to please him:** for he that cometh to God **must believe that he is**, and *that* he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.

One of the problems with these perverted translations is that the translators do not approach the word of God by faith. Many of these perverted translators believe in the inspiration of the scriptures but deny God's work in preservation of the scriptures. Preservation of God's word is a clearly taught tenet of the Bible. The doctrine of preservation as taught by the Bible teaches us that God will preserve His word in much the same way that the word was given or inspired. The problem with those who deny preservation is dealt with in other chapters. But when an unbelieving approach to the word of God is taken, the unbelieving denier of preservation will develop his own science of textual criticism. This will in turn lead to a view of the Bible that denies the Bible principles we are going to study. The fourth principle of interpretation and translation upcoming in the next section gives the clearly stated Biblical references that teach the doctrine of preservation.

However, you need to clearly understand. The Bible is God's word to His children first and foremost and God intended His children to carry the word of God to the rest of the world. However, the Bible is written to the whole world. And yes, any unsaved person, no matter how vile or wretched when they turn to the Bible for help and answers, with a sincere and seeking heart, will find Christ in the pages of God's word. Bless the men's business group, ***The Gideons International***, a lay association of Christian business and professional men banded together inter-denominationally to share the message of God's Word around the world. ***The Gideons International*** is the group that provides the Bibles in hotel rooms, hospitals, and schools. They pass out Bibles and New Testaments to every group and in every public place that will permit them. They have amply proved that the word of God will take root and see men and women, boys and girls, of every race and nationality under the sun converted and come to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ.

### **Principles of Interpretation and Translation— Principle 1: The word of God is written to all men.**

**First**, the word of God is written to all men and has been sent out to the entire world. There is no contradiction here. The Bible is written to the Christian and the Christian is responsible to carry the Bible to the rest of the world. However, even a non-Christian who approaches the Bible as a sinner and seeking Christ will find Him. The unsaved person must approach the

Bible seeking a God to forgive their sin. That is the approach of faith and faith in the heart of man will be honored by God as stated in **Hebrews 11:6** above. Note the following verses which document that God sent His word into all the world.

 **Romans 10:13 through Romans 10:18 (KJV)** <sup>13</sup>For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. <sup>14</sup>How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? <sup>15</sup>And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things! <sup>16</sup>But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? <sup>17</sup>So then faith *cometh* by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. <sup>18</sup>But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, **their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.**

 **Romans 16:25 through Romans 16:27 (KJV)** <sup>25</sup>Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, <sup>26</sup>But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, **made known to all nations** for the obedience of faith: <sup>27</sup>To God only wise, *be* glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen.

 **Acts 13:45 through Acts 13:47 (KJV)** <sup>45</sup>But when the Jews saw the multitudes, they were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming. <sup>46</sup>Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. <sup>47</sup>For so hath the Lord commanded us, *saying*, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for **salvation unto the ends of the earth.**

Ah! The lesson is so plain, so straightforward, and so simple for all. God wants all to be saved. We could quote a host of other verses. And yes, He wants all to understand his word.

**Principle 2: The Bible is the Christian's guide**  
**for all matters of faith and practice.**

 **Matthew 4:4 (KJV)** <sup>4</sup>But he answered and said, It is written, **Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the**

mouth of God.

📖 *Psalm 119:130 (KJV)* The entrance of **thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding** unto the simple.

📖 *Psalm 119:105 (KJV)* <sup>105</sup>Thy word **is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.**

We live and move and have our Christian being in the word of God. God's word leads us and guides us. And yes, the word of God will even tell us how to understand, interpret and translate itself. **2 Timothy 3:17** says through the word of God, "**the man of God may be perfect...**" Some of these verses are quoted herein many times. The word of God uses a minimum of words to project a host of concepts, principles and ideas. Yet, the brief words of the Bible stand alone as the most profound ever penned.

We have no rule for faith and practice except the Bible. It is the only source of authority for any Christian work or worker. For us who speak English, the true Authorized Version (AV) is the KJV. The man who stands in the pulpit without authority becomes impotent and becomes as sounding brass and tinkling symbol, void of the power of God. Again, **The writer believes that the KJV is the perfectly preserved word of God for us in English. Specifically, the KJV is a preserved copy of the inspired, inerrant and infallible word of God. In addition, this writer believes the word of God is the sole and final authority for Christian faith, doctrine, and practice.**

### Principle 3: Every word is critical.

📖 *Matthew 4:4 (KJV)* <sup>4</sup>But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by **every word** that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

📖 *Luke 4:4 (KJV)* <sup>4</sup>And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by **every word** of God.

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

Note the following—to leave out one word or to add one word is a grave error and will bring upon the guilty party a curse from God. The ultimate destiny of every man will depend upon what he does with the word of God. Our Christian testimony depends upon what we do with the word of God.

📖 *Jeremiah 26:2 (KJV)* <sup>2</sup>Thus saith the LORD; Stand in the court of the

LORD'S house, and speak unto all the cities of Judah, which come to worship in the LORD'S house, **all the words** that I command thee to speak unto them; **diminish not a word:**

📖 **Deuteronomy 4:2 (KJV)** <sup>2</sup>Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, **neither shall ye diminish ought from it**, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you.

📖 **Deuteronomy 12:32 (KJV)** <sup>32</sup>What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: **thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.**

📖 **Proverbs 30:5 through Proverbs 30:6 (KJV)** <sup>5</sup>Every word of God is pure: he *is* a shield unto them that put their trust in him. <sup>6</sup>**Add thou not unto his words**, lest he reprove thee, and **thou be found a liar.**

📖 **Revelation 22:18 through Revelation 22:19 (KJV)** <sup>18</sup>For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, **If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book:** <sup>19</sup>**And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.**

In our United States Congress, the unpardonable breach of conduct is to call a fellow colleague a liar. God does not abide with our political correctness and simply says that those who change the word of God will “be found a liar.”

Note again, the addition of one word is a fatal error and will bring upon the guilty party a curse from God. Just reread the above passages in this section. These will give you ample evidence of God's warnings to man not to change the word of God.

And we shall soon see that the deletion of the word “begotten” destroys doctrinal cornerstones. And we shall soon find out that some of these new versions leave out over 60,000 words—not 60, not 600, or not 6,000, but 60,000 words are left out. That should shock you!

## Chapter 10: Bible Principles of Interpretation and Translation Continued...

### Principle 4: The Word of God Will Not Pass Away

**Fourth**, the Word of God will not pass away or in other words, God will preserve His word. Here, you may look at the clear evidence of God's promise to preserve His word that we discussed in our introduction.

📖 **Psalm 12:6 through Psalm 12:7 (KJV)** <sup>6</sup>The words of the LORD *are* pure words: *as* silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. <sup>7</sup>Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, **thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.**

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

📖 **Mark 13:31 (KJV)** Heaven and earth shall pass away: but **my words shall not pass away.**

📖 **Luke 21:33 (KJV)** Heaven and earth shall pass away: but **my words shall not pass away.**

📖 **Psalms 119:89** For ever, O LORD, **thy word is settled** in heaven.

📖 **Psalms 119:152** Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that **thou hast founded them for ever.**

📖 **Psalms 119:160** Thy word is true from the beginning: and **every one** of thy righteous **judgments endureth for ever.**

📖 **Isaiah 40:8** The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but **the word of our God shall stand for ever.**

📖 **Isaiah 55:11** So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.

📖 **1Peter 1:23** Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the **word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.**

📖 **1Peter 1:25** But the word of the **Lord endureth for ever.** And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.

Yes, the Bible clearly teaches that God will preserve His word forever and the Lord Jesus Himself said in Matthew, Mark and Luke, **“My words shall not pass away.”**

Some seem to think the word of God passed away and disappeared and then from time to time reappeared. That is certainly not the case and could not be the case because God promised His word would not pass away. And we can definitely understand the words “shall not pass.”

For over 300 hundred years among protestants, the KJV stood alone and was considered the very word of God. There was no dispute. The KJV

had no widely recognized competition. The KJV was the sole authority among the common people. Now these new versions come along and pretend to correct, improve, or yield better renderings, and update what they term “unfortunate” readings. If the KJV needed all of this, then the KJV was not the very word of God and the Word of God had to disappear from the English speaking peoples for over 300 years. That simply did not happen. In order for the word of God to be the true word of God, it had to be the “perfect” law of God. See Psalms 19:7.

Check your Christian history and you will find that God has used the KJV above all other versions. The advent of the KJV ushered in the revival age of the Church. The KJV is the preserved word of God and the KJV will preserve the true church.

God directly states that He will preserve His word. Also, God looks down through time and through the ages and God sees and understands the deceitful tricks in the heart of man and the devil. Thus, God, in His word, gives us illustrations, just as if we were little children, to demonstrate that man’s devices will be futile. We will find that sin, nor time, nor the efforts of man himself will be able to change or destroy the word of God. And yes, God’s word still stands today! Read on! The words in **Bold and in Brackets-**[ ]--are inserted by this writer and are for special emphasis. This does not imply that my words are more important than the words of God. My inserted words are simply to emphasize the premises of this book. Let us now look at these eternal illustrations of God’s preserving and providential power that He exercises over His word.

### **Illustration 1: The word of God will not be destroyed by sin.**

📖 **Exodus 32:1 through Exodus 32:35 (KJV)** <sup>1</sup>And when the people saw that Moses delayed to come down out of the mount, the people gathered themselves together unto Aaron, and said unto him, Up, make us gods, which shall go before us; for *as for* this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him. <sup>2</sup>And Aaron said unto them, Break off the golden earrings, which *are* in the ears of your wives, of your sons, and of your daughters, and bring *them* unto me. <sup>3</sup>And all the people brake off the golden earrings which *were* in their ears, and brought *them* unto Aaron. <sup>4</sup>And he received *them* at their hand, and fashioned it with a graving tool, after he had made it a molten calf: and they said, These *be* thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. <sup>5</sup>And when Aaron saw *it*, he built an altar before it; and Aaron made proclamation, and said, To morrow *is* a feast to the LORD. <sup>6</sup>And they rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt offerings, and brought peace offerings; and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and

rose up to play. <sup>7</sup>And the LORD said unto Moses, Go, get thee down; for thy people, which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted *themselves*: <sup>8</sup>They have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped it, and have sacrificed thereunto, and said, These *be* thy gods, O Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. <sup>9</sup>And the LORD said unto Moses, I have seen this people, and, behold, it *is* a stiffnecked people: <sup>10</sup>Now therefore let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them: and I will make of thee a great nation. <sup>11</sup>And Moses besought the LORD his God, and said, LORD, why doth thy wrath wax hot against thy people, which thou hast brought forth out of the land of Egypt with great power, and with a mighty hand? <sup>12</sup>Wherefore should the Egyptians speak, and say, For mischief did he bring them out, to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth? Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people. <sup>13</sup>Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou swarest by thine own self, and saidst unto them, [**Note: in this case, God's own word is used to remind God that God Himself had made promises to His people. God's word became the preserving element of God's people. And yes, that is the way it is with the Christian today. We are standing on and in the promises of God.**] I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven, and all this land that I have spoken of will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit *it* for ever. <sup>14</sup>And the LORD repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people. <sup>15</sup>And Moses turned, and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony *were* in his hand: the tables *were* written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other *were* they written. <sup>16</sup>And the tables *were* the work of God, and the writing *was* the writing of God, graven upon the tables. <sup>17</sup>And when Joshua heard the noise of the people as they shouted, he said unto Moses, *There is* a noise of war in the camp. <sup>18</sup>And he said, *It is* not the voice of *them* that shout for mastery, neither *is it* the voice of *them* that cry for being overcome: *but* the noise of *them* that sing do I hear. <sup>19</sup>And it came to pass, as soon as he came nigh unto the camp, that he saw the calf, and the dancing: and Moses' anger waxed hot, and he cast the tables out of his hands, and brake them beneath the mount. [**the people sin and break the law and Moses breaks the tables of God—the law**] <sup>20</sup>And he took the calf which they had made, and burnt *it* in the fire, and ground *it* to powder, and strawed *it* upon the water, and made the children of Israel drink *of it*. <sup>21</sup>And Moses said unto Aaron, What did this people unto thee, that thou hast brought so great a sin upon them? <sup>22</sup>And Aaron said, Let not the anger of my lord wax hot: thou knowest the people, that they *are set* on mischief. <sup>23</sup>For they said unto me,

Make us gods, which shall go before us: for *as for* this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him. <sup>24</sup>And I said unto them, Whosoever hath any gold, let them break *it* off. So they gave *it* me: then I cast it into the fire, and there came out this calf. <sup>25</sup>And when Moses saw that the people *were* naked; (for Aaron had made them naked unto *their* shame among their enemies:) <sup>26</sup>Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp, and said, Who *is* on the LORD'S side? *let him come* unto me. And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him. <sup>27</sup>And he said unto them, Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, Put every man his sword by his side, *and* go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbour. <sup>28</sup>And the children of Levi did according to the word of Moses: and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men. <sup>29</sup>For Moses had said, Consecrate yourselves to day to the LORD, even every man upon his son, and upon his brother; that he may bestow upon you a blessing this day. <sup>30</sup>And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto the LORD; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin. <sup>31</sup>And Moses returned unto the LORD, and said, Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. <sup>32</sup>Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written. <sup>33</sup>And the LORD said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book. <sup>34</sup>Therefore now go, lead the people unto *the place* of which I have spoken unto thee: behold, mine Angel shall go before thee: nevertheless in the day when I visit I will visit their sin upon them. <sup>35</sup>And the LORD plagued the people, because they made the calf, which Aaron made.

**[Well, man may think that he can break the law of God and forget about it and that God will forget it too. Not so! God makes Moses hew two more tables of stone. And then God gives Moses His law again. The law of God will stand forever!]**

 **Exodus 34:1 through Exodus 34:5 (KJV)** <sup>1</sup>And the LORD said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first: and I will write upon *these* tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest. <sup>2</sup>And be ready in the morning, and come up in the morning unto mount Sinai, and present thyself there to me in the top of the mount. <sup>3</sup>And no man shall come up with thee, neither let any man be seen throughout all the mount; neither let the flocks nor herds feed before that mount. <sup>4</sup>And he hewed two tables of stone like unto the first; and Moses rose up early in the morning, and went up unto mount Sinai, as the LORD had

commanded him, and took in his hand the two tables of stone. <sup>5</sup>And the LORD descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the LORD.

 **Exodus 34:28 through Exodus 34:29 (KJV)** <sup>28</sup>And he was there with the LORD forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments. <sup>29</sup>And it came to pass, when Moses came down from mount Sinai with the two tables of testimony in Moses' hand, when he came down from the mount, that Moses wist not that the skin of his face shone while he talked with him.

**Illustration 2: The word of God will not be destroyed  
by the passage of time.**

Just to set the stage here, Hezekiah was a Godly king who trusted in the Lord. Hezekiah's son, Manasseh was twelve years old when he began to reign, and reigned fifty and five years in Jerusalem. Then the son of Manasseh, Amon, at the age of twenty-two took the throne. Amon reigned two years. Manasseh and Amon were ungodly and did not worship God. Thus, the word of God would not, in all probability, have been read during those reigns.

Then, along comes Josiah, the son of Amon. Josiah, at eight years old, became king and he worshiped God. The Bible says that, "he did *that which was* right in the sight of the LORD, and walked in all the way of David his father, and turned not aside to the right hand or to the left." In the eighteenth year of his reign, Josiah, sent Shaphan and Hilkiyah the high priest to repair the house of the LORD. There, they discovered the "book of the law."

The key unlocking this passage is that "the book of the law" had been lost and not read for a total of 75 years—55 years in the reign of Manasseh, 2 years in the reign of Amon and 18 years in the reign of Josiah.

 **2 Kings 22:8 through 2 Kings 22:13 (KJV)** <sup>8</sup>And Hilkiyah the high priest said unto Shaphan the scribe, I have found the book of the law in the house of the LORD. And Hilkiyah gave the book to Shaphan, and he read it. <sup>9</sup>And Shaphan the scribe came to the king [**Josiah**], and brought the king word again, and said, Thy servants have gathered the money that was found in the house, and have delivered it into the hand of them that do the work, that have the oversight of the house of the LORD. <sup>10</sup>And Shaphan the scribe showed the king, saying, Hilkiyah the priest hath delivered me a book. And Shaphan read it before the king. <sup>11</sup>And it came to pass, when the king had heard the words of the book of the law, that he rent his

clothes. <sup>12</sup>And the king commanded Hilkiah the priest, and Ahikam the son of Shaphan, and Achbor the son of Michaiah, and Shaphan the scribe, and Asahiah a servant of the king's, saying, <sup>13</sup>Go ye, inquire of the LORD for me, and for the people, and for all Judah, concerning the words of this book that is found: for great *is* the wrath of the LORD that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this book, to do according unto all that which is written concerning us.

**[Note the effect of the word of God on Josiah.]**

 **2 Kings 23:1 through 2 Kings 23:3 (KJV)** <sup>1</sup>And the king sent, and they gathered unto him all the elders of Judah and of Jerusalem. <sup>2</sup>And the king went up into the house of the LORD, and all the men of Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem with him, and the priests, and the prophets, and all the people, both small and great: and he read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant which was found in the house of the LORD. <sup>3</sup>And the king stood by a pillar, and made a covenant before the LORD, to walk after the LORD, and to keep his commandments and his testimonies and his statutes with all *their* heart and all *their* soul, to perform the words of this covenant that were written in this book. And all the people stood to the covenant.

This was just like an old time tent revival. In the Sulphur Springs Community near Jonesborough, Tennessee, the Sulphur Springs Methodists maintain an old weather-beaten wooden outdoor tabernacle. The tabernacle looks like a rustic barn with a tin roof and no sides. And yes, I can remember the old folks telling about the days when people came with horses and wagons and stayed a week at a time for revival. The Old Testament feast days were similar.

Josiah, because of the effectual power of the word of God, brought about the greatest revival in the history of his people. The word of God was read. The people went on a rampage and cleaned up and cleaned out the town of Jerusalem and the surrounding area. Get out your Bible and read the “rest of the story” in *2 Kings chapter 23*.

The point is that while man may put the Bible on the shelf for 75 years and avoid it, time does not change the truths. Nor does the Bible lose the power and the ability of the word of God to change lives. Nor does time change the fact that God will judge every man according to His word. Time will not destroy the word of God!

**Illustration 3: Man will not destroy the word of God.**

In this illustration, we have a man who does not like what God has to say about a matter. This man, in turn, takes it upon himself to destroy the word of God. Can he do it? Read on!

 **Jeremiah 30:1 through Jeremiah 30:2 (KJV)** <sup>1</sup>The word that came to Jeremiah from the LORD, saying, <sup>2</sup>Thus speaketh the LORD God of Israel, saying, Write thee all the words that I have spoken unto thee in a book.

 **Jeremiah 36:9 through Jeremiah 36:32 (KJV)** <sup>9</sup>And it came to pass in the fifth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah, in the ninth month, *that* they proclaimed a fast before the LORD to all the people in Jerusalem, and to all the people that came from the cities of Judah unto Jerusalem. <sup>10</sup>Then read Baruch in the book the words of Jeremiah in the house of the LORD, in the chamber of Gemariah the son of Shaphan the scribe, in the higher court, at the entry of the new gate of the LORD'S house, in the ears of all the people. <sup>11</sup>When Michaiah the son of Gemariah, the son of Shaphan, had heard out of the book all the words of the LORD, <sup>12</sup>Then he went down into the king's house, into the scribe's chamber: and, lo, all the princes sat there, *even* Elishama the scribe, and Delaiah the son of Shemaiah, and Elnathan the son of Achbor, and Gemariah the son of Shaphan, and Zedekiah the son of Hananiah, and all the princes. <sup>13</sup>Then Michaiah declared unto them all the words that he had heard, when Baruch read the book in the ears of the people. <sup>14</sup>Therefore all the princes sent Jehudi the son of Nethaniah, the son of Shelemiah, the son of Cushi, unto Baruch, saying, Take in thine hand the roll wherein thou hast read in the ears of the people, and come. So Baruch the son of Neriah took the roll in his hand, and came unto them. <sup>15</sup>And they said unto him, Sit down now, and read it in our ears. So Baruch read *it* in their ears. <sup>16</sup>Now it came to pass, when they had heard all the words, they were afraid both one and other, and said unto Baruch, We will surely tell the king of all these words. <sup>17</sup>And they asked Baruch, saying, Tell us now, How didst thou write all these words at his mouth? <sup>18</sup>Then Baruch answered them, He pronounced all these words unto me with his mouth, and I wrote *them* with ink in the book. <sup>19</sup>Then said the princes unto Baruch, Go, hide thee, thou and Jeremiah; and let no man know where ye be. <sup>20</sup>And they went in to the king into the court, but they laid up the roll in the chamber of Elishama the scribe, and told all the words in the ears of the king. <sup>21</sup>So the king sent Jehudi to fetch the roll: and he took it out of Elishama the scribe's chamber. And Jehudi read it in the ears of the king, and in the ears of all the princes which stood beside the king. <sup>22</sup>Now the king sat in the

winterhouse in the ninth month: and *there was a fire* on the hearth burning before him. <sup>23</sup>And it came to pass, *that* when Jehudi had read three or four leaves, he cut it with the penknife, and cast *it* into the fire that *was* on the hearth, until all the roll was consumed in the fire that *was* on the hearth. <sup>24</sup>Yet they were not afraid, nor rent their garments, *neither* the king, nor any of his servants that heard all these words. <sup>25</sup>Nevertheless Elnathan and Delaiah and Gemariah had made intercession to the king that he would not burn the roll: but he would not hear them. <sup>26</sup>But the king commanded Jerahmeel the son of Hammelech, and Seraiah the son of Azriel, and Shelemiah the son of Abdeel, to take Baruch the scribe and Jeremiah the prophet: but the LORD hid them. <sup>27</sup>Then the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah, after that the king had burned the roll, and the words which Baruch wrote at the mouth of Jeremiah, saying, <sup>28</sup>Take thee again another roll, and write in it all the former words that were in the first roll, which Jehoiakim the king of Judah hath burned. <sup>29</sup>And thou shalt say to Jehoiakim king of Judah, Thus saith the LORD; Thou hast burned this roll, saying, Why hast thou written therein, saying, The king of Babylon shall certainly come and destroy this land, and shall cause to cease from thence man and beast? <sup>30</sup>Therefore thus saith the LORD of Jehoiakim king of Judah; He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David: and his dead body shall be cast out in the day to the heat, and in the night to the frost. <sup>31</sup>And I will punish him and his seed and his servants for their iniquity; and I will bring upon them, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and upon the men of Judah, all the evil that I have pronounced against them; but they hearkened not. <sup>32</sup>Then took Jeremiah another roll, and gave it to Baruch the scribe, the son of Neriah; who wrote therein from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the book which Jehoiakim king of Judah had burned in the fire: and there were added besides unto them many like words.

You surely remember this little story. God will not lower his standards because of man's sin, nor will he change one letter of his word. Truly, evil men, who think they can avoid judgment by helping to destroy God's word, are guilty of the hatching of many of these word changes. They imagine that God will judge them by their standards. Not so! You will be judged by the very word of God.

The eternal fate of every man is determined by what he does with the word of God. You will live by it or be destroyed by it.

## Chapter 11: Bible Principles of Interpretation and Translation Continued... Principles 5 to 8: Translation, Perfection, Interpretation, and Simplicity— Principle 5 : Interpret can mean translate.

**Fifth**, the word “interpret” and its derivatives in the KJV Bible may be rendered “translate” and/or its derivatives.

- 📖 **Ezra 4:7 (KJV)**<sup>7</sup> And in the days of Artaxerxes wrote Bishlam, Mithredath, Tabeel, and the rest of their companions, unto Artaxerxes king of Persia; and the writing of the letter *was* written in the Syrian tongue, **and interpreted** in the Syrian tongue.
- 📖 **Matthew 1:23 (KJV)**<sup>23</sup> Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, **which being interpreted** is, God with us.
- 📖 **Mark 5:41 (KJV)**<sup>41</sup> And he took the damsel by the hand, and said unto her, Talitha cumi; which is, **being interpreted**, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise.
- 📖 **Mark 15:22 (KJV)**<sup>22</sup> And they bring him unto the place Golgotha, which is, **being interpreted**, The place of a skull.
- 📖 **Mark 15:34 (KJV)**<sup>34</sup> And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? **which is, being interpreted**, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?
- 📖 **John 1:38 (KJV)**<sup>38</sup> Then Jesus turned, and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye? They said unto him, Rabbi, **(which is to say, being interpreted, Master,)** where dwellest thou?
- 📖 **John 1:42 (KJV)**<sup>42</sup> And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, **which is by interpretation, A stone.**
- 📖 **Acts 4:36 (KJV)**<sup>36</sup> And Joses, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas, **(which is, being interpreted, The son of consolation,)** a Levite, *and* of the country of Cyprus,

Again, note above that the Greek word “**hermeôneuo**” is used and translated “**interpret**” in our KJV. The definition of “interpret” can be defined as “to translate” and in this case perfectly matches the usage above in KJV. The following is copied from *Strong’s Concordance*.

**G2059** hermeôneuo ô= From a presumed derivative of G2060 (as the god of language); to *translate*:—interpret.<sup>1</sup>

The key here is that any and all the rules that apply to our day-to-day

Bible study and interpretation would also apply to a scholar's translation of the Bible. When we read the Bible, we should read the Bible word for word. And every word should be weighed as coming directly from the mouth of God.

In other words, the Bible tells us how to interpret and translate itself. We will look at methods of translation later and we will note only one method of translation is correct and Biblical. We will also look at methods that violate the Bible's own principles of interpretation and translation. The violation of the Bible's own principles is heretical and will lead to additional heresy in versions translated with unbiblical foundations and principles.

### **Principle 6: The word of God is perfect.**

**Sixth,** The word of God is complete, perfect, without error and every passage will harmonize with every other Biblical passage (i.e. the Bible is without contradiction).

 **Psalm 19:7 through Psalm 19:8 (KJV)** <sup>7</sup>**The law of the LORD is perfect**, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD *is* sure, making wise the simple. <sup>8</sup>**The statutes of the LORD are right**, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the LORD *is* pure, enlightening the eyes.

 **Psalm 18:30 (KJV)** <sup>30</sup>*As for* God, **his way is perfect: the word of the LORD is tried**: he *is* a buckler to all those that trust in him.

 **Proverbs 30:5 through Proverbs 30:6 (KJV)** <sup>5</sup>**Every word of God is pure**: he *is* a shield unto them that put their trust in him. <sup>6</sup>Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.

It has been said that the Old Testament is the New Testament infolded. In addition, the New Testament is the Old Testament unfolded. In the Old Testament, the shadow is seen. In the New Testament, the substance can be touched, handled, tasted, smelled, heard, and seen.

Every New Testament doctrine has an Old Testament type, story, or illustration as its foundation.. Many Old Testament illustrations are available to foreshadow the New Testament doctrine. A lamb is a good Old Testament illustration to show us a New Testament truth. Note the following verses:

 **(Genesis 22:7-8 KJV)** "And Isaac spake unto Abraham his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here *am* I, my son. And he said, Behold the fire and the wood: but where *is* the **lamb** for a burnt offering? {8} And Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a **lamb** for a burnt offering: so they went both of them together."

 **(John 1:29 KJV)** "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and

saith, Behold the **Lamb** of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

Lambs were used throughout the Old Testament as sacrifices illustrating and pointing forward to the sacrificial work of Christ on the Cross.

### Principle 7: The word of God interprets itself.

**Seventh**, the Word of God must be interpreted in light of every scripture in the Word of God. Or that is to say, that the word of God interprets itself.

 **2 Peter 1:16 through 2 Peter 1:21 (KJV)** <sup>16</sup>For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. <sup>17</sup>For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. <sup>18</sup>And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount. <sup>19</sup>We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts: <sup>20</sup>**Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.** <sup>21</sup>For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake *as they were* moved by the Holy Ghost.

 **1 Corinthians 2:11 through 1 Corinthians 2:16 (KJV)** <sup>11</sup>For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. <sup>12</sup>Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. <sup>13</sup>**Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.** <sup>14</sup>But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know *them*, because they are spiritually discerned. <sup>15</sup>But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. <sup>16</sup>For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ.

 **Isaiah 28:9 through Isaiah 28:14 (KJV)** <sup>9</sup>Whom shall he teach knowledge? and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? *them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts.* <sup>10</sup>**For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little:** <sup>11</sup>For with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people. <sup>12</sup>To whom he said, This *is* the rest *wherewith* ye may cause the weary to rest; and this *is* the refreshing:

yet they would not hear. <sup>13</sup>**But the word of the LORD was unto them precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little;** that they might go, and fall backward, and be broken, and snared, and taken. <sup>14</sup>Wherefore hear the word of the LORD, ye scornful men, that rule this people which *is* in Jerusalem.

The above passages simply tell us that we need to look at all scriptures pertaining to a particular subject in order to fully understand the subject or doctrine. In other words, every scripture is to be interpreted in light of every other scripture. Any student of the word of God knows the value of aids such a topical Bible, a cross-reference Bible and a complete Bible concordance.

When you compare scripture with scripture, and you compare the KJV to these new translations, the new translations quickly become mis-translations and their gross errors are apparent. Most people will not take the time to “search the scriptures.” In the KJV, when you compare scripture to scripture, you will quickly find the full harmony of the scriptures. In the new versions you will find multitudes of disagreements, variations, deletions, errors, and gross discrepancies. John 3:16 is the proof positive example set forth herein.

The KJV translators used the method of comparing scripture with scripture, and transcripts with transcripts, and Bible translations with translations. A number of resources, in the reference section contained herein, will give you an abundance of detail about the KJV translators and their methods. Also, an overview of their methods is given later in this book.

The old adage “a text without context is pretext” is absolutely true. Context must be considered on at least four levels:

1. The context of the immediate passage
2. The context within the specific book of the Bible
3. The context of the Bible when taken as a whole.
4. The contexts of the usage of the Greek and English words in other passages of the Bible.

### **Principle 8: The Word of God is simple.**

**Eighth,** the Word of God is simple.

 **2 Corinthians 11:1 through 2 Corinthians 11:4 (KJV)** <sup>1</sup>Would to God ye could bear with me a little in *my* folly: and indeed bear with me. <sup>2</sup>For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present *you as* a chaste virgin to Christ. <sup>3</sup>But I fear,

lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from **the simplicity that is in Christ.**

<sup>4</sup>For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or *if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him.*

 **Romans 12:8 (KJV)** <sup>8</sup>Or he that **exhorteth, on exhortation:** he that giveth, *let him do it* with **simplicity**; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness.

Yes, the Bible talks about the “simplicity that is in Christ.” In both cases the word “simplicity” is applied to preaching (exhortation is preaching). We have nothing else to preach except Christ as found in the word of God. Go back and look at the section about John Gill and how he completely reverses the meaning of God’s offer of salvation to the whole world. Some would have you believe that to believe “in Christ” is just not that simple.

I personally knew a pastor who preached there was a difference in “believing on” rather than “believing in” Jesus. This pastor preached on a regular basis that “believing in” Christ was not enough to be saved. He preached that you must “believe on” the Lord Jesus Christ to be saved. However note **John 3:16 (KJV)** <sup>16</sup>**For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.** Yes, our text says, “believeth in.” This is just an example of the subversion and perversion of the scripture that has abounded in all ages. It is just “make it up as you go.” We have this type of thing occurring and reoccurring with these new translations. And yes, “believing on” and “believing in” is exactly the same in Biblical thought and terminology.

And many want you to believe that God’s word is written to the educated, the clergy, the especially anointed, or the spiritual “upper crust.” Dr. B.R. Lakin used to say that the “upper crust is a few crumbs held together by a little dough.” The word of God is simple. Let no man rule over you by saying he has been given a special supernatural knowledge that you do not have or cannot acquire by simple study.

We are saved by simple faith and simply by faith alone. We live daily by simple faith. God’s laws—the Ten Commandments are so simple that they can be taught to a child.

God warns us about those who use much speaking, vain philosophy, and great swelling words to influence us. The KJV translators did not believe as the arrogant Catholics of yesteryear that the Bible belonged to the clergy. The KJV translators wanted the Bible in the hands of the common man. And yes, they put the Bible in the hands of the common man.

We have a simple Bible and our message to the lost world is a simple

---

message of redemption through simple faith in the death, burial and resurrection of Christ.

The Bible is the best literature textbook (bar none) in the world. You will find the best illustrations, great broad based parables, spiritual types and anti-types, alliterations, similes, metaphors, etc. We could go on and on.

However, the Bible is a straightforward and simple book, written to all men of all times. The Bible is a literal book first. The stories and events recorded are actual divine records from a God who is true. And the word of God is the very word that defines truth. **(John 3:33 KJV) "He that hath received his testimony hath set to his seal that God is true."** And one last thought—all symbols in the Bible are explained in the Bible. The Bible is a complete book.

## Chapter 12: Bible Principles of Interpretation and Translation Continued...

### Principle 9: Precision of the Biblical Language

Ninth, the word of God is precise (exactly exact).

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

Note the singular words “thee, thou, and thine” and the plural words “you and ye” which are replaced by the simple “you” in the new modern translations. These old words are, yes, somewhat archaic. However, the use of “thee, thou, thine and ye” **was not found in the course of normal language during 1611** either. In the original introduction of the 1611 King James Bible, you will not find the use of “thee”, “thou” and “ye”. A little homework will verify this if you will do the work.

Notice also that the singular “thou” takes various forms depending on its grammatical usage:

- **Thou-** as sentence subject: “**Thou** art the man.”
- **Thee-** as sentence object: “He shall give his angels charge concerning **thee**: and in *their* hands they shall bear **thee** up.”
- **Thy-** possessive form (as an adjective): “After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be **thy** name.”
- **Thine-** possessive form (as object or recipient of the possession): “**Thine** is the glory.”<sup>2</sup>

The 1611 King James Bible translators translated the Bible “literally” and thus used the “formal equivalence” method of translation. This method of translation is defined as “an attempt to translate by keeping as close as possible to the exact words and phrasing in the original language...”, or inasmuch as possible hold to an accurate, word-for-word translation of the Hebrew and Greek texts.

In our time and at the time of the writing of the KJV, the one-word “you” is used for both the singular and plural. The Greek and Hebrew languages contain a different word for the second person singular and the second person plural pronouns. Words that begin with “t” (thou, thy, thine) are singular, and words that begin with “y” (ye) are plural. Note the following verse.

 **John 3:7 (KJV)** <sup>7</sup>Marvel not that I said unto **thee**, **Ye** must be born again.

Jesus is talking to old Nicodemus above. The statement is directed

specifically to Nicodemus where Jesus said, “I said unto thee,” (singular). However, the statement applies to all in, “Ye must be born again” (plural). The exact accuracy and the divine doctrinal perfection of the KJV Bible are found in this little verse that is written to the entire world.

Verb forms & endings in the Greek and Hebrew will vary depending on usage. Thus, we have the exact and precise endings not found in the modern versions. Note the following examples of verb inflection. These verb inflections such as “est” and “eth” make a difference in the following manner:

- The first person—the one who speaks
- The second person—the one spoken too
- The third person—the one spoken about

**Example: the first person—John 9:38 (KJV)** <sup>38</sup>And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him.

**Example: the second person—John 1:50 (KJV)** <sup>50</sup>Jesus answered and said unto him, Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig tree, **believest thou?** thou shalt see greater things than these.

**Example: the third person—John 3:36 (KJV)** <sup>36</sup>**He that believeth** on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

In addition, *The Dean Burgon Society* makes the following excellent observation that fits here. “We could attempt to replace the “eth” verb endings in the AV with a present tense or perhaps a past, but would find that the “eth” (historical present) is not adequately translated by either.”<sup>1</sup> The Hebrew and the Greek languages make the distinction between these seemingly minor nuances of the above pronouns and in a host verb inflections. There should be no doubt in your mind. All of these little nuances have super significant doctrinal implications. Minor variations from the translation of the original text will destroy the word of God. At that point, the word of God becomes the word of some man’s interpretation.

Just from a literary point of view, when we set aside the KJV for these new versions, we lose the greatest international treasure ever given to the English speaking peoples. Historically, the KJV has proved its usefulness and value in religion, in government, in business, in literature and in our family lives.

There is another tenet here that is absolutely crucial. Edward F. Hills (1912-1981) in his comprehensive work entitled *The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscripts* (1956) soundly upholds the historic doctrines of the divine inspiration and providential preservation of Holy Scripture. Dr. Hills calls the KJV—“biblical English.”<sup>2</sup> G.A. Riplinger in the excellent book *In Awe of Thy Word*

correctly describes the word of God as “The Breath and Heartbeat of God.”<sup>3</sup> Riplinger proves the word of God contains meter, rhythm, rhyme, poetry and alliteration that give the Bible a beauty and grace that God uses to gently touch and yet, strongly impact lives of those who believe it. An unjust and brief personal summary of a host of writers who advocate for the KJV shows us that **when we lose the style of the KJV, we lose the style of the original Greek and Hebrew. In other words, we lose the intended style of the divine inspiration of God.**

Ian Richard Kyle Paisley (1926- ) is Pastor of a noted Free Presbyterian congregation in Ireland. In his unsurpassed defense of the KJV entitled *My Plea for the Old Sword*, Dr. Paisley says, “I believe the Bible is the verbally inspired Word of the living God and because the Authorised Version is a faithful English translation of the original Hebrew of the Old Testament and the original Greek of the New Testament, it is the very Word of God in my mother tongue. Being a translation does not alter one iota of its integrity, inerrancy and infallibility as God's Word.” In the preface of his online book, Dr. Paisley describes the KJV as “incomparable in its faithfulness, majestic in its language, and inexhaustible in its spiritual fruitfulness.” You can read his brilliant work at the *European Institute of Protestant Studies* website.<sup>4</sup>

Adam Clarke in 1810 in his *General Introduction to his Commentary on the Whole Bible* writes: “the English translation of the Bible made under the direction of king James I, is the most accurate and faithful of the whole. Nor is this its only praise; the translators have seized the very spirit and soul of the original and expressed this almost everywhere with pathos and energy.” Clarke also states “our translators have not only made a standard translation, but they have made their translation the standard of our language” and continues by saying the KJV is “the standard of purity and excellence of the English tongue.”<sup>5</sup>

It is interesting to note that Winston Churchill and Ronald Reagan, the two greatest leaders of the free world and the two greatest orators from the past century, are on record extolling the virtues of the KJV. This writer just completed reading the biography of Churchill and it should be noted that he was one on the most prolific writers in history. Churchill produced volumes on world history, political and news articles, and yes, even a host of articles on the Bible. Winston Churchill writes, “The scholars who produced this masterpiece are mostly unknown and unremembered. But they forged an enduring link, literary and religious, between the English-speaking people of the world.”<sup>6</sup>

Ronald Reagan, in this address (which aired September 6, 1977), eloquently exalts the King James Bible while showing the impotence and powerlessness of the Good News version. Reagan’s address ended with this

---

statement, "Indeed, it is an incontrovertible fact that all the complex and horrendous questions confronting us at home and worldwide have their answer in that single book." (The King James Bible, Newsweek, Dec. 27, 1982 p.46 and the entire article is widely quoted on a host of websites.)<sup>7</sup>

And it is also interesting to note that a number of first class heathen, that I would not want in my home, wrote comments showing the value of the KJV in religion and literature. There is no end to the scholars who recognize the KJV as the unexcelled masterpiece of English literature. The KJV is widely regarded as the most influential book in the history of the English speaking peoples. There are absolutely no competitors. It would take a library to compile all of the positive complimentary quotes and detailed commentaries bestowed upon the KJV. And we find a continuous stream of KJV praises flowing from mouths, pens and presses for 400 years. And yes, the praises continue today as we approach the 400th birthday of the KJV. May 2, 1611 is the KJV birthday.

Benjamin Keach (1649-1704), in his 1000 page book entitled Preaching from the Types and Metaphors of the Bible, details a host of literary techniques used in the Bible. The Bible is filled with types, figures, metonymy, irony, schemes, parables, synecdoche, hyperbole, allegories, enigmas, and proverbs.<sup>8</sup> Did these come from the KJV? No! The KJV just does a far better job of reflecting the Hebrew and Greek tone, flavor, and mood of these techniques used in the Bible than these other versions. And may I say, in this part of this discussion, this writer is woefully ignorant. Ah! But, history has left us a library full of books to document this tenet.

## Chapter 13: Bible Principles of Interpretation and Translation Continued... Principles 10 to 12: “Tenses”, “The Law of First Mention”, “Rightly Dividing the Word”

### Principle 10: Verb tenses are doctrinally critical.

**Tenth**, even the **verb tenses are doctrinally critical**. Look at the following illustration where the Lord Jesus Christ Himself drives home His point based upon the verb tense.

 **Matthew 22:23 through Matthew 22:33 (KJV)** <sup>23</sup>The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him, <sup>24</sup>Saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. <sup>25</sup>Now there were with us seven brethren: and the first, when he had married a wife, deceased, and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother: <sup>26</sup>Likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seventh. <sup>27</sup>And last of all the woman died also. <sup>28</sup>Therefore in the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her. <sup>29</sup>Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. <sup>30</sup>For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. <sup>31</sup>But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, <sup>32</sup>**I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?** God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. <sup>33</sup>And when the multitude heard *this*, they were astonished at his doctrine.

The point is, as you can see, that God said, “I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.” God did not say that “I **was** the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” and thus proving that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had a soul and that their soul is just as alive as you are. The whole episode is hilarious. The Sadducees were “sad—u—see” because they did not even believe in the resurrection. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are still alive and one day—it will not be long now—they will get a new body in the resurrection. What a glorious hope and a blessed hope. So now, you and I (if you are saved) do not have to be “sad—u—see” because we are not a Sadducee and we have the hope of the resurrection (the raising of the body) through Jesus Christ.

### Principle 11: The Law of First Mention

Eleventh, the “**law of first mention**” while not critical to the **translation** process is an excellent study tool. The law of first mention is this, “The first time that a word is used in the Bible will give the key to meanings elsewhere and throughout the Bible.” Thus, this study tool is critical to the **interpretation** of the Bible.

Let us conduct a short study on the word “believe” using this law. Genesis 15:6 records the first time the word “believe” is used.

(Gen 15:6 KJV) "And he **believed** in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness."

(John 3:16 KJV) "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever **believeth** in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

The following in Romans clearly and fully explains the doctrine of “**the righteousness of God... by faith... without the law.**” However, the “first mention” in Genesis 15:6 contains the complete doctrine and sets forth this principle for the rest of the Bible. Carefully note the following:

Romans 3:21 through Romans 3:31 (KJV) <sup>21</sup>**But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested** being witnessed by the law and the prophets; <sup>22</sup>**Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe:** for there is no difference: <sup>23</sup>For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; <sup>24</sup>Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: <sup>25</sup>Whom God hath set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in his blood, **to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins** that are past, through the forbearance of God; <sup>26</sup>To declare, *I say*, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. <sup>27</sup>Where *is* boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. <sup>28</sup>Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. <sup>29</sup>*Is he* the God of the Jews only? *is he* not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: <sup>30</sup>Seeing *it is* one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith. <sup>31</sup>Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.

Romans 4:1 through Romans 4:9 (KJV) <sup>1</sup>What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? <sup>2</sup>For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath *whereof* to glory; but not before God. <sup>3</sup>For what saith the scripture? **Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto**

**him for righteousness.** <sup>4</sup>Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. <sup>5</sup>But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. <sup>6</sup>Even as **David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works,** <sup>7</sup>*Saying,* Blessed *are* they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. <sup>8</sup>*Blessed is* the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. <sup>9</sup>*Cometh* this blessedness then upon the circumcision *only*, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that **faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness.**

You see, when you trust (believe in) Christ as your saviour, a divine swap takes place. Your unrighteousness (your sinful nature and the sins committed because of your sinful nature) is put to the account of Christ and they were crucified with Him on the cross. At the same point of trust, God imputes or imparts to your account the forgiveness of sins (it takes more than just forgiveness of sins to be saved) and credits to your account the very righteousness of God—that is, the righteousness of Christ Himself. The Lord Himself said that our righteousness had to exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees. Mine certainly did not. So we get the righteousness of God through faith and from Christ. And thus and yes! We are saved because of the righteousness of God that He imputes to every believer.

Think of that! And the seed of this doctrine is planted when the word **“believe” is first mentioned** in the Bible. Dr. M.R. DeHaan and Dr. H.L. Willmington are two outstanding conservative preachers and teachers that come to mind that teach this critical principle of the “law of first mention.”

### **Principle 12: Rightly Dividing the Word**

**Twelfth,** and again, while not critical to the translation process, **“rightly dividing the word”** is a key to appropriately applying God’s truth. The following verse gives us this principle.

 **(2 Tim 2:15 KJV)** "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, **rightly dividing the word of truth.**"

The Bible divides people into three classes. **(1 Cor 10:32 KJV)** "Give none offence, neither to the **Jews**, nor to the **Gentiles**, nor to the **church** of God:..." The three classes of people are the Jew as God’s chosen people to bring Christ into the world, the Gentiles consisting of all other races and nations, and the church which is the called out body of true believers consisting of both the Jew and the Gentile.

The Bible is also divided into time periods. (*Eph 1:10 KJV*) "That in the **dispensation** of the **fullness of times** he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; *even* in him:"

A Biblical time period or dispensation has the following common traits:

1. **God gives a new revelation.**
2. **Man is tested and fails.**
3. **God provides redemption.**

Many Bible believing students divide the Bible into seven time periods and the following scripture reference is the traditional starting point of each dispensation.

1. **Innocence—Gen 1:28**
2. **Conscience—Gen 3:7**
3. **Human Government—Gen 8:15**
4. **Promise—Gen 12:1**
5. **Law—Ex 19:1**
6. **Church Age or Grace—Acts 2:1**
7. **Kingdom—Revelation 20:4**

Another parenthetical time period could be added. This would be the time of the **Tribulation** described in the Book of The Revelation in chapters 6 to 18. See *Dispensational Truth or Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth by Clarence Larkin*.

The above can be quite complicated to a young Christian. However, this “dispensational” view is nevertheless important in understanding the word of God. A broader and easier view would be to divide the Bible into two time periods consisting of the Old and New Testaments. In both testaments, we find the tenets of the sinfulness of man, the judgment of God, the grace of God and salvation through faith. However, in New Testament times, we do not worship in the same manner as taught in the Old Testament—that is around the tabernacle, and the offering of blood sacrifices, and the performing of the rituals of the Old Testament. All of those Old Testament ordinances pointed to Christ. In the New Testament, these Old Testament rituals are done away. Christ has come and fulfilled the Old Testament law. There is no need for the former things. The Old Testament looks forward to the coming of Christ. The New Testament looks back at the life and redeeming work of Christ on the cross. We march in victory from the cross in the power of His resurrection. The Old Testament and New Testament have two views. We need to differentiate between them. It is the same with each of the time periods listed

previously in **1 through 7** and there are valuable lessons in each.

In conclusion, one other helpful hint shows the superiority of the King James Version. The King James Bible contains a built-in dictionary defining all of its words for you. G.A. Riplinger documents the keys for usage of this amazing KJV “built-in dictionary” in her excellent and highly recommended book, *In Awe of thy Word*.<sup>1</sup>

1. **The definition may be the word next to the word.**
2. **The definition may be in the same verse.**
3. **The definition may be in the preceding or the following verse.**
4. **The definition may be somewhere in the chapter.**

Example: Mark 1:18, 20, 28, 29, 30, 31. Webster’s 1828 Dictionary defines ‘straightway,’ ‘forthwith,’ and ‘anon’ as “**immediately.**” The same definition is given in parallelism by the KJV’s built-in dictionary.

All of these words are from the same Greek word and Strong’s # “**G2112** eutheoōs, an adverb from **G2117**; *directly*, that is, *at once* or *soon*:—anon, as soon as, forthwith, immediately, shortly, straightway” or its derivative listed above **G2117**.

The word of God is the power of God unto salvation. These new versions subvert and pervert God’s word. Look at the blessed promises we have in the word of God about the word of God.

 **1 Peter 1:23 through 1 Peter 1:25 (KJV)** <sup>23</sup>Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. <sup>24</sup>For all flesh *is* as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: <sup>25</sup>But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.

## Chapter 14: “What Think Ye Of Christ” Or The Doctrine Of Christ

 **Matthew 22:41 through Matthew 22:42 (KJV)** <sup>41</sup>While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, <sup>42</sup>Saying, **What think ye of Christ? whose son is he?** They say unto him, *The Son of David.*

The most important question facing mankind—the most important question facing every individual—every man, woman, boy, or girl and the most important question facing every sinful, fallen creature is simply, “What think ye of Christ?” The eternal destiny of heaven or hell of every person rises or falls on this one question. Each person born into Adam’s fallen race was born with a sin nature and thus in time sinned.

 **Romans 5:12 (KJV)** says <sup>12</sup>“Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.”

Look at **Romans 3:10 (KJV)** <sup>10</sup>“As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one.”

Now look at **Romans 3:23 (KJV)** <sup>23</sup>“For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;”

And lets look at **Romans 6:23 (KJV)** <sup>23</sup>“For the wages of sin *is* death; but the gift of God *is* eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

One note: Babies and children who have not reached the age of accountability, even though born with a sin nature, are not condemned before God. This is not a subject for discussion here and there is no need for elaboration.

However, the above verses put all mankind under the condemnation and judgment of God. “The wages of sin is death,” the Bible says. Search and look, the only book in the world that explains death is the Bible. The Bible talks about a first death that all of must face Then, the Bible speaks of a second death. The first death speaks of the body and the grave. The second death speaks of the soul and eternal judgment in the lake of fire. **Revelation 21:8 (KJV)** says <sup>8</sup>“**But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.**”

What a terrible condition mankind is in. But, the “but” in Romans 6:23 changes all of this. **“But the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.”**

Now, almost every Christian knows that the above verses come from an evangelistic outline called the “Romans Road.” This outline has been used to lead thousands to the Lord. Romans 10:9-10 concludes and tells us how to receive this gift of eternal life. **Romans 10:9 through Romans 10:10 (KJV)** **“<sup>9</sup>That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. <sup>10</sup>For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.”**

We simply believe to receive Christ and eternal life. Our confession is a public confession or profession of faith to others. This public profession provides the world with evidence of our salvation. Thus, the old adage, “Possessing Faith is Professing Faith” is absolutely true. Believers Baptism is the God ordained method for a Christian to make a public profession of faith. Baptism is symbolic of our identification with Christ in His death, burial and resurrection. See Romans chapter 6.

John 1:12-13 makes it plain that believing and receiving Christ is the same thing. Read and reread this verse. **John 1:12 through John 1:13 (KJV)** says **“<sup>12</sup>But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, *even* to them that believe on his name: <sup>13</sup>Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.”**

This is a short and simple explanation of salvation. Salvation is an immediate transaction based upon your simple faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

The question here is. What Christ is it that saves? The answer is of course, “the Christ of the Bible.” The Bible continually warns of false christs and/or antichrists. **2 John 1:7 through 2 John 1:9 (KJV)** says **“<sup>7</sup>For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. <sup>8</sup>Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward. <sup>9</sup>Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.”**

Note, the Bible says “many deceivers.” The deceivers have the following classic traits:

1. They deny Jesus came in the flesh.
2. They transgress the doctrine of Christ. Transgress means to violate or break.
3. They do not abide in the doctrine of Christ. When the Bible says they “abideth not”, the indication is that these deceivers or antichrists move in and out of the doctrine of Christ as it fits their evil needs and

desires.

The Bible teaches us to beware of wolves in sheep’s clothing. We look for the wolf. The wolf will not fool the sheep. It is the wolf in sheep’s clothing that we need to be on the lookout for.

 **Matthew 7:15 (KJV)** <sup>15</sup>**Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.**

Somewhere, somehow—I do not know—early after I trusted Christ to save me, it became clear that Christians could quickly identify an antichrist or deceiver and Christian cultist by simply asking the right question and the proper follow up questions. The process is amazingly simple. Ask the wolf in sheep’s clothing, “What think ye of Christ?” You will get basically orthodox answers at first, (they come in sheep’s clothing). However, as you keep up your quest in asking about a person’s thoughts on Christ, the true position of a deceiver will be revealed.

Note here, **1 John 2:18 through 1 John 2:22 (KJV)** <sup>18</sup>**Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time.** <sup>19</sup>**They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would *no doubt* have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.** <sup>20</sup>**But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.** <sup>21</sup>**I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth.** <sup>22</sup>**Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son.”**

This passage is critical. The passage clearly teaches that the doctrine of Christ will separate the Christians from the non-Christians and religious pretenders. Christians have a divine unction from the Holy One and the seal of the indwelling Spirit of God as a guide for us. This could be described as a divine instinct from the divine interpreter of God—the Third Person of the Trinity, which is, of course, the Holy Spirit.

Now the majority of my very little experience in dealing with cults has been with the Jehovah’s Witnesses. They are a smug, self-righteous little clan that typify and illustrate wolves in sheep’s clothing. They dress like a Christian. They act like a Christian by visiting and going into “all the world.” They go two by two. JWs carry a Bible, quote the Bible, and their unblessed Watch Tower Society Bible literature.

They strut on your porch and sit in your home with the sheep’s cloak on. I do not invite them in because of the admonition found in II John. Now, when you can get a word in edge wise, ask a JW, “Who is Jesus Christ?”

JW will answer, “The Son of God.” You ask, “Is he God?”

JW will answer, “He is a god.” Note the word “a.” You ask, “Please explain.” JW will answer, John 1:1 says, “The ‘word’ refers to ‘Jesus’ and he is a god according to the new world translation.”

You respond, “My King James Version reads ‘The word was God’.”

JW responds, “In the Greek the Bible says... so on and so forth ...”

You can go on and on, but there will be no way to convince one of a thousand or ten thousand that Jesus is God. I generally ask the JW about how much Greek they know? And if you want to be mean about it, you could carry a Greek passage and ask them to read it to you. Note: I do not know Greek either.

The point here is that the JW’s miss the entire point of the book of John and a whole multitude of other passages throughout the New Testament. The doctrine taught and the whole purpose of the book of John was to prove, beyond any shadow of doubt, that Jesus was God. When that is settled, then, we can have eternal life by believing in Him. **See John 20:30-31.** All cultists and deceivers appearing as wolves in sheep’s clothing can be quickly identified by a few well-timed and well-directed questions based on the theme, “Is Jesus God?”

### “What Think Ye of Christ?”

The basics of the doctrine of Christ or “Christology” are as follows. And listed you will find several passages that clearly point to the correct orthodox position of the doctrine of Christ.

Just a comment before we get started. Satan has the same heresies that he has promoted for centuries. He is like an old magician. He may change suits and get himself a new outfit, but the tricks are the same. We will look at a brief background of Satanic devices when we get to the heresies.

Hebrews 11:1-3 is a critical passage in explaining the true Christian point of view when dealing with the doctrine of Christ.

 ***Hebrews 11:1 through Hebrews 11:3 (KJV)*** <sup>1</sup>Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. <sup>2</sup>For by it the elders obtained a good report. <sup>3</sup>**Through faith we understand** that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.

Look at the little phrase, “Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God.” When a Christian believes the Bible, he understands the pure doctrine of Christ because he believes what God has revealed about His son.

Read again, “Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God.” Now note the following with a special emphasis on John 1:1-3 and John 1:14.

 **John 1:1 through John 1:3 (KJV)** <sup>1</sup>In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. <sup>2</sup>The same was in the beginning with God. <sup>3</sup>All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.

 **John 1:14 (KJV)** <sup>14</sup>And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

 **Romans 1:3 through Romans 1:4 (KJV)** <sup>3</sup>Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; <sup>4</sup>And declared *to be* the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead:

 **Colossians 1:14 (KJV)** <sup>14</sup>In whom we have redemption through his blood, *even* the forgiveness of sins:

Thus, we see the “word” that was made “flesh” (that is Jesus) and Jesus made all things. Here is the key: I understand what God had to say about His Son and creation. You can understand that perfectly.

I do not understand the how. The how must be taken as everything else in this life—by faith. Many say they want proof. And yes, there is absolute and infallible proof! Creation and you are the proof! You exist because God made you exist. Only a fool tries to put God in a glass jar and run an analysis on the Creator of heaven and earth. Poor little ole man has been unable to create one simple cell of life. Yet man, in many cases, wants to be his own God. God is God and the doctrine of Christ is clear.

Now, the basics of the doctrine of Christ are briefly taught in the aforementioned verses and summarized as follows:

1. Christ was pre-existent with the Father and thus not created but was, in fact, creator of all things.
2. Christ is God and equal with the Father and thus not “a” god or sub-god or a little god.
3. Christ was fully God on this earth as He always was from eternity. His body contained the complete divine nature of God and thus did not become God at a later date. Note: we fully understand that Jesus voluntarily laid aside some of His glory, for a time, to come to the world in the flesh.
4. Christ was fully man and thus not some kind of spirit cloaked in the form of a man.
5. God used the virgin birth to bring Christ into this world. And thus,

- Christ is the “only begotten” of the Father. Jesus is fully God and fully man, thus unbelief in the virgin birth denies the deity of Christ.
6. Christ died for our sins and suffered His death as our sin substitute and sacrifice, thus there is no other way that leads to salvation and eternal life.
  7. The resurrection is our proof of these tenets and the proof of the satisfaction of God the Father with the work of His Son on the cross. The atonement of Jesus Christ was made on behalf of all mankind. As true believers, we have no reason to despair or fear.

Again in the above you will find the basics of the doctrine of Christ and a few simple proof texts. For a fuller explanation turn to any page in your KJV Bible and start reading. The theme of the Bible is Jesus. Look at John 5:46-47.

 **John 5:46 through John 5:47 (KJV)** <sup>46</sup>For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. <sup>47</sup>But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?

## **Chapter 15—“Begotten” And Its Relationship To The Physical Birth Of Christ—A Glorious Gospel Truth**

The critical issue in this study is the doctrinal perversions of John 3:16 and “only begotten.” Here, we begin a new section to deal with doctrinal issues. The translators of these perverted versions claim they are completely orthodox and each specific reading in each new translation is completely orthodox and doctrinally accurate. Whenever their hand is called for watering down certain passages, these translators squeal like an old pig, that is being rooted out from the trough, and claim their pseudo-scholarship is a return to an older more accurate reading. The truth is that neither older, nor more accurate is true. These overly zealous eggheads have anointed themselves as the guardians of their own brand of truth. These scholars act as surgeons and can dissect words. They write pages upon pages of interpretation on a single word but cannot put these words in context of a simple sentence or in context with the Bible. Wait a minute—I am sounding like them—they can dissect a word but cannot put together a simple sentence or thought.

These modernist and liberal scholars have created a host of problems in dealing with John 3:16. They have perverted John 3:16 with their subtle changes. The introduction of unorthodox interpretations, and the robbing of this summative verse of numerous critical ties that break the completion and continuity of a multitude of thought lines and interconnected Bible doctrines, is blasphemous. Every individual passage in the Bible relates to the Bible as a whole. The translators of these perversions have “blindness” (used on old farm mules) on and fail to understand the significance of the word “begotten” in relation to the rest of the Bible.

This book offers two complete sets of proofs to verify the translations of “only begotten” in the KJV.

1. The first set of proofs is found beginning in chapter IV documenting the historical and time tested “only begotten” rendering by spiritual and intellectual giants of the faith.
2. The second set of doctrinal proofs is found here in Section II and starting with chapter 15. These doctrinal proofs are based on the internal evidence from the Bible itself. That is—the Bible must agree with itself and be in perfect doctrinal harmony.

Now, we will look at the doctrinal perversions created by these new versions. We will divide this section of the book into four parts in an effort to touch on the perversions as opposed to the doctrinal truths found in John 3:16. The four parts are as follows: “Begotten” and Its Relationship To The Physical Birth Of Christ—A Glorious Gospel Truth; “Begotten” and Its Relationship To Other Bible Doctrines; John 3:16 and Its Role In Refuting

---

Ancient Heresies; John 3: 16 And Other Vital Doctrinal Considerations.

**“Begotten” and Its Relationship To The Physical Birth Of Christ—The Correct View & A Glorious Gospel Truth**

As just stated, every passage in the Bible relates to the whole. The old adage “a text without context is pretext” is absolutely true. Context must be considered on four levels:

1. **The context of the immediate passage.**
2. **The context within the specific book of the Bible.**
3. **The context of the Bible when taken as a whole.**
4. **The contexts of the usage of the Hebrew, Greek and English words in other passages of the Bible.**

Inserted are all the verses in the Bible where the Greek word “monogenes” is used. There are a total of nine verses where “monogenes” is used. These verses have been listed for your quick reference in two formats:

- ◆ **RD#7:** The KJV with the Strong’s Concordance numbers attached. Note: The Strong’s number for “monogenes” is **G3439 in the bold reference.**<sup>1</sup>
- ◆ **RD#8:** The standard KJV reading with **[monogenes] noted in brackets.**<sup>1</sup>

The first three verses listed in each format do not refer to Christ. The last six verses refer to Christ with Hebrews 11:17 comparing Isaac to Christ. Hebrews 11:17 will be explained in context with its immediate passage and the rest of the Bible later in this chapter.

As you can see, in the first three verses “monogenes” is interpreted as follows:

1. Luke 7:12—“only” in the context of “the only son of his mother”
2. Luke 8:42—“one only” in the context of “he had one only daughter”
3. Luke 9:38—“only child” in the context of “he is mine only child”

These are verses that are sometimes quoted in order to justify the rendering of “only son” or “one and only son” in John 3:16 in the new perverted translations.

If you have read this book word for word up to this point, you know that this writer believes the Greek should be translated literally. The obvious question arises, “Why was “genes” part of “monogenes” in the Greek not translated as “begotten” in the English in the verses in Luke?”

When you study these passages (that is, if you study these passages) you do not have to be a scholar to discern the following simple facts concerning these readings. In all three verses the **literal** meaning is clearly expounded within the very brief and simple context. There was no need for the word “begotten” because:

1. It is clear that the “**begetting**” (yes, this is a word) had taken place.
2. It is clear who the “**begetter**” was.
3. It is clear who the “**begotten**” was.
4. The Greek word “**monogenes**” relates in all three cases to the procreation process or physical birth and that is clearly related in the KJV.

**Proof Documentation from the Reference Desk RD# 7**  
**The KJV with the Strong’s Concordance numbers attached.**  
**Note: The Strong’s number for “monogenes” is G3439.**

-  **Luke 7:12 (KJV)** <sup>12</sup>Now <sup>G1161</sup> when <sup>G5613</sup> he came <sup>G1448</sup> nigh <sup>G1448</sup> to the gate <sup>G4439</sup> of the city <sup>G4172</sup>, behold <sup>G2400</sup>, there was a dead <sup>G2348</sup> man carried <sup>G1580</sup> out, the **only** <sup>G3439</sup> son <sup>G5207</sup> of his mother <sup>G3384</sup>, and she was a widow <sup>G5503</sup>; and much <sup>G2425</sup> people <sup>G3793</sup> of the city <sup>G4172</sup> was with her.
-  **Luke 8:42 (KJV)** <sup>42</sup>For he had <sup>G1510</sup> one **only** <sup>G3439</sup> daughter <sup>G2364</sup>; about <sup>G5613</sup> twelve <sup>G1427</sup> years <sup>G2094</sup> of age, and she lay a dying <sup>G599</sup>. But as he went <sup>G5217</sup> the people <sup>G3793</sup> thronged <sup>G4846</sup> him.
-  **Luke 9:38 (KJV)** <sup>38</sup>And, behold <sup>G2400</sup>, a man <sup>G435</sup> of the company <sup>G3793</sup> cried <sup>G310</sup> out, saying <sup>G3004</sup>, Master <sup>G1320</sup>, I beseech <sup>G1189</sup> thee, look <sup>G1914</sup> upon my son <sup>G5207</sup>: for he is mine <sup>G3427</sup> **only** <sup>G3439</sup> child <sup>G3439</sup>.
-  **John 1:14 (KJV)** <sup>14</sup>And the Word <sup>G3056</sup> was made <sup>G1096</sup> flesh <sup>G4561</sup>, and dwelt <sup>G4637</sup> among <sup>G1722</sup> us, (and we beheld <sup>G2300</sup> his glory <sup>G1391</sup>, the glory <sup>G1391</sup> as of the **only** <sup>G3439</sup> **begotten** <sup>G3439</sup> of the Father <sup>G3962</sup>), full <sup>G4134</sup> of grace <sup>G5485</sup> and truth <sup>G225</sup>.
-  **John 1:18 (KJV)** <sup>18</sup>No <sup>G3762</sup> man <sup>G3762</sup> hath seen <sup>G3708</sup> God <sup>G2316</sup> at <sup>G4455</sup> any <sup>G4455</sup> time <sup>G4455</sup>, the **only** <sup>G3439</sup> **begotten** <sup>G3439</sup> Son <sup>G5207</sup>, which <sup>G3588</sup> is in the bosom <sup>G2859</sup> of the Father <sup>G3962</sup>, he hath declared <sup>G1834</sup> him.
-  **John 3:16 (KJV)** <sup>16</sup>For God <sup>G2316</sup> so <sup>G3779</sup> loved <sup>G25</sup> the world <sup>G2889</sup>, that he gave <sup>G1325</sup> his **only** <sup>G3439</sup> **begotten** <sup>G3439</sup> Son <sup>G5207</sup>, that whosoever <sup>G3956-G3588</sup> believeth <sup>G4100</sup> in him should not perish <sup>G622</sup>, but have <sup>G2192</sup> everlasting <sup>G166</sup> life <sup>G2222</sup>.
-  **John 3:18 (KJV)** <sup>18</sup>He that believeth <sup>G4100</sup> on <sup>G1519</sup> him is not condemned <sup>G2919</sup>: but he that believeth <sup>G4100</sup> not is condemned <sup>G2919</sup> already <sup>G2235</sup>, because <sup>G3754</sup> he hath not believed <sup>G4100</sup> in the name <sup>G3686</sup> of the **only** <sup>G3439</sup> **begotten** <sup>G3439</sup> Son <sup>G5207</sup> of God <sup>G2316</sup>.
-  **Hebrews 11:17 (KJV)** <sup>17</sup>By faith <sup>G4102</sup> Abraham <sup>G11</sup>, when he was tried <sup>G3985</sup>, offered <sup>G4374</sup> up Isaac <sup>G2464</sup>. and he that had received <sup>G324</sup> the promises <sup>G1860</sup> offered <sup>G4374</sup> up his **only** <sup>G3439</sup> **begotten** <sup>G3439</sup> son.
-  **1 John 4:9 (KJV)** <sup>9</sup>In this <sup>G5129</sup> was manifested <sup>G5319</sup> the love <sup>G26</sup> of God <sup>G2316</sup> toward <sup>G1722</sup> us, because <sup>G3754</sup> that God <sup>G2316</sup> sent <sup>G649</sup> his **only** <sup>G3439</sup> **begotten** <sup>G3439</sup> Son <sup>G5207</sup> into <sup>G1519</sup> the world <sup>G2889</sup>, that we might live <sup>G2198</sup> through <sup>G1223</sup> him.

**Proof Documentation from the Reference Desk *RD# 8***  
**The standard KJV reading with [monogenes] noted in brackets.**

-  **Luke 7:12 (KJV)** <sup>12</sup>Now when he came nigh to the gate of the city, behold, there was a dead man carried out, the **only [monogenes]** son of his mother, and she was a widow: and much people of the city was with her.
-  **Luke 8:42 (KJV)** <sup>42</sup>For he had **one only [monogenes]** daughter, about twelve years of age, and she lay a dying. But as he went the people thronged him.
-  **Luke 9:38 (KJV)** <sup>38</sup>And, behold, a man of the company cried out, saying, Master, I beseech thee, look upon my son: for he is **mine only [monogenes]** child.
-  **John 1:14 (KJV)** <sup>14</sup>And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the **only begotten [monogenes]** of the Father,) full of grace and truth.
-  **John 1:18 (KJV)** <sup>18</sup>No man hath seen God at any time; the **only begotten [monogenes]** Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared *him*.
-  **John 3:16 (KJV)** <sup>16</sup>For God so loved the world, that he gave his **only begotten [monogenes]** Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.
-  **John 3:18 (KJV)** <sup>18</sup>He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the **only begotten [monogenes]** Son of God.
-  **Hebrews 11:17 (KJV)** <sup>17</sup>By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his **only begotten [monogenes]** son,
-  **1 John 4:9 (KJV)** <sup>9</sup>In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his **only begotten [monogenes]** Son into the world, that we might live through him.

Again, **the literal meaning is always clear in the KJV.** In addition, “genes” or “begotten” has no doctrinal significance in these first three cases. The word “begotten” has tremendous doctrinal implications in the KJV when used in reference (either in direct reference or indirect reference) to Christ. Also note, “monogenes” when referring to Christ is fully translated as “only begotten” in every case.

In the KJV, the words beget, beget, begetteth, begetteth, and begotten, are used hundreds of times in both testaments in relation to the physical procreation process of the begetting of the flesh. Look at John 1:14.

📖 **John 1:14 (KJV)** <sup>14</sup>And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

Note the words: “the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,).” **Note, “made flesh” is even defined by the parenthesis “only begotten of the Father.”** Amazing! How simple the Bible makes it for us to understand. The purpose of a parenthesis according to Mr. Webster is “an amplifying or explanatory word, phrase, or sentence inserted in a passage...” And the Greek word for “made” is “ginomai”—the root word for “begotten”. In other words the root for the “genes” portion of “monogenes” is “ginomai.”

Now a host of Bible scholars teach the “law of first mention.” As we have discussed, the first mention of a word in the Bible will render the key to the usage in the rest of the Bible. Look at Genesis 4:17-18.

📖 **Genesis 4:17-18 (KJV)** <sup>17</sup>And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived, and **bare** Enoch: and he builded a city, and called the name of the city, after the name of his son, Enoch. <sup>18</sup>And unto Enoch was **born** Irad: and Irad **begat** Mehujael: and Mehujael **begat** Methusael: and Methusael **begat** Lamech.

Note the word “bare” (not its first usage) and “born” (first usage) and the word “begat” (first usage). All of these refer to a physical birth. Look again in the following passage at the first usage of “begotten” and how it refers to the physical procreation process.

📖 **Genesis 5:4 (KJV)** <sup>4</sup>And the days of Adam after he had **begotten** Seth were eight hundred years: and he **begat** sons and daughters:

**Maybe, you did not get the point. And there is one critical proof point here. In the KJV, the words begat, beget, begetteth, begetteth, and begotten, are used hundreds of times in relation to the physical procreation process of the begetting of the flesh.** Yes, this is a repeat of the above statement. Yes, the KJV translators knew the Hebrew and Greek words related to physical birth and thus we find the same relationship in the English words. To say that these translators (the best qualified in the history of the Bible) did not understand these critical points is absurd. Our greatest proof text and proof study is in the full agreement of the KJV itself, by itself and within itself! Let us continue for more KJV agreement.

Ah! Yes! The KJV relates these words to each other and thus each will help define the other. G.A. Riplinger calls this the KJV “built-in

dictionary.”

Now when we come to John 1:14, as we cited above, the first usage of the word “monogenes” as it refers to Christ, undeniably links the words “only begotten” with “made flesh” and defines the terms for us.

A book could easily be written on John 1:14, but the background has been covered here. However, you need to know that there are **three views** of the word “begotten” in relation to Christ. **The first is the above view that “begotten” refers to “made flesh” and this is clearly the teaching in John.** Look at the relation of Matthew to John.

 **Matthew 1:20 (KJV)** <sup>20</sup>But while he thought<sup>G1760</sup> on<sup>G1760</sup> these<sup>G5023</sup> things, behold<sup>G2400</sup>, the angel<sup>G32</sup> of the Lord<sup>G2962</sup> appeared<sup>G5316</sup> unto him in a dream<sup>G3677</sup>, saying<sup>G3004</sup>, Joseph<sup>G2501</sup>, thou son<sup>G5207</sup> of David<sup>G1138</sup>, fear<sup>G5399</sup> not to take<sup>G3880</sup> unto thee Mary<sup>G3137</sup> thy wife<sup>G1135</sup>: for that which is **conceived**<sup>G1080</sup> in her is of the Holy<sup>G40</sup> Ghost<sup>G4151</sup>. footnote 2

The Greek word for “**conceived**” from *Strong’s Hebrew and Greek Dictionaries* is: “**G1080** gennaō *ghen-nah'-o* From a variation of G1085; to procreate (properly of the father, but by extension of the mother); figuratively to regenerate:—bear, beget, be born, bring forth, conceive, be delivered of, gender, make, spring.”<sup>3</sup>

**The Greek word for “conceived” is the root word for “begotten” in John 3:16!** Absolutely amazing! The Bible agrees with itself! As we have seen in **Strong’s**, the reference 1096, *ginomai*, is the root for “begotten” (the “*genes*” part of “*monogenes*”). From some quick reference work in Strong’s, we have the derivation of the *genes* part of *monogenes* as *ginomai* (1096) < *genos* (1085) < *gennaō* (1080) < *genes* (the masculine derivation as it relates to Jesus’ Father). You will note, “**genes**” is actually derived from a more definitive form of that word, 1080, *gennaō*. *Gennaō* is the sub-root of “begotten.”<sup>4</sup>

This is simple and absolutely undeniable. The divine conception that took place in Matthew is clearly taught in John when he said “the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.)...”

The only reason this is mentioned is that it is a sheer gross misinterpretation to say that “only begotten” does not refer to the incarnation or the birth of Christ. Listen to *VINE’S COMPLETE EXPOSITORY DICTIONARY OF OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT WORDS* W.E. VINE, MERRILL F. UNGER, WILLIAM WHITE, JR.—Vol. 2, Page 447. The **bold** in the following is **mine**.

We can only rightly understand the term “the only begotten” when used of the Son, in the sense of **unoriginated** relationship. **“The begetting is not an event of time,** however remote, but a fact irrespective of time. The Christ did not *become*, but necessarily and eternally *is* the Son... In John 3:16 the statement, “God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son,” **must not be taken to mean that Christ became the only begotten son by incarnation...** In John 3:18 the phrase “the name of the only begotten son of God” lays stress upon the full revelation of God’s character and will, His love and grace, as conveyed in the name of One who, being in a unique relationship to Him, was provided by Him as the object of faith. In 1 John 4:9 the statement “God hath sent His only begotten son into the world” does not mean that God sent out into the world one who at His birth in Bethlehem had become His Son.<sup>5</sup>

Three times in the above passage, “only begotten” is denied as having any relationship with the incarnation. If you are any kind of Bible student at all, you know how popular the above commentary is. Vine’s is referenced herein because of the popular usage of this commentary. However, this is only one of many.

Note the statement, “In 1 John 4:9 the statement ‘God hath sent His only begotten son into the world’ does not mean that God sent out into the world one who at His birth in Bethlehem had become His Son.” This statement is true. However, it is misleading and addresses a non-issue in this specific passage of Christ becoming God’s Son at His birth—that would be heresy. Jesus did not become the son at His birth because He was God’s Son “in the beginning.” The exact wording of the passage teaches the opposite saying **“God sent his only begotten son.”** And yes, Christ was the eternal Son of God when God sent Him. And, as we have proven, “begotten” refers to the physical birth and incarnation of Christ. The revelation of the Son to us was through the fact that He was begotten.

The other thing we should mention here is that the new commentaries that are coming out almost inevitably use “unique” as the definition of “begotten.” These commentaries do not deny the incarnation in other passages but rather support it. They are inconsistent. The problem here is that these new commentaries are “batched.” That is one author handles a batch and another author handles a batch, and thus there is not continuity of thought and of doctrinal lines. In addition, one commentator reads after others to get the latest batch of thought lines, readings and interpretations. Then, the old expression “monkey see, monkey do” is applicable here. Note the following comparison.

**The Believer’s Bible Commentary** in their comments of John 1:14 say, “Jesus is **the only begotten of the Father**, that is, Christ is God’s unique Son. God did not have any other Son like Him. In one sense, all true believers are sons of God. But Jesus is *the* Son of God—in a class all by Himself. As the Son of God, He is equal to God.”<sup>6</sup>

**Nelson’s New Illustrated Bible Commentary**, in their comments of John 1:14 say, “**Only begotten** (3:16, 18) means unique, one of a kind. The same term is used of Isaac (Heb 11:17), who was not the only physical son of Abraham, but was the unique son of promise. All who trust Christ are born of God. In the Gospel of John, these “born ones” are called children of God (vv. 12, 13), but Jesus Christ is the unique Son of God. He is the only Son who is fully God.”<sup>7</sup>

Both of these are **not** wrong in what they say. And yet, in one sense, they are **not right**. They are just not precisely right. We repeat. These commentaries miss the mark when they fail to direct their comments to the foundational doctrine of the incarnation. The “uniqueness” of Jesus is His “begottenness.” “Begotten” does not mean unique. Again this is “monkey see, monkey do” pseudo-scholarship. God help us to study the Bible and not to rely on some egghead’s explanation. We need to get back to the book.

There is a big difference in these new “theologians” and actual doctrinal beliefs and preaching within the protestant denominations. We will point out some well-rounded and well-grounded authors who agree with this writer’s point of view. Here are some real heavy weights and some clear-cut statements of faith from various sound denominations to support our position.

J. Vernon McGee in his *Thru the Bible* commentary, in his remarks on John 1:1-2, says:

“The Greek philosopher probably would have stayed with us through verse one, but he leaves us here. He would never agree that the Word was made flesh. The Greek language allows us to put it more specifically and, I think, more accurately: “The Word was *born* flesh.” Turn this over in your mind for a moment. Here comes God out of eternity, already the Ancient of days; but He also came to Bethlehem, a little baby thing that made a woman cry. And notice that John’s gospel does not even mention His birth in Bethlehem. Do you know why? He is talking about One who is too big for Bethlehem. Out of eternity, the Word became flesh.”<sup>8</sup>

John R. Rice in his commentary on John, *The Son of God*, page 29 in

his section title says, “Christ, the Physically begotten Son of God.” On the following page he says, “In other words, Jesus was the sinlessly born, physically begotten of God.”<sup>9</sup>

Charles Haddon Spurgeon in his published sermon *The Great Birthday* discusses the birth of Christ and gives us this revealing statement, “God’s hands do not glorify him so much as the gift of his dear Son...his Only Begotten and sends him into the world...” Mr. Spurgeon left us a rich bounty and I have no doubt that there are not literally dozens of such statements.<sup>10</sup>

Harold Willmington of Liberty University and the author *Willmington’s Guide to the Bible* writes, “The Savior was begotten by the Holy Spirit” and quotes Luke 1:35. “**Luke 1:35 (KJV)** <sup>35</sup>**And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.**”<sup>11</sup>

J. Sidlow Baxter in his book, *Explore the Book* heads a section in his study on “John’s Gospel” as “Incarnate Word: Only-begotten Son.” He makes exactly the same connection as made above.<sup>12</sup>

G.A. Riplinger states “Christians have tenaciously held to the doctrine that Christ is God and co-eternal with the Father. The term ‘begotten’ is used in reference to Christ, is introduced and interpreted in John 1:14.” She then references John 1:14 and continues, “From this we gather that ‘begotten’ is used in reference to the body of ‘flesh’ ‘beheld’ by mankind.” She then references Gabriel’s address to Mary in Luke 1:35.<sup>13</sup>

Adam Clarke, the old Methodist in *Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the New Testament* supports our position as he comments on John 1:14. “**The only begotten of the Father**—That is, the only person born of a woman, whose human nature never came by the ordinary way of generation; it being a mere creation in the womb of the virgin, by the energy of the Holy Ghost.”<sup>14</sup>

Dr. W. A. Criswell, Mr. Southern Baptist, is the man who influenced Baptists, and in my opinion, the entire realm of Christianity more than any man in the past century. In his sermon, *The Christ Of Christmas* with the text of Luke 2:9, and preached on 12-23-90, Dr. Criswell gives us the following.

And Joseph thought to put her away. And the angel said, ‘Joseph, fear not to take unto thee thy espoused, promised, wife Mary. For that which is born in her is the Son of God.’”

And all of this came to pass that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, ‘A virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son. And thou shalt call His name Emmanuel which being interpreted is, “God with us.”’

“For the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. And we saw His glory, as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and

truth.”<sup>15</sup>

I researched a host of messages from Criswell and his view of the incarnation and there is no question the he made the connection between “made flesh” and “only begotten.” In addition, if you read his sermons, you can easily discern that he believed that the proper view of the incarnation was an absolute condition to a proper view of Christianity. A quote from another sermon of his is found in “Chapter 4, Proof Studies.”

Read this little excerpt from Dr. Ian Richard Kyle Paisley from the book *CHRISTIAN FOUNDATIONS* and the chapter “Seven Reasons Why I Believe In THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST,” “To reject the Virgin Birth is to imply that our Lord Jesus Christ was an imposter and liar. He claimed to be the only begotten Son of God. How could He be that, when in reality He was, according to these blaspheming modernists, the bastard child of a fallen woman? Such are some of the implications involved in denying the Virgin Birth.”<sup>16</sup>

Dr. Hank Lindstrom was the former Pastor of Calvary Community Church in Tampa, Florida where he served from 1966 until he went home to be with the Lord in 2008. Hulk Hogan trusted Jesus Christ at the age of thirteen in one of Dr. Lindstrom's meetings. Dr. Ralph "Yankee" Arnold, the current pastor, and Calvary Community Church maintain an excellent webpage entitled the Biblelineministries Web Page. Dr. Lindstrom explains the meaning of “only begotten son” at the Biblelineministries Web Page.

Jesus Christ is the "only begotten Son", according to John 3:16. In John 1:14, He is the "only begotten of the Father." What is this phrase speaking about? We know that Jesus Christ is God and man. Jesus Christ is God in human flesh (II Corinthians 5:19). Two thousand years ago, God came to the earth taking on Himself human flesh in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. Each Christmas we celebrate this wonderful event..... John 3:16 reminds us of this wonderful doctrine of the incarnation of God in a human body. Jesus was then to die on Calvary to pay for the sins of all mankind, so that all who would trust (believe) on Christ would not perish, but have everlasting life.<sup>17</sup>

The *Southern Baptist Statement of Faith* states, “Christ is the eternal Son of God. In His incarnation as Jesus Christ He was conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of the virgin Mary.”<sup>18</sup> And yes, they are exactly right.

The [United Methodist Church Official Website](#) quote the Brethren in their foundational documents and put forth this “Confession of Faith”, “We believe in Jesus Christ, truly God and truly man, in whom the divine and

---

human natures are perfectly and inseparably united. He is the eternal Word made flesh, the only begotten Son of the Father, born of the Virgin Mary by the power of the Holy Spirit. As ministering Servant he lived, suffered and died on the cross. He was buried, rose from the dead and ascended into heaven to be with the Father, from whence he shall return. He is eternal Savior and Mediator, who intercedes for us, and by him all men will be judged.”<sup>19</sup>

Evangelical Presbyterian Church in its *Essentials of Our Faith* says... “Jesus Christ, the living Word, become flesh through His miraculous conception by the Holy Spirit and His virgin birth. He who is true God became true man united in one Person forever. He died on the cross a sacrifice for our sins according to the Scriptures. On the third day He arose bodily from the dead, ascended into heaven, where, at the right hand of the Majesty on High, He now is our High Priest and Mediator.”<sup>20</sup>

*The Church of the United Brethren in Christ, USA* in their *Confession of Faith* reads as follows... “We believe in Jesus Christ; that He is very God and man; that He became incarnate by the power of the Holy Ghost in the Virgin Mary and was born of her; that He is the Savior and Mediator of the whole human race, if they with full faith in Him accept the grace proffered in Jesus; that this Jesus suffered and died on the cross for us, was buried, arose again on the third day, ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God to intercede for us; and that He shall come again at the last day to judge the quick and the dead.”<sup>21</sup>

## Chapter 16: The View That “Begotten” Refers to the Doctrine of the “Eternal Generation” of Christ

The second and erroneous view of “begotten” is that God begat the Son sometime in eternity past before the creation of the world. This is known as the doctrine of the “Eternal Generation” of Christ. John 3:16, along with other “only begotten” verses in the gospel of John are some of the “proof” texts that some try to use to advocate for this “eternal generation” tenet. This “doctrine” was totally unknown to me until I begin this study—that is 30 years of studying my Bible, reading Christian books and commentaries, and attending church 3 times weekly with no comment about “eternal generation” from pastors or teachers. This shocked me in that some (many in fact) orthodox and well respected men hold this view and many commentators from yesteryear consider this view to be orthodox. However, through the centuries this doctrine of “eternal generation” has been a bone of contention. As we have noted and will continue to note in undisputable fashion, the “only begotten” verses without question refer to the incarnation of Christ. There seems to be no end to the Satanic attack on John 3:16 and other “only begotten” passages.

John Gill (1697-1771) wrote “A Dissertation Concerning The Eternal Sonship Of Christ, Shewing By Whom It Has Been Denied And Opposed, and By Whom Asserted And Defended In All Ages Of Christianity” (<http://www.reformedreader.org/rbs/gill/dissertation.htm>.) In his dissertation, Gill equates the belief in the Eternal Sonship of Christ and belief in the Trinity with “eternal generation”. In other words, in his mind, you must believe all three. This writer certainly believes that the Son is Co-eternal with the Father and certainly believes in the Trinity. However, this “eternal generation” tenet appears to be an ancient addition to the word of God.

Many of the ancient Christian creeds contain the tenet of “eternal generation” or state that Christ was “eternally begotten of the Father.” “The Baptist Confession Of Faith Of 1689 With Scripture Proofs” is relatively recent compared to others and reads as follows:

**Chapter 2; of God and of the Holy Trinity...** Paragraph 3. In this divine and infinite Being there are three subsistences, the Father, the Word or Son, and Holy Spirit,<sup>27</sup> of one substance, power, and eternity, each having the whole divine essence, yet the essence undivided:<sup>28</sup> the Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; **the Son is eternally begotten of the Father;**<sup>29</sup> [bold emphasis belongs to this writer] the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son,<sup>30</sup> all infinite, without beginning, therefore but one God, who is not to be divided in nature and being, but distinguished by

several peculiar relative properties and personal relations; which doctrine of the Trinity is the foundation of all our communion with God, and comfortable dependence on Him.

[http://www.reformed.org/documents/index.html?mainframe=http://www.reformed.org/documents/baptist\\_1689.html#Ch.%202Ch.%202](http://www.reformed.org/documents/index.html?mainframe=http://www.reformed.org/documents/baptist_1689.html#Ch.%202Ch.%202)

<sup>27</sup> 1 John 5:7; Matt. 28:19; 2 Cor. 13:14

<sup>28</sup> Exod. 3:14; John 14:11; 1 Cor. 8:6

<sup>29</sup> **John 1:14,18**

<sup>30</sup> John 15:26; Gal. 4:6

Note “eternally begotten” above is equivalent to “eternally generated” and their proof texts are John 1:14 & 18. Let’s take a look at these texts.

 **John 1:14 & 18 (KJV)** <sup>14</sup>And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth... <sup>18</sup>No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared *him*.

These verses and “only begotten” do not refer to “eternal generation.” However, **in context** they refer to Jesus Christ as the virgin born physically begotten Son for the following reasons. Note the references, in bold, from John Chapter 1.

1. The entire message of the Bible refers to coming of the Lord Jesus in the flesh. The Old Testament looks forward to the coming of Christ and New Testament tells us about that coming.
2. The purpose of the Book of John was to introduce Jesus Christ to the world.

**John 1:6 - 12 (KJV)** <sup>6</sup>There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. <sup>7</sup>The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all *men* through him might believe. <sup>8</sup>He was not that Light, but *was sent* to bear witness of that Light. <sup>9</sup>*That* was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. <sup>10</sup>He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. <sup>11</sup>He came unto his own, and his own received him not. <sup>12</sup>But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, *even* to them that believe on his name:

3. John 1:14 defines “**only begotten**” as “**made flesh**.”
4. The word “made” in “made flesh” according to Strong’s Concordance is “ginomai—A prolonged and middle form of a primary verb;

to *cause to be* (“gen” -erate), that is, (reflexively) to *become* (*come into being*)” and the exact same Greek word as “begotten.”

5. The entire passage is dealing with the Christ Jesus that mankind could see. Christ “dwelt among us,” “we beheld his glory,” and “No man hath seen God at any time... [but now] he hath declared *him*.”
6. John the Baptist went on record saying in **John 1:29 (KJV)** “ **Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.**” Yes, begotten refers to the Christ Jesus that we could behold, look at, and see.
7. If God wanted us to believe that Jesus was eternally begotten, why did God not just say so. The words “eternally begotten are not in this passage” nor or they in any other passage in any translation.
8. The plain teaching in this passage is “**the Word was with God, and the Word was God**” and then subsequently “**the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.**”

The Bible method of interpretation is “comparing spiritual things with spiritual” and that is just what has been done above.

The ancient proof passages for those who believe in “eternal generation” have been John 1:14 & 18 and John 3:16. However, another passage these “eternal generation” advocates use and in my mind their strongest passage is found in Colossians 1:15-18.

 **Colossians 1:15 through Colossians 1:18 (KJV)** <sup>15</sup>Who is the image of the invisible God, the **firstborn of every creature**: <sup>16</sup>For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: <sup>17</sup>And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. <sup>18</sup>And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the **firstborn from the dead**; that in all *things* he might have the preeminence.

The phrase “firstborn of every creature” is quoted as a text proof of the “eternal generation” tenet. However, many sound fundamental preachers and scholars interpret the phrase “firstborn of every creature” as teaching that Christ was the “prōtokos” or our prototype and speaks of his rank. This passage has nothing to do with His creation or “eternal generation,” and could not because Christ was not a created being. In fact, as the above passage states, “For by him were all things created,” The Greek “monogenes” is not in this passage. Christ was not a created being and John 1:1-4 is the standard proof text. Yes, there are a host of others. The phrase “firstborn from the dead” will be explained in the next section and it has to refer to the previous

phrase “firstborn of every creature.”

In the end, the “eternal generation” tenet appears to be an over interpretation of the Bible and has to be “read into” passages. Many of these advocates of “eternal generation” give many passages a double fold meaning. In many cases, Bible passages do contain a double fold meaning and the view of a double fold meaning is legitimate. This is doubly true when looking at prophesies that have both a short term and long term application.

In this case, the “eternal generation” tenet is refuted by “the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” This subject could consume a few volumes and has consumed a few volumes, but again, **there are no clear-cut passages that refer to the eternal generation of Christ!** The text passages used to support the “eternal generation of Christ” tenet can be more easily and correctly interpreted in light of the birth of Christ or of His resurrection. Jesus “begotten” in His resurrection will be discussed shortly. There are several other passages and tenets that the “eternal generation” advocates use to infer “eternal generation.” And that is exactly the point, “eternal generation” has to be inferred, deducted or read into the passages.

One of many proof texts that argue against the doctrine of eternal generation reads as follows: **Revelation 1:8 (KJV)** “**<sup>8</sup>I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.**” In this passage Christ is identifying Himself with Jehovah of the Old Testament. Jehovah in the Old Testament means, “I AM.” And yes, here, we are at the pinnacle of orthodoxy.

“I AM” means the “self existent one” or the one who always exists. Yes, Jesus has always existed, exists today, and will exist tomorrow. The Gospel of John presents Jesus as the “I AM.” If Jesus is the “I AM and the “self existent one,” then, why the “eternal generation” stuff. How could there be a need for generation or how could it occur if Christ always existed? I can find no value in this pseudo-doctrine of “eternal generation” and absolutely no relation to man or the redemption of man. **“Only begotten” relates God to man and the redemption of man as do all other doctrines of the Bible.**

In additional research, the doctrine of “eternal generation” is primarily held today in the camp of those who adhere to “Reformed Theology” lines of thought. The “double predestination” mindset seems to lend itself to adding this “doctrine” of “eternal generation” to the Bible. However, even the majority in the “Reformed Theology” camp do not appear to adhere to the concept of “eternal generation.” Also, the proponents of “eternal generation” admit the “doctrine” has fallen on hard times. And yes, it should. I pulled three theology books from my home bookshelf to see if this doctrine was advocated or mentioned. It was not mentioned in any of the three. However, each had definitive statements that in my mind refuted this

“eternal generation” nuance.

Charles Ryrie in his *Basic Theology* says, “Christ claimed eternity when He declared, ‘Before Abraham was, I AM’ (John 8:58). This is more than a limited existence before Abraham was born because He said ‘I AM.’ ‘I was’ might indicate that He existed for several centuries before Abraham, but I am (*eimi*) states eternity.”<sup>1</sup>

Millard J. Erickson in *Christian Theology* declares, “The Word, the Second Person of the Trinity, has always been.”<sup>2</sup>

*Willmington’s Guide to the Bible* by Dr. H. L. Willmington does a concise but thorough section entitled “The Preexistence of Jesus Christ as God” and there is no “eternal generation” gibberish found in his book.<sup>3</sup>

This writer revisited this section on three occasions. The question that came to mind was, “Where did this eternal generation gibberish begin?” Louis Berkhof (*Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids, 1949, pp. 93-94) on the Eternal Generation of the Son writes “Origen, one of the very first to speak of the generation of the Son,…”<sup>4</sup> And there, this eternal generation degeneracy was given the death blow to any who could argue for it. My former pastor, Roy Yelton used to say quite correctly, “What’s in the well will come up in the bucket.” Check and see and you will find Origen is a dirty well! Origen (185--254) was an early Christian scholar, theologian, and Egyptian who taught in Alexandria. From Origen we receive the corrupted and tainted Alexandrian manuscripts. Jasper James Ray reveals the corruption of Origen’s thoughts and doctrines in numerous places in his book *God Wrote Only One Bible*. Mr. Ray gives this revealing statement concerning the strange unbiblical beliefs of Origen, “He [Origen] taught that the Lord Jesus was a created being…”<sup>5</sup> Origen despite his fame, many writings and high esteem in some places was just a heretic.

Remember, the Gospel of John is clearly given to reveal Christ as the Son of God, and God the Son, and Jehovah God, and the great I Am. Yes, the eternal preexistence and self-existence of Christ is a fact and needs no “eternal generation” in some misdirected effort to explain God.

Edwin H. Palmer is “the executive secretary of the New International Version of the Bible (NIV) and general editor of the NIV Study Bible.” In his book *The Holy Spirit*, Palmer states his “eternal generation” bias by stating, “From all eternity the Father begat the Son.” James White comments in a debate format with G.A. Riplinger on YouTube, “If you read *The Holy Spirit* by Palmer and the citation that you give, he is talking about the internal operations of the trinity where the Father begets the son. This has been orthodox Christian theology for the past 2,000 years.” The overall context is a series of debates in which White is arguing for these new versions while Riplinger quite properly defends the KJV. So Palmer and White state clearly their belief in “eternal generation” However, in Palmer’s NIV, the “eternal;

generation” doctrine is removed when Palmer changes “only begotten” to “one and only!” Their intellectual circle thought has tripped them up! May I say, the word of God is constantly changed by these new version advocates to advocate for their point of view. It could change on any particular day for the topic at hand.

This “eternal generation” stuff is readily refuted in my mind by noting:

1. There are no clear-cut passages that refer to the “eternal generation” of Christ. The term is not used in the Bible.
2. “Only begotten” refers to “physically begotten” as explained above.
3. “Eternal Generation” is too close to the false ancient tenets of Arianism of a created Christ or Modalism (known as Monarchianism or Sabellianism)—the heretical doctrine of the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Modalism supported monotheism and opposed the Trinity. Modalism stated that God existed essentially as “one” and that he “revealed himself” in three different “modes”—Father, Son, and Spirit. Oh! The devil has no new tricks. He just repackages old products. This “eternal generation” appears to me to have been “generated” in times past as a product of compromise to when dealing with the above heresies.

Well, what is the old adage? “Where the Bible speaks, let us speak and where the Bible is silent, let us be silent!”

**The third view of “begotten” and its relationship to Christ says that “begotten” refers to the resurrection of Christ from the dead.** This view has merit and is correct in some cases. The word “only” is not used with “begotten” in those cases. “Resurrection” as you should know means “the standing up of the body.” The Bible knows nothing of a spiritual or “spirit” resurrection. The word “begotten” in the KJV does refer to the resurrection of Christ on several occasions. Let’s be clear, the English word “begotten” can refer to the birth or the resurrection of Jesus depending upon the usage in the passage. The following passages illustrate verses that refer to the resurrection. Note the Strong’s Concordance numbers are attached.<sup>6</sup>

 **Psalm 2:7 (KJV)** <sup>7</sup>I will declare<sup>H5608</sup> the decree<sup>H2706</sup>: the LORD<sup>H3068</sup> hath said<sup>H559</sup> unto me, Thou art my Son<sup>H1121</sup>; this day<sup>H3117</sup> have I **begotten**<sup>H3205</sup> thee.

 **Acts 13:33 (KJV)** <sup>33</sup>God<sup>G2316</sup> hath fulfilled<sup>G1603</sup> the same<sup>G5026</sup> unto us their children<sup>G5043</sup>, in that he hath raised<sup>G450</sup> up Jesus<sup>G2424</sup> again<sup>G450</sup>; as it is also<sup>G2532</sup> written<sup>G1125</sup> in the second<sup>G1208</sup> psalm<sup>G5568</sup>, Thou art<sup>G1488</sup> my Son<sup>G5207</sup>, this<sup>G4594</sup> day<sup>G4594</sup> have I **begotten**<sup>G1080</sup> thee.

 **Romans 8:29 (KJV)** <sup>29</sup>For whom<sup>G3739</sup> he did foreknow<sup>G4267</sup>, he also<sup>G2532</sup>

did predestinate<sup>G4309</sup> to be conformed<sup>G4832</sup> to the image<sup>G1504</sup> of his Son<sup>G5207</sup>, that he might be the **firstborn**<sup>G4416</sup> among<sup>G1722</sup> many<sup>G4183</sup> brethren<sup>G80</sup>.

📖 **Colossians 1:18 (KJV)**<sup>18</sup> And he is the head<sup>G2776</sup> of the body<sup>G4983</sup>, the church<sup>G1577</sup>: who<sup>G3739</sup> is the beginning<sup>G746</sup>, **the firstborn**<sup>G4416</sup> from the dead<sup>G3498</sup>; that in all<sup>G3956</sup> things he might have the preeminence<sup>G4409</sup>.

📖 **Hebrews 1:5 (KJV)**<sup>5</sup> For unto which<sup>G5101</sup> of the angels<sup>G32</sup> said<sup>G2036</sup> he at<sup>G4218</sup> any<sup>G4218</sup> time<sup>G4218</sup>, Thou art<sup>G1488</sup> my Son<sup>G5207</sup>, this<sup>G4594</sup> day<sup>G4594</sup> have I **begotten**<sup>G1080</sup> thee? And again<sup>G3825</sup>, I will be to him a Father<sup>G3962</sup>, and he shall be to me a Son<sup>G5207</sup>?

📖 **Hebrews 5:5 (KJV)**<sup>5</sup> So<sup>G3779</sup> also<sup>G2532</sup> Christ<sup>G5547</sup> glorified<sup>G1392</sup> not himself<sup>G1438</sup> to be made<sup>G1096</sup> an high<sup>G749</sup> priest<sup>G749</sup>; but he that said<sup>G2980</sup> unto him, Thou art<sup>G1488</sup> my Son<sup>G5207</sup>, to day<sup>G4594</sup> have I **begotten**<sup>G1080</sup> thee.

📖 **Revelation 1:5 (KJV)**<sup>5</sup> And from Jesus<sup>G2424</sup> Christ<sup>G5547</sup>, who is the faithful<sup>G4103</sup> witness<sup>G3144</sup>, and **the first**<sup>G4416</sup> **begotten**<sup>G4416</sup> of the dead<sup>G3498</sup> and the prince<sup>G758</sup> of the kings<sup>G935</sup> of the earth<sup>G1093</sup>. Unto him that loved<sup>G25</sup> us, and washed<sup>G3068</sup> us from our sins<sup>G266</sup> in his own<sup>G848</sup> blood<sup>G129</sup>,

You will note that two different Greek words for the English word “begotten” are used in the New Testament passages.

- ◆ **G1080** = *gennaō* = *ghen-nah'-o* From a variation of G1085; to *procreate* (properly of the father, but by extension of the mother); figuratively to *regenerate*:—bear, beget, be born, bring forth, conceive, be delivered of, gender, make, spring.<sup>7</sup>
- ◆ **G4416** = *prototokos* = *pro-tot-ok'-os* From G4413 and the alternate of G5088; *first born* (usually as noun, literally or figuratively):—firstbegotten (-born).<sup>8</sup>

Again, you will note that “begotten” is used alone (without the prefix “only”) above. And comparing scripture to scripture, begotten in the above passages speaks of the resurrection of Christ. We repeat again and please note that “only begotten” is not used in those passages that refer to the resurrection. There is no contradiction here. Christ was both the physically born Son of God and the physically resurrected Son of God. The word “begotten” is properly used of both scriptural tenets. Again, both are true and there is absolutely no contradiction. Look at the context of the above verses and that will be clear.

The word “prototokos” teaches us that Christ was our prototype in the resurrection. What a blessing! Since, He came out of the tomb, we have the true and sure hope of coming out of the grave. That is the reason that Christians are buried and not cremated. A Christian burial demonstrates that

we believe that we will be raised bodily to live again with Christ. Of course, Christ could take a cremated body and put it back together and bring it back to life. The point of the traditional Christian burial is to glorify Christ, as we should both in life and in death.

There are some deadly and damnable pitfalls here. Some hold that Jesus was “begotten” by the resurrection and do not see he was begotten by His physical birth. They reason that if Jesus were begotten by birth, that this act would make Him a created being. Not so! Jesus was in the beginning with the Father and equal with the Father and that is clearly taught in a host of passages.

Another perverted view is that Christ became the Son of God at the resurrection. They create some slick arguments by twisting a few Bible verses to back up their view. But again, John 1:1-4 and a multitude of other texts when properly expounded completely disarms them. This idea of Christ becoming the Son of God at His resurrection is totally heretical and foreign to the Bible.

When these new versions hit the market in the early 1900s, the old time born again, Holy Ghost filled, Bible believing Christians stood and cried aloud. They stated that the removal of “begotten” from John 3:16 was nothing more than a Satanic attack on the doctrine of the virgin birth. And yes, there are still many fine men that hold that position today. May this writer be counted in that crowd. Clearly, the doctrine of “the only begotten Son” is divinely connected to the Biblical doctrine of the “virgin birth.” And the congregation said...

## Chapter 17: Doctrinal Perversion— John 1:18 and The “Only Begotten God” Issue

At this point, we need to back up and touch one more time on the first three verses where “monogenes” is translated. They are Luke 7:12, Luke 8:42 and Luke 9:38. As we have seen, these verses do not relate to Christ. However, as stated previously, they relate to procreation or a physical birth. In other words, **in every case** where the Greek word “monogenes” is found in the Bible, whether referring to Christ or others, it refers to a physical birth.

If we continue to **John 1:18**, we open a “witches brew” in the majority of these new versions. Some versions have changed “only begotten Son” to “only begotten God” or “one and only God”, etc.

They do have some limited “evidence” found in a few corrupt ancient manuscripts. Just to deal with this, we could write another book. Those who agree with the new versions argue that this rendering in the new translations strengthens the position of the deity of Christ. This position has gained wide acceptance as of late. We will not take time and space to elaborate but the reverse is actually true. The tenet of “only begotten God” makes Jesus a “begotten” and created god, or “a god” that fits the Jehovah Witnesses view. Do your homework.

It is the position of this book and the far majority of conservative Bible believing pastors and teachers that to insert “God” in the place of “Son” in John 1:18 is totally corrupt. The reasons are as follows.

“Monogenes” or “only begotten” are adjectives that refer to the position of the Son in His incarnation. Look at the other verses quoted at the start of the chapter. The position of these new versions is out of context with the Book of John and the rest of the Bible.

The idea of a “begotten God” is heretical and totally foreign to scripture. The argument (held by some) that there are only a few clear and decisive passages that teach that Jesus is God is laughable. There are a host of passages such as John 1:1, John 10:22-38 and John 14:9. Look at the following passage.

 ***John 5:17 through John 5:23 (KJV)*** <sup>17</sup>But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. <sup>18</sup>Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, **making himself equal with God.** <sup>19</sup>Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. <sup>20</sup>For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that himself doeth: and he will show him greater works than these, that ye may marvel. <sup>21</sup>For as the Father raiseth

up the dead, and quickeneth *them*; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. <sup>22</sup>For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: <sup>23</sup>That all *men* should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him.

Every time a passage teaches that Jesus is the Son of God or the “only begotten” Son of God, that same passage teaches that Jesus is God. The Jew fully understood this and hated the Lord Jesus because He made Himself “equal” with God. Look again at *John 5:18 (KJV)*, “Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but **said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.**”

It is unbelievable to me that these self-proclaimed scholars know so much about certain minor nuances of the Bible but have no understanding of the very basics of the Bible. Look at Philippians 2:6 in the KJV and compare it to the NIV.

 *Philippians 2:6 (KJV)* “<sup>6</sup>Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:...”

 *Philippians 2:6 (NIV)* “<sup>6</sup>Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped...”

This verse in the NIV yields the exact opposite meaning of the KJV. Dictionary.com will tell us the primary definition of “grasp” means “to make an attempt to seize, or a motion of seizing.” The Lord Jesus is God and equal with the Father. Contrary to the NIV, equality with God did not need to be grasped or seized by Jesus and yes, was always grasped because Jesus is God. The NIV commentators tell us that they remain orthodox here and the real meaning in the NIV is in perfect context with verse 7 of the NIV which says “but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.” The thought is that Christ willingly laid aside a portion of his power and glory in order to enter this world in a human body to become the savior of mankind. The NIV translators idea in the NIV of grasped is “to cling or to hold to.” And yes, if you use a secondary explanation of “grasped” the NIV explanation is orthodox. However, the direct reading and plain interpretation of the NIV is wrong, misdirected and completely heretical. Why did they just not say what they meant rather than choosing the word “grasped” where the correct meaning can only be discerned by using a secondary definition or some notes from a NIV Bible commentary. How wrong can you be and still maintain that you are completely orthodox in your belief and in your translation. Just looking at the very words of the NIV, the NIV is absolutely and totally heretical here. Again, the phrase “thought it not

robbery to be equal with God:...” is not equal in any manner with “did not consider equality with God something to be grasped...”

As we continue our textual study, we come to John 3:16 and 18. We will deal with these as a pair and project one thought. Salvation comes by believing that Jesus is the only begotten Son of God and believing in His atoning work on Calvary. The reason the unsaved are unsaved is because they have “not believed in the **name of the only begotten Son of God.**” You must believe in the incarnation or that Jesus is come in the flesh to be saved. Look at 2 John 7-11.

 **2 John 1:7 through 2 John 1:11 (KJV)** <sup>7</sup>For many deceivers are entered into the world, **who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.** This is a **deceiver and an antichrist.** <sup>8</sup>Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward. <sup>9</sup>**Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.** <sup>10</sup>If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into *your* house, neither bid him God speed: <sup>11</sup>For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.

The Bible is clear. You must believe in the “begottenness” (yes, I coined a word) of the Lord Jesus Christ in order to be saved. Why would anyone remove the word “begotten” from John 3:16. Oh! The shame! The perverseness! The subversion! The utter depravity and the utter satanic nature of this wickedness!

Ah! Yes! There is another side. Look at the simplicity of salvation in John 3:14-18.

 **John 3:14 through John 3:18 (KJV)** <sup>14</sup>And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: <sup>15</sup>That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. <sup>16</sup>For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. <sup>17</sup>For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. <sup>18</sup>He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

**Now we will look at Hebrews 11:17.** Also note the context of verses 18 and 19 of chapter 11.

📖 Hebrews 11:17 through Hebrews 11:19 (KJV) <sup>17</sup>By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered **up his only begotten son**, <sup>18</sup>Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called: <sup>19</sup>Accounting that God *was* able to raise *him* up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure.

The critics of “only begotten” point out that Abraham had another son, Ishmael. These critics say that Isaac was not the “only begotten.” D.A. Carson is one of these critics and he says, “That the word can mean a little more than ‘only’ is made clear from its use in Hebrews 11:17. There, Isaac is called Abraham’s *monogenēs* son.” Yes, Abraham had another child, Ishmael. Ishmael was the child of Abraham and Hagar the Egyptian. Also, in case you are not aware, Abraham had sons through Keturah, whom he wed after the death of Sarah and also he had concubines. See Genesis 25:1-4.

D.A. Carson makes a pitiful statement. He says that “monogenes” can mean little more than “only” and in then contradicts himself by proving “monogenes” could not mean “only” by stating “Abraham fathered Ishmael and others.” D.A. Carson goes on to say, “In the Johannine passages, I suspect the meaning is “unique” or “unique and beloved,...” Note, these critics say that Isaac was not the “only begotten” son but the “unique” son of Abraham. Carson argues that Jesus was “unique” because “He always does what is pleasing in the Father’s sight (John 8:28-29).”<sup>1</sup> The interpretation of “monogenes” as “only” or “unique” is again, meandered. “Monogenes” still literally means “only begotten.”

And yes, God has a purpose here in Hebrews 11:17. The promise was to Abraham and Sarah. Hagar and Keturah are not in view here. You do the research. Isaac was the “only begotten” son of the heirs of promise which included both Abraham and Sarah. In addition, the use of the term here is meant to precisely typify Christ. Hebrews 11:17 says “he received him in a figure.” Isaac is a clear type of Christ and any interpretation of “monogenes” in Hebrews 11:17 other than “only begotten” fails to completely typify our Lord Jesus.

To the critics that would say that Isaac was not the “only begotten” son but the “unique” son of Abraham, maybe they would like to correct God. God in His book, His inspired book, His deadly accurate book, where God calls Isaac, “thine only son” in His direct statements to Abraham.

📖 Gen 22:2(KJV) 2 And he said, Take now thy son, **thine only son** Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.

📖 **Gen 22:12(KJV)** 12 And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, **thine only son** from me.

📖 **Gen 22:16(KJV)** 16 And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the LORD, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, **thine only son:**

📖 **Gen 21:10-12(KJV)** 10 Wherefore she [**Sarah**] said unto Abraham, Cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac.

11 And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son.

12 And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice; **for in Isaac shall thy seed be called.**

One final point, D.A. Carson, after making his perverted arguments, says that “Modern translations... are not... reflecting a desire to meddle with the word of God.” D.A. Carson also claims the agreement about the meaning of “monogenes” is over, and thus finally settled, and then points back to Dale Moody’s “God’s Only Son” and says, “so it is disappointing to face the same misinformed charges at this late date.”<sup>2</sup> May I say, “monogenes” always has and always will mean “only begotten” or its equivalent. “Unique” and “only” are not equivalent. D.A. Carson with his perverted scholarship and condescending attitude does not settle the matter.

**I John 4:9 is the last verse that contains the Greek word “monogenes.”** **1 John 4:9 (KJV)** **<sup>9</sup>In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him.** And yes, of course, this verse refers to Christ and “monogenes” is translated in the KJV as “only begotten.” This verse, as you would expect, sums up the other five verses where “monogenes” is used in referring to Christ. The word “manifested” here is interesting. You see God manifested Himself or showed Himself or revealed Himself in the flesh. This was actuated by the fact that Jesus was physically “begotten” by the Father.

To sum up here, “monogenes” in the KJV is always fully translated as “only begotten” when referring to Christ and “only begotten” always refers to the physical birth and incarnation of Christ. The Satanic attacks on John 3:16 and the incarnation of Christ are endless. The correct doctrine of Christ separates the Bible from the Catholic religion, the mystic religions of the east and all other Satanic forms of religion.

May this writer say, the Lord Jesus came as a man and he walked on this earth like you and I. He loved us and he died for our sin. And yes, we

---

have an high priest which can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities. He came in the likeness of sinful flesh. The Lord Jesus was in all points tempted like as we are. Yet, He did not sin. He understands us. He knows our frame. Now you and I can come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need. If you know him today, you have one who knows you and loves you and can help you. Oh! What a savior!

## Chapter 18: John 3:16 & “Begotten” Related to Glorious Gospel Doctrines—Introduction

### Introduction: Thayer’s Lexicon and the NIV and “monogenes”— The Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

**The defining doctrine of the Bible is the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.** In the KJV, the words beget, beget, begetteth, and begotten, are used hundreds of times in relation to the physical procreation process of the begetting of the flesh. The “monogenes” verses, referring to Christ, always refer to the incarnation of Christ. This brief introduction is a virtual word for word repeat of our thoughts under the chapter on **Proof Studies**. However, this repeat perfectly sets the stage for the rest of the chapter. We need to understand that there is a doctrinal bias from these new version translators. So any product that we have from these versions starts with this bias. Thus, we need to revisit some previous comments that have application to this section.

A host of new revisionists (copy cats of these new versions and not real translators) have come out trying to justify the perversions of John 3:16. What is unbelievable is that many of these have written position papers to justify these new versions. Many of these are fly by nights (like me), and again, are not real translators. These pseudo translators go much beyond the actual translators in an effort to convincingly promote their perverted point of view. In order to cover the critical thoughts in this chapter, we must look at the point of view of those who pervert and subvert John 3:16. First we will go to Thayer’s Lexicon. Thayer says monogenes means:<sup>1</sup>

1) single of its kind, only

1a) used of only sons or daughters (viewed in relation to their parents)

1b) used of Christ, denotes the only begotten son of God

Now these commentators will use #1 above to show that the rendering of “one and only” is accurate because Thayer says, “single of its kind.” They fail to mention that 1a or 1b is necessary to complete the definition of #1. Now when you define #1 in light of 1a or 1b, you are right back in perfect alignment with the KJV.

The KJV is right and so simple that all you need is a good English dictionary to help you with difficult words. In addition, these modern lexicons have their biases. And we will find there is a bias in the works of Thayer. However, in order to sale books, those who publish Bible references must be somewhat accurate to be credible.

In chapter 42 of *New Age Bible Versions*, G.A. Riplinger dedicates

that chapter to “Lucifer’s Lexicons.” It is down right scary. She states that J Henry Thayer “ was a Unitarian who vehemently denied the deity of Christ.” Goggle “Joseph Henry Thayer” you will find that the Jehovah’s witnesses use him as their advocate against the doctrine of the “Trinity.”<sup>2</sup>

In addition, I followed the lead of G.A. Riplinger and looked at my computer program featuring *THAYER’S GREEK DEFINITIONS* “PARSONS TECHNOLOGY, INC. Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Copyrights--*Brown-Driver-Briggs’ Hebrew Definitions*--Electronic Edition STEP Files Copyright © 1999, Findex.com, Inc. All rights reserved.”

Under # 3 in the section “Plan for the Book” we read, “Next follows the Thayer’s Definitions given in English as edited by the Online Bible of Winterbourne, Ontario. The nature of the edits is two-fold. First, they simplify the content by removing the etymology, cross-references, and Greek phrases. The result allows for easier reading of the English definitions. **Secondly, they correct some of Thayer’s Unitarian doctrinal positions concerning the work and person of Christ so that they will be more widely accepted within the Christian community.**”<sup>3</sup>

The **emphasis in bold is mine**. If they correct “some,” then how much is uncorrected and how are you supposed to know which is corrected and which is not? I repeat, that “in order to sale books they must be somewhat accurate to be credible.” You see a worn out technique found in these new translations by these heretical translators is to provide a corrupt ancient text or somewhat altered definition when their hand is called for mistranslation. They hold on their to groundless bias and they claim orthodoxy by referring to their notes from corrupt sources.

Even the corrupt Thayer, though he does not believe it, owns up to the fact that the written word of God teaches that Jesus was the “only begotten” son of God.

**The defining doctrine of the Bible is the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.** In order to be honest then, these pseudo-translators, if they are to write a complete treatise, would need to cover in detail what Thayer said about the definition of the word “monogenes” and they do not. Most look to an abbreviated computer addition of Thayer’s definition and do not do their homework. However, online at the [Blue Letter Bible](#) website, Thayer gives his total definition and attests to “monogenes” as a clear-cut reference to the incarnation. Here is the quote “He [Christ] is so spoken by John.....because by the incarnation.....in him he is of nature or essentially Son of God.” Some of the Greek words and phrases are left out in the above quote. However, this is in the exact context of the meaning that Mr. Thayer is conveying in that passage. As you can easily see, Thayer fully attests that the reading of “monogenes” points to and relates to the incarnation of Christ.<sup>4</sup>

The following is a very limited list of books and articles that have been published in an effort to get pastors and the general Christian public to accept the perverted NIV version.

- Richard Barnard, *God's Word in Our Language: The Story of the New International Version*. Colorado Springs: International Bible Society, 1989.
- Kenneth L. Barker, ed., *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- Kenneth L. Barker, *Accuracy defined and illustrated: An NIV translator answers your questions*. Colorado Springs: International Bible Society, 1995.
- Kenneth L. Barker, *The Accuracy of the NIV*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996.
- Kenneth L. Barker, *The Balance of the NIV: What Makes a Good Translation*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.
- Burton L. Goddard, *The NIV Story: The Inside Story of the New International Version*. New York: Vantage Press, 1989.
- Richard J. Goodrich and Albert L. Lukaszewski, eds., *A Reader's Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004. ISBN: 0310248884. Purports to give the readings adopted by the NIV translation committee, with notes showing variations from the third edition of the UBS Greek New Testament.
- Stephen W. Paine, "Twentieth-Century Evangelicals Look at Bible Translation," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 4/1 (Spring, 1969)
- John H. Skilton, review of the NIV New Testament in *Westminster Theological Journal* 37/2 (Winter 1975)
- Bruce K. Waltke, "The New International Version and Its Textual Principles in the Book of Psalms," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 32/1 (March 1989) pp. 17-26.
- Carolyn Johnson Youngblood, "The New International Version Translation Project: Its Conception And Implementation," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 21/3 (September 1978)

However, after all the jabber, the NIV translators give themselves away and especially in their treatment of “monogenes.” Here is an exact quote from *The Making of the NIV*, “Literally *monogenes* means ‘sole descent’ or ‘the only child of one’s parents.’”<sup>5</sup> The NIV translators admit here that they do not translate the word “monogenes” literally. This violates the Bibles’ own principles of interpretation. In order for me to be honest here, the NIV translators never claim to translate literally but use their “dynamic equivalence” which allows for their own interpretation to be conjured and printed in any way they see fit. Let’s be clear, the NIV translators mistranslate “monogenes” and they know it. Eight pages are dedicated in their book to

justify their perverted translation of “monogenes” as “one and only.” These pages are filled with slight of hand and miss-directed statements to justify their position and to hide their wicked and deplorable mistranslation. They admit that they interpret the Bible in light of the usage in secular literature rather than using the Bible as the chief resource in interpreting itself. See Chapter 9: “Bible Principles Of Interpretation And Translation” and Chapter 23: “Methods Of Translation—Legitimate And Illegitimate” for a more detailed but brief explanation of the methods of translation.

The NIV claims a “heightened Christological perspective” in context with the book of John. They do not like the translation of “monogenes” as “only begotten” (quoting directly from *The Making of the NIV*) “particularly because it leaves open the possibility of an etymological emphasis on *genes* (the idea of generation)...”<sup>6</sup> Bless the Lord! Oh my soul! John wanted to impart the idea of generation—not eternal generation nor creation—but the idea that Christ was “begotten” or physically generated through the virgin birth and thus became God incarnate.

 **Hebrews 10:5 (KJV)**<sup>5</sup> Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a **body** hast thou prepared me:

Let me repeat. The defining doctrine of the Bible is the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. This will be thoroughly documented in the upcoming chapters. You should know that the first hated and most hated doctrine of the Bible is that of the incarnation. If the doctrine of incarnation is not true, all other doctrines related to redemption and the blood atonement fall.

Quoting again from *The Making of the NIV*, “In all these cases, whether corporately or individually understood, ‘Son of God’ must be seen as an epithet to designate one whose relationship with God can be characterized as of one of loving obedience.”<sup>7</sup> Jesus was certainly the Son of loving obedience. However, his obedience did not make Him the Son. Here in *The Making of the NIV*, the Old Testament Jews, as God’s chosen people, are “corporately” compared to Christ and are correctly said to be “sons” or “children” of God in a whole pot full of references. As you read the references, you will find that these references show the children of Israel in rebellion and disobedience. The Old Testament is a continual history of the disobedience of man and also the disobedience of the Jew. The Old Testament ends in the book of Malachi with God laying the following charges by saying in **Malachi 1:6 through Malachi 1:8 (KJV)**<sup>6</sup> **A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the LORD of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name. And ye say, Wherein have we**

despised thy name? <sup>7</sup>Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar; and ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say, The table of the LORD is contemptible. <sup>8</sup>And if ye offer the blind for sacrifice, *is it not evil?* and if ye offer the lame and sick, *is it not evil?* offer it now unto thy governor; will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person? saith the LORD of hosts.

First of all, the nation of Israel did not become the children of God through loving obedience and no child of God ever became a child of God by loving obedience. Abraham and the children of Israel were chosen, we came to Jesus by faith and our Lord Jesus was physically begotten. *John 1:12 (KJV)* says <sup>12</sup>**But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, *even to them that believe on his name:*...**

Second, Jesus was obedient because He was the Son of God and did not become the Son of God because of His loving obedience.

Third, the attempt here is to divert attention away from the incarnation and to redefine your thinking about the term “Son of God.” Longenecker, the author of this passage, indicates Jesus is unique because of His “loving obedience” and thus intentionally by-passes the true meaning of “monogenes” in its relationship to the incarnation. When you read Longenecker’s passage, you find irrelevant Bible references, long complex sentences, and a misdirection to non-issues. The Bible says, “and their mouth speaketh great swelling *words.*”

One more point before we move on. The entire Bible will be opened to any Christian who takes time to understand the doctrines and tenets surrounding John 3:16 and the word “begotten.”

Now, we will deal with the doctrinal problems from the mistranslation of “only begotten.” The continual argument from these new version translators when they are called to account for weakening one passage by their so called better renderings is that the same thought or doctrine is taught in other passages. Of course, these translators will couple their arguments with some reading from a tainted minority manuscript. True readings always strengthen God’s word. God is not the author of confusion nor is He double minded on any occasion. The strength of the KJV is that the KJV agrees with itself. These new versions do not agree within their own version. There are no contradictions in God and with God.

## Chapter 19: John 3:16 & “Begotten” Related To Glorious Gospel Doctrines—Fourteen Doctrinal Issues

**First**, we have already established the Bible admonition against adding a word to God’s word. And to add a word is a doctrinal problem in itself. **New translations create a perversion by adding a word in the translation of “only begotten” such as:**

1. **“one and only” and**
2. **“unique”**

Some would argue that the word “unique” is an appropriate translation on the basis of secular usage and the evidences from Thayer’s Greek Dictionary. The Greek word for “unique” would be *monadikos*, not *monogenes*. Their position is untenable.

Before we leave this point, we do not deny that Jesus is unique. Certainly, He is unique and yes, we could write a book on this point. However, “unique” is not a proper translation. This utterly ridiculous position of these new translations and their translators is held because they fail to understand that what makes Jesus unique is the fact that He is the “only begotten Son of God.” And the word “begotten” fully explains the “uniqueness” of Christ. Also, the “uniqueness” of Christ can not be explained without the word and concept of “begotten.” Man has always wanted to become God and there is certainly nothing unique about that concept. Ah! But the glory of God is seen in the fact that God became man. These new version translators claim to see the trees but are wondering where to find the forest.

**Second, many of the new perverted translations have subtracted the word “begotten” which we will show has tremendous doctrinal significance.** In addition, the Bible warns, as in the same manner above, of the problem of deleting even one word from the Bible. And that is a problem in itself.

As we continue, we will deal with the doctrinal problems with the omission of “begotten” and the failure to translate “monogenes” as “only begotten.” These new version translators continually claim their new versions are completely orthodox. Every doctrine of the Bible is based upon multiple passages and framed through a combination of Biblical illustrations, types and antitypes, and direct declarations. It has been rightly said that in the Old Testament you will find the shadow, and in the New Testament you find the substance. A doctrine would not be discarded because one passage or reading was corrupted or tainted. But, why we would we want even one reading or passage to be wrong?

John 3:16 is the great verse that summarizes the rest of the Bible. It is simple and yet profound and acts as a great drawstring that holds and binds a multitude of doctrines. We have already discussed some of the basics of disagreement within various passages in these new versions. When the word “begotten” is not used in John 3:16, the verse:

1. **fails to provide the continuity to a host of other doctrines and passages which we will discuss shortly.**
2. **fails to provide the tie that binds John 3:16 to the rest of the Bible.**
3. **leaves an unfilled void in relation to the rest of the Bible.**
4. **falls short of lending the proper support that was divinely intended for other passages**
5. **is just translated wrong illustrating the perversion and subversion of John 3:16**

Now, let us look at the doctrines that relate to the incarnation of Christ from a few selected passages and make a few comments. Now, we are changing tones, the next problem is the third doctrinal problem.

### **Third, look at the teaching of “her seed” in Genesis 3:14 and 15.**

 ***Genesis 3:14 through Genesis 3:15 (KJV)*** <sup>14</sup>And the LORD God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou *art* cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: <sup>15</sup>And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and **her seed**; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

The phrase “her seed” is the first Bible prophecy concerning the coming of our saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ. This prophecy was given to the serpent and the prophecy continues with the “head” and “heel” statements. Satan bruised the heel of Christ on the cross. Satan had surely hoped this was the “head” blow. Ah! But, up from the grave Christ arose, and Satan is a defeated foe. The “head” blow was delivered to Satan by the resurrection. God will follow up by casting Satan into the lake of fire.

We are all children of Adam. All of us, in context with Genesis 3:15, are Adam’s seed and/or the seed of a man. Christ is from “her seed.” Look at Galatians 4:4. ***Galatians 4:4 (KJV)*** “But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, **made of a woman**, made under the law...” Christ was physically made of a woman. And again and in contrast, each one of us are generated from a man’s seed and birthed through a woman and thus, we are from the seed of Adam.

And yes, the Lord Jesus Christ had to be the “only begotten” through the virgin birth to be “her seed.” Look at the perfect architecture and craft of thought and word to precisely fit the two concepts of “her seed” and “only begotten” into a doctrinal building fitly framed together with our Lord Jesus Christ as the Chief Corner Stone. “Only begotten” provides the tie that binds, the proper connectivity and the total prophetic fulfillment to the teaching of “her seed.” These new versions fail to make this critical doctrinal tie.

**Fourth, let us consider the doctrine of the “virgin birth” and its relation to “only begotten.”** Note, the clear-cut prophecy found in Isaiah 7:14. As we have pointed out, this is a perfect fit to the above prophecy of “her seed.” **Isaiah 7:14 (KJV)** <sup>14</sup>**Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.**

In Matthew we have the perfect fulfillment of this prophecy. **Matthew 1:22 through Matthew 1:23 (KJV)** <sup>22</sup>**Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying,** <sup>23</sup>**Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.**

And we have this same fulfillment repeated again in Luke. **Luke 1:26 through Luke 1:28 (KJV)** <sup>26</sup>**And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth,** <sup>27</sup>**To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin’s name was Mary.** <sup>28</sup>**And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women.**

And yes, the Lord Jesus Christ is the “only begotten” through the virgin birth. Look at the perfect architecture and craft of thought and word to precisely fit the two concepts of “the virgin birth” and “only begotten” into a doctrinal building fitly framed together with our Lord Jesus Christ as the Chief Corner Stone. “Only begotten” provides the tie that binds, the proper connectivity and the total prophetic fulfillment to the teaching of “the virgin birth.” These new versions fail to make this critical doctrinal tie.

**Fifth, note the law and doctrine of the “kinsman redeemer” and its connection to “only begotten.”** We find the law in Leviticus. **Leviticus 25:47 through Leviticus 25:50 (KJV)** <sup>47</sup>**And if a sojourner or stranger wax rich by thee, and thy brother that dwelleth by him wax poor, and sell himself unto the stranger or sojourner by thee, or to the stock of the stranger’s family:** <sup>48</sup>**After that he is sold he may be redeemed again; one of his brethren may redeem him:** <sup>49</sup>**Either his uncle, or his uncle’s son, may redeem him, or any that is nigh of kin unto him of his family may redeem**

him; or if he be able, he may redeem himself. <sup>50</sup>And he shall reckon with him that bought him from the year that he was sold to him unto the year of jubilee: and the price of his sale shall be according unto the number of years, according to the time of an hired servant shall it be with him.

The entire book of Ruth in the Bible provides us with a beautiful and touching illustration of this principle of the kinsman redeemer. The Lord Jesus could only become our kinsman redeemer by being born in the flesh. Through Mary, Jesus “came in the likeness of sinful man” and Jesus called Himself “the Son of man.” And “the Son of man” was the title Jesus most often used of Himself. The entire *Book of Luke* was written to prove to us that Jesus was kin to us in the flesh and was “the Son of man.” We find that the doctrine of redemption is perfectly stated for us in Galatians. **Galatians 3:13 (KJV)** <sup>13</sup>**Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree:**

Jesus had to be both the “Son of man” and the “Son of God” in order to be the perfect sacrifice and the perfect “kinsman redeemer.” This could only be accomplished because He was the “only begotten” Son of the Father.”

And yes, the Lord Jesus Christ is our “kinsman redeemer” because He is the “only begotten.” Look at the perfect architecture and craft of thought and word to precisely fit the two concepts of “the kinsman redeemer” and “only begotten” into a doctrinal building fitly framed together with our Lord Jesus Christ as the Chief Corner Stone. “Only begotten” provides the tie that binds, the proper connectivity and the total prophetic fulfillment to the teaching of “the kinsman redeemer.” These new versions manifest their evil perversion and subversion when they fail to make this critical doctrinal tie.

**Sixth, the doctrine of Christ as “the Son of man”, as alluded to above, is a critical issue.** Christ, throughout the Gospels, refers to Himself as the “Son of man.” Ah! Listen to the Lord Jesus Himself as He is quoted by Dr. Luke. **Luke 12:8 through Luke 12:10 (KJV)** <sup>8</sup>**Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: <sup>9</sup>But he that denieth me before men shall be denied before the angels of God. <sup>10</sup>And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven.** The title “Son of man” was the favorite way that the Lord enjoyed seeing Himself. Ah! That tells us that Jesus is kin to you a me. What a blessing!

And yes, the Lord Jesus Christ is “the (Note the word “the”) Son of man” through the virgin birth because He is the “only begotten of the Father.” (see **John 1:14 KJV**). Jesus was “the Son of man” and in Him was no sin taint and fallen nature that you and I have today. Look at the perfect architecture and craft of thought and word to precisely fit the two concepts of

“the Son of Man” and “only begotten” into a doctrinal building fitly framed together with our Lord Jesus Christ as the Chief Corner Stone. “Only begotten” provides the tie that binds, the proper connectivity and the total Biblical fulfillment to the teaching of “the Son of man.” These new versions fail to make this critical doctrinal tie.

**Seventh, the doctrine of the “incarnation” or of Christ being “made flesh” is related to “only begotten.” Yes, God has “come in the flesh” and the doctrine of incarnation is the defining doctrine of the Bible.** I understand that I am repeating myself. The truth needs to be repeated. And to miss this truth is a fatal eternal error. In fact, the denial of this doctrine yields to us the critical revealing test of a deceiver and an antichrist. The author is a Baptist and holds to the traditional orthodox view of all elements of the protestant faith. Our faith boils down the critical elements of certain fundamentals. “Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” is one of these fundamentals. John, the disciple, comments, **2 John 1:7 (KJV) “<sup>7</sup>For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist.”**

W.A. Criswell in his sermon entitled, *How Could God Become Man?* preached on 04-16-84 with the text of John 1:14 talks about the heresies that the *Book of John* combats. Read a portion of this sermon from one of God’s choice spokesmen of the ages.

From the first chapter of the gospel of John, verses 1 and 14.  
John 1, Verse 1: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.”

Verse 14: “And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.”

The Incarnation of God: God in human flesh, God becoming a man. The denial and the perversion of that revelation in the holy scriptures has characterized the Christian faith from the beginning to this present day.

You could almost write the history of the Christian faith and the heresies that have attacked that doctrine of the humanity and deity of the Son of God.

Arius and the Arian controversy that simply tore apart the Roman Empire; Apollinarius and the Apollinarian controversy; Sabellius and the Sabellian controversy; Nestorius and the Nestorian controversy; Eutyches and the Eutychian controversy.

And, even in the days of the apostles, they were attacked by heretical teachers, academician sophists called Gnostics—from the

Greek word ‘know,’ Gnosticism. In the days of Paul and the days of John, they confronted those heretical teachers.

For example, one of the sect of those sophists were called Docetic Gnostics. They preached the doctrine that Jesus had just a phantom body, a seeming body, but He was really pure deity. They denied the humanity of our Lord.

Another branch of that Gnostic sect that attacked the apostles was Cerinthian Gnosticism from Cerinthus who was a contemporary of John and lived in Ephesus at the same time that John lived.

The Cerinthian Gnostics taught that the deity, the unction, of God came upon Jesus at His baptism and left Him at His cross. They denied the deity of our Lord. You'll see references to that confrontation with the Gnostic heretics throughout the New Testament.

For example, John will write in his second letter in the seventh verse: “Many deceivers are entered into the world who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.” ‘*Erchomenon*,’ translated here ‘come.’

It's the participial form of ‘*erchomai*’ which means ‘come.’ ‘*Erchomenon*’—‘*erchomenon*.’ You could translate it two ways.

You can do it as it is here. They denied that Jesus is God Incarnate, God in the flesh. Or you can translate it ‘coming’—that Jesus is coming in the flesh, a visible, personal, actual man.

In any event, throughout the story of the Christian faith, there have been heretics who have attacked the idea, the gospel that God could become a man, that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.

These Gnostics are everywhere today. They're in every part of the church life. They're in every part of its academic institutions. They're in every denominational pulpit in the land—modern Gnostics denying either the full humanity or the full deity of Christ, that God could become a man.

I so well remember when I was preaching through the Bible for those eighteen years. That I came to the twenty-fourth chapter of the gospel of Luke.

And in Luke 24:36 to 43 is the story of the appearance of the risen, resurrected Lord to His disciples. And they thought He was a phantom. They thought He was a ghost. It couldn't be that it was actually the Lord raised from the dead.

So, the Lord said, “Handle Me and see that it is I myself, for a spirit hath not flesh and bone such as you see Me have.”

Then He asked, “Do you have anything here to eat?”

And they gave Him a piece of a broiled fish and of a honeycomb. And He did eat before them.

Now that was the passage that I'd come to -- in the Bible. Well, there was one of these Gnostics who belongs to a denomination—whole denomination is Gnostic—and she was present in the service.

And when she went out that door she exclaimed to her friend, "Never have I heard anything so crassly material and so grossly physical in my life, that Jesus should have a physical body, raised immortalized but flesh and bone, a human man."<sup>1</sup>

And yes, the Lord Jesus Christ is “come in the flesh” because He is the “only begotten.” Look at the perfect architecture and craft of thought and word to precisely fit the two concepts of “come in the flesh” and “only begotten” into a doctrinal building fitly framed together with our Lord Jesus Christ as the Chief Corner Stone. “Only begotten” provides the tie that binds, the proper connectivity and the total Biblical fulfillment to the teaching of “Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.” These new versions fail to make this critical doctrinal tie.

**Eighth, young Timothy gives the concept of the “mystery of godliness” to us and this concept is connected to “only begotten.”**

 ***1 Timothy 3:16 (KJV)*** “<sup>16</sup>And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.”

The Bible is not hard to understand, that is if you believe the Bible. God simply declares His position and it is our position to believe. The Bible says in Hebrews, “by faith we understand.” No, I do not understand the “how” of how God became man. Yes, this is a great mystery to me. It is the “mystery of godliness.” But I do believe the Bible. Thus, by faith, you and I can understand that God in Christ is the “mystery of godliness.” Biblical faith is always believing God’s word.

And yes, the Lord Jesus Christ is “the mystery of godliness” (that is God manifest in the flesh) because He is the “only begotten.” As “the mystery of godliness” and the “only begotten,” we find that Christ lived a Godly life without sin. And yes, it is a mystery to me as to the how that God could become man. and then demonstrate His godliness by living without sin.

Look at the perfect architecture and craft of thought and word to precisely fit the two concepts of “the mystery of godliness” and “only

begotten” into a doctrinal building fitly framed together with our Lord Jesus Christ as the Chief Corner Stone. “Only begotten” provides the tie that binds, the proper connectivity and the total Biblical fulfillment to the teaching of “the mystery of godliness.” These new versions fail to make this critical doctrinal tie.

**Ninth, the Lord Jesus has to be “begotten” in order to be “the son of David” that will become “King of Kings” and sit on the throne of David.** Here, we will give you some quotes from the Old and New Testaments for additional review and then a brief explanation.

📖 **Matthew 1:1 (KJV)** <sup>1</sup>The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, **the son of David**, the son of Abraham.

As we travel through the Old Testament, we find this promise to David begins with Abraham and his seed.

📖 **Genesis 12:1 through Genesis 12:3 (KJV)** <sup>1</sup>Now the LORD had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father’s house, unto a land that I will show thee: <sup>2</sup>And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: <sup>3</sup>And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and **in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.**

📖 **Galatians 3:16 (KJV)** <sup>16</sup>Now to **Abraham and his seed were the promises made.** He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, **And to thy seed, which is Christ.**

As we continue through the Old Testament, David as a son of Abraham receives the promises of a kingdom and throne. Note we are not covering all the promises in the Messianic Line but just hitting the highlights.

📖 **(2 Sam 7:13-16 KJV)** "He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever. {14} I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men: {15} But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took *it* from Saul, whom I put away before thee. {16} And **thine house** and **thy kingdom** shall be established for ever before thee: **thy throne** shall be established for ever."

So God tells David that his throne will be established forever. That throne will be established through Jesus Christ. This divine promise is what we know as the Davidic Covenant. Verse 16 above declares three essential

parts that make up the ongoing Davidic Covenant.

1<sup>st</sup> “thine house”—a continued family

2<sup>nd</sup> “thy kingdom”—a realm of political power

3<sup>rd</sup> “thy throne”—the rulership of that kingdom would be centered in David’s family

Note the following verses that give us additional information about the consummation of the Davidic Covenant.

 **Jeremiah 23:5 through Jeremiah 23:6 (KJV)** <sup>5</sup>Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. <sup>6</sup>In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this *is* his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Isaiah predicts that Christ will fulfill this covenant. Listen to these prophecies in Isaiah.

 **(Isa 9:7 KJV)** "Of the increase of *his* government and peace *there shall be* no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this."

 **(Isa 11:1-5 KJV)** <sup>{1}</sup>And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: <sup>{2}</sup>And the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD; <sup>{3}</sup>And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: <sup>{4}</sup>But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. <sup>{5}</sup>And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins.

This prophecy was fulfilled in Luke 2:20. **Luke 2:40 (KJV)** <sup>40</sup>**And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him.**

Let us continue by looking at prophecies in Psalms.

 **(Psa 89:3-4 KJV)** "<sup>{3}</sup>I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, <sup>{4}</sup>Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations. Selah."

📖 **(Psa 89:35-37 KJV)** "<sup>35</sup>Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. <sup>36</sup>His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. <sup>37</sup>It shall be established for ever as the moon, and *as* a faithful witness in heaven. Selah."

Now, we will pick up our thoughts back in the New Testament.

📖 **Matthew 1:18 through Matthew 1:25 (KJV)** <sup>18</sup>Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. <sup>19</sup>Then Joseph her husband, being a just *man*, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. <sup>20</sup>But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, **Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife:** for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. <sup>21</sup>And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins. <sup>22</sup>Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, <sup>23</sup>Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. <sup>24</sup>Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife: <sup>25</sup>And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS.

📖 **Luke 1:26 through Luke 1:33 (KJV)** <sup>26</sup>And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, <sup>27</sup>To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name *was* Mary. <sup>28</sup>And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, *thou that art* highly favoured, the Lord *is* with thee: blessed *art* thou among women. <sup>29</sup>And when she saw *him*, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. <sup>30</sup>And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. <sup>31</sup>And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. <sup>32</sup>He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: **and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David:** <sup>33</sup>And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.

The Book of Matthew is the Book of the King and presents Jesus as the Son of David and King of Kings. King David in the Old Testament had two sons that need to be mentioned here. One was Solomon who became King and the other was Nathan. Thus in Matthew we have the genealogical

record of Joseph. Joseph was from the kingly line of Solomon. A curse by God was put on this genealogical line when Coniah sinned exceedingly. Note the following passage.

 ***(Jeremiah 22:24-30 KJV)*** "As I live, saith the LORD, though Coniah the son of Jehoiakim king of Judah were the signet upon my right hand, yet would I pluck thee thence; {25} And I will give thee into the hand of them that seek thy life, and into the hand of *of them* whose face thou fearest, even into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, and into the hand of the Chaldeans. {26} And I will cast thee out, and thy mother that bare thee, into another country, where ye were not born; and there shall ye die. {27} But to the land whereunto they desire to return, thither shall they not return. {28} *Is this man Coniah a despised broken idol? is he a vessel wherein is no pleasure? wherefore are they cast out, he and his seed, and are cast into a land which they know not?* {29} O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the LORD. {30} Thus saith the LORD, **Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah.**"

This verse (Jeremiah 22:30) speaking of Coniah says, “**Write this man childless.**” What does this mean? This actually means that Coniah will not have an heir to come to the throne of David. If you just continue to read the passage it is clear, “**a man that shall not prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah.**” Coniah had several sons. You will find that 1 Chronicles 3:17 gives a list of those sons. But there would not be an heir from the family of Coniah who would sit on the throne of David. God has cursed the kingly line to which He has promised the throne “for ever”. How will God keep His promise to David of “**thy throne shall be established for ever**”? And the clear biblical inference in these passages is that the next heir of David who will sit on the throne must be the Lord Jesus Christ. This sums up the curse on the line through Joseph, the husband of Mary. However, without the curse, Joseph would have had a legal right to the throne of David.

Now the Book of Luke gives the genealogical record of Mary through Nathan, the other son of David previously referred to. It is necessary that we remember that both Joseph and Mary were from the lineage of David—28 generations later.

God promises a throne to David forever and then, God curses the kingly line of David and says none of his heirs can sit on the throne. These declarations totally contradict one another. God’s word must uphold both. From a worldly perspective, both cannot happen. However, through the

divine miracle of the virgin birth and the “begetting” of the Lord Jesus, God can fulfill his promises. This is how God does it.

Through Mary, Jesus received His body of flesh from the line of David.

Although not the physical father, Joseph was the legal earthly father of the Lord Jesus. Remember, that as a son of David through Solomon, Joseph (without the curse) has a legal right to the throne of David. And also remember, Joseph and Mary were legally married at the time of the birth of Jesus. Thus, Jesus, without the fleshly of the line of Coniah, has no curse and has a legal right to the throne of David. Jesus is and will be the only one in history to be able to legally take and hold this title.

You know the story. Christ came the first time and they put a crown of thorns on his head. Christ will return at the second coming and take the Throne of David. Then, we can proclaim Him King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Note, it took the **exact** combination of the above to work this out.

To finish and sum up here, through Mary, Christ acquires His human or fleshly side from the line of David and also the title “Son of man.” Through this title of the “Son of man,” Jesus becomes our kinsman redeemer. Through the conception of the Holy Ghost, Christ carries the title of the Son of God. Through the birth of Jesus into the family of Joseph, Jesus has the legal right to the throne of David. The curse is removed from the kingly line through the virgin birth and the line of David has a seed that is eligible to take the throne.

Joseph and Mary combine to give Jesus the complete title “son of David.” And yes, the Lord Jesus Christ is “the son of David and King of Kings”. All of this is divinely and precisely designed because Jesus is the “only begotten.” Look at the perfect architecture and craft of thought and word to precisely fit the two concepts of “the son of David and King of Kings” and “only begotten” into a doctrinal building fitly framed together with our Lord Jesus Christ as the Chief Corner Stone. “Only begotten” provides the tie that binds, the proper connectivity and the total Biblical fulfillment to the teaching of “the son of David and King of Kings.” These new versions fail to make this critical doctrinal tie.

**Tenth, the Bible teaches that Jesus had the actual blood of God flowing through his veins. “The blood of God” cannot be the blood of God unless Jesus was “begotten.”** Look at this astounding verse. *Acts 20:28 (KJV)* “<sup>28</sup>Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed **the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.**” Do you understand what this is saying? The church of God was purchased with the blood of God. **Yes! The blood of Jesus was divine blood and holy blood.**

Dr. M.R. DeHann wrote the little high impact book The Chemistry of the Blood. Dr. DeHann, a medical doctor and preacher from yesteryear, points out that the blood came from the Holy Ghost, and the blood of the child inside the womb never mixes with that of its mother. The conception of the Holy Ghost made the divine blood of God possible. A true Christian will fight for the doctrine of the blood. To leave out the term “begotten” from John 3:16 leaves out the blood. May a few good Christians read this and determine to fight the battle for the purity of the Word of God.

And yes, the Lord Jesus Christ had “the blood of God” flowing through His veins because He was the “only begotten.” Look at the perfect architecture and craft of thought and word to precisely fit the two concepts of “the blood of God” and “only begotten” into a doctrinal building fitly framed together with our Lord Jesus Christ as the Chief Corner Stone. “Only begotten” provides the tie that binds, the proper connectivity and the total Biblical fulfillment to the teaching of “the blood of God.” These new versions fail to make this critical doctrinal tie.

**Eleventh, the failure to translate “begotten” in John 3:16 removes Christmas from this verse.** Christ was not the only son of God but, as we have already proved, Christ was the “only begotten” Son of God. We have Christmas because Christ was “begotten.” Do I need to go on? What kind of person removes Christmas from any verse in the Bible? At the time of this writing, Christmas is two weeks in the future. The Jehovah’s Witnesses do not observe Christmas and we need no part of that crew. These new versions in many instances mirror the corrupt New World Translation of the Jehovah’s Witnesses. Compare the first chapter of the Gospel of John in the New Word Translation to these new versions. Do your homework!

Two weeks after this writer wrote the above paragraph, my wife helped with a simple children’s Christmas program. She wrote it herself using the word “Christmas” as an acrostic. All the verses were directly related to the birth of the Christ child and the program concluded with the KJV version of John 3:16. My wife had not read the writings of these theological reprobates and their treacherous view that “begotten” does not relate to the incarnation of Christ. Yes, the Bible talks about these theological reprobates saying “professing themselves wise they became fools.”

**Twelfth, to fail to translate “begotten” in John 3:16 is to violate the perfect genealogical context of the four gospels.** Note the precise harmony of the Gospels:

- ◆ Matthew—the book of the King... Note, the genealogy of Joseph and wise men episode...

- ◆ Mark—the book of the Servant... a servant has no genealogy of that one that’s note of
- ◆ Luke—the book of the Son of Man...Genealogy of Mary and record of her family
- ◆ John—the book of the Son of God... John 1:14

And yes, the Lord Jesus Christ was God the Son and the Son of God made flesh because He was the “only begotten.” Look at the perfect architecture and craft of thought and word to precisely fit the two concepts of “the Son of God” and “only begotten” into a doctrinal building fitly framed together with our Lord Jesus Christ as the Chief Corner Stone. “Only begotten” provides the tie that binds, the proper connectivity and the total Biblical fulfillment to the teaching of “the Son of God.” These new versions fail to make this critical doctrinal tie to the genealogical records of the other gospels. Any novice should readily see the precise divine connectivity and accuracy of how the Bible always agrees with itself.

**Thirteenth, God’s perfectly prepared sacrificial body of Christ was possible because Jesus was “begotten” through the virgin birth of Mary. Look at what Hebrews has to say.**

 **Hebrews 10:4 through Hebrews 10:10 (KJV)** <sup>4</sup>For *it is* not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. <sup>5</sup>Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a **body** hast thou prepared me: <sup>6</sup>In burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin thou hast had no pleasure. <sup>7</sup>Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God. <sup>8</sup>Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and *offering* for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure *therein*; which are offered by the law; <sup>9</sup>Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. <sup>10</sup>By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the **body** of Jesus Christ once *for all*.

Hebrews is the book of better things found in the better covenant of the New Testament. The Old Testament book of Leviticus gives us meticulous details about the old covenant sacrifices and how they were to be offered. It has been said that if you could enter the throne room of heaven and ask our Heavenly Father what He thought of His Son, the Father would take you to the book of Leviticus and there each offering would be used to describe the work, personality, character and very perfection of Christ. There we would find a portion of God’s family album with a multitude of pictures of Christ. God gave those old covenant ordinances and sacrifices to the Jew as prophetic signposts pointing forward to the coming of Christ.

Oh! Although thousands upon thousands of sacrifices have been offered though the ages, the Bible says these ordinances and sacrifices were just shadow of good things to come. These sacrifices could never take away sin nor make the comers thereunto perfect. They could not purge the conscience of sins and in fact, called sins to remembrance again each year. It was impossible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.

You should also know that the Bible teaches that our body is made of sinful flesh and we are unable to be the sacrifice for ourselves or anyone else. Christ was made in the “likeness of sinful flesh.” Yet, Christ was without sin.

Christ came and Christ died. Now, the world is offered salvation through the offering of the **body** of Jesus Christ. Christ died once for all sinners, for all sin, and for all time.

And yes, God “prepared” the sacrificial “body” of our Lord Jesus Christ and this was made possible because He was “begotten.” Look at the perfect architecture and craft of thought and word to precisely fit the two concepts of a perfect sacrificial “body” and “only begotten” into a doctrinal building fitly framed together with our Lord Jesus Christ as the Chief Corner Stone. “Only begotten” provides the tie that binds, the proper connectivity and the total Biblical fulfillment of the teaching of the perfect “body” necessary to meet the sacrificial demands of a Holy God. These new versions fail to make this critical doctrinal tie.

**Fourteenth, there is a Biblical relationship between “begotten” and the “resurrection.”** We have established that Christ came through the virgin birth and lived in a body that met the demands of a Holy God for a perfect sin sacrifice. The Bible plainly teaches Jesus died, was buried, spent three days and three nights in the tomb and came out of that tomb with his body—alive and well. This could only happen because Jesus was “begotten.”

The word “resurrection” is defined as the “raising of the dead” and literally refers to “the standing up of a body.” The Bible knows nothing of a spiritual resurrection. Oh, a few professing apostates have tried to argue for a spiritual resurrection but they have found no biblical merit for their case. Now the heathen and pagan religions have their various forms of spiritual ascensions, reincarnations, transmigrations of the soul into other bodies, and host of other after life speculations derived from minds that have become vain in their imaginations and their own darkened foolish hearts.

1 Corinthians chapter 15 is commonly known as the “Resurrection Chapter of the Bible” and verses 21 and 22 say, “For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” Read the rest of the chapter for Paul’s irrefutable defense of the doctrine of the resurrection.

Jesus appeared to the eleven after His resurrection and said in *Luke*

**24:39 KJV**, “Behold **my** hands and **my** feet, that it is **I myself**: handle **me**, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see **me** have.” Six times, Jesus uses personal pronouns concerning Himself—**my** hands, **my** feet, **I**, **myself**, **me** and **me** again. Man was created in the sixth day and Jesus was raised alive with a body as a man. And those who understand the word of God know that the use of personal pronouns in this case is not by happenchance.

Acts 1:3 says, “To whom also he showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible **proofs**, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God:” Think of it! There is more evidence documented by many infallible proofs that Jesus died, was buried and rose again than any other fact from modern to ancient history.

The resurrection proves that the Father has accepted the sacrifice and that there is an eternal remedy for your sins and my sins. We now have the promised blessing of Abraham graciously bestowed upon us and all who will accept the Son of God as their personal savior. In Chapter 16 of this book, we have demonstrated that “begotten” in some cases refers to the resurrection. In other words, the English word “begotten” can refer to the birth or the resurrection of Jesus depending upon the usage in the passage. However, many of these new version commentators want to say that “begotten” has nothing do with the physical. Think of it! By the divine providence of God, the Bible uses “begotten” to refer to both the physical birth and the physical resurrection of Christ.

And yes, the Lord Jesus Christ had to be “begotten” before there could be a “resurrection” of the “body.” Look at the perfect architecture and craft of thought and word to precisely fit the two concepts of the bodily “resurrection” of Christ and “only begotten” into a doctrinal building fitly framed together with our Lord Jesus Christ as the Chief Corner Stone. “Only begotten” provides the tie that binds, the proper connectivity and the total Biblical fulfillment of the doctrine of the “resurrection” of the body of Christ. These new versions fail to make this critical doctrinal tie.

**In conclusion, “only begotten” as used in John 3:16 and other verses is absolutely necessary to connect Christ from the first book to the last book of the Bible.** Yes, today, we worship the God-man, the Lord Jesus Christ who is raised from the dead and serves as mediator for all. **1 Timothy 2:3 through 1 Timothy 2:6 (KJV)** <sup>3</sup>“For this *is* good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; <sup>4</sup>Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. <sup>5</sup>For *there is* one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; <sup>6</sup>Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.” To the saved, the Lord Jesus is set down at he right hand of throne of God as our Great High Priest.

Oh and Christ can be our mediator because He is a man and because

He was physically “begotten.” Did we miss that?

This writer feels old some days. However, because He lives, I will live forever some day. Yes, the grave will get me unless the Lord returns to rapture His saints. Ah, but there is a resurrection for all who believe. And yes, in Christ there is a sure and eternal hope. The Bible teaches, “now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.”

The Old Testament Ark of the Covenant is the most interesting piece of furniture in the history of mankind. God gave the plan for the architecture. Man built the Ark. Many scholars say that the Ark of the Covenant is the most perfect type and picture of Christ in the Old Testament. You may remember the “Indiana Jones” blockbuster movie Raiders of the Lost Ark. In it, Hitler thought if he could capture the Ark, he could control the world. So we have a little truth and a little myth in the movie. Read about the very truth of this Ark from the word of God and then we will briefly sum up its absolutely critical relation to John 3:16.

 **Exodus 25:10 through Exodus 25:22 (KJV)** <sup>10</sup>And they shall make an ark of shittim wood: two cubits and a half *shall be* the length thereof, and a cubit and a half the breadth thereof, and a cubit and a half the height thereof. <sup>11</sup>And thou shalt overlay it with pure gold, within and without shalt thou overlay it, and shalt make upon it a crown of gold round about. <sup>12</sup>And thou shalt cast four rings of gold for it, and put *them* in the four corners thereof; and two rings *shall be* in the one side of it, and two rings in the other side of it. <sup>13</sup>And thou shalt make staves of shittim wood, and overlay them with gold. <sup>14</sup>And thou shalt put the staves into the rings by the sides of the ark, that the ark may be borne with them. <sup>15</sup>The staves shall be in the rings of the ark: they shall not be taken from it. <sup>16</sup>And thou shalt put into the ark the testimony which I shall give thee. <sup>17</sup>And thou shalt make a mercy seat of pure gold: two cubits and a half *shall be* the length thereof, and a cubit and a half the breadth thereof. <sup>18</sup>And thou shalt make two cherubims of gold, of beaten work shalt thou make them, in the two ends of the mercy seat. <sup>19</sup>And make one cherub on the one end, and the other cherub on the other end: *even* of the mercy seat shall ye make the cherubims on the two ends thereof. <sup>20</sup>And the cherubims shall stretch forth *their* wings on high, covering the mercy seat with their wings, and their faces *shall look* one to another; toward the mercy seat shall the faces of the cherubims be. <sup>21</sup>And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. <sup>22</sup>And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubims which *are* upon the ark of the testimony, of all *things* which I will give thee in

---

commandment unto the children of Israel.

As you have seen above, the Ark of the Covenant was made of wood and covered with gold. Remember, today, Christ is the true Ark and is the fulfillment of this scriptural typology. Any Bible scholar will tell you that the wood speaks of the humanity of Jesus and the gold speaks of His deity. You see the humanity of Christ is all wrapped up in His Deity. And that is exactly the teaching of “only begotten” in John 3:16.

Now we conclude this section. Look at this verse in the last chapter in the Bible.

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

The word offspring as defined by Strong’s is “**G1085** *genos ghen'-os* From **G1096**; “kin” (abstractly or concretely, literally or figuratively, individually or collectively):—born, country (-man), diversity, generation, kind (-red), nation, offspring, stock.” You will note that G1096 is the “begotten” part of “only begotten” or “monogenes” in the Greek. **Yes, Jesus is the “only begotten” from the book of Genesis (her seed) to the Book of the Revelation.**

Look at the perfect architecture and craft of thought and word to precisely tie the beginning of the Bible to the end of the Bible into a doctrinal building fitly framed together by our Lord Jesus Christ. Dr. Criswell calls Christ, “the scarlet thread through the Bible.” “Only begotten” provides the tie that binds, the proper connectivity and the total Biblical fulfillment to “her seed” and to the final thought of who Jesus was, that is “the root and offspring of David.” These new versions fail to make these critical doctrinal ties to the Biblical genealogical records.

## Chapter 20: John 3:16 And Its Role In Refuting Ancient Heresies

If you have read any of the sound Christian books on the New Age Movement and its effect on Christianity and the Christian heresies they perpetuate, you know that the new age heresies are just the old “doctrines of devils” with a new wrapping. The devil has no new tricks and the Bible adage, “there is nothing new under the sun,” is absolutely true.

Texe Marrs is the well-known author of the #1 landmark national Christian bestseller, *Dark Secrets of the New Age*. Mr. Marrs, in his book, points out that these new age dark secrets are just old heresies in a new age garb. Then G.A. Riplinger comes along and rightly ties these new versions to these new age religions and heresies. These heresies are as old as the New Testament itself. The early church fathers, through correct interpretation of the Bible, have settled these heresies long ago. In spite of established orthodox doctrine, the old slippery serpent slides in and markets his old goods in a new package.

The Book of John and John 3:16 combats and thoroughly refutes many of these old “doctrines of devils.” These true doctrines are taught in a host of other books and places in the Bible, but our comments will be directed toward passages from John and their relation to the refutation of these heresies and the relationship to our theme verse of John 3:16. This is an effort to be brief. Books could be written on each of the three heresies—Gnosticism, Adoption, and Arianism. *Christian Apologetics & Research Ministry* gives us a concise definition of each heresy and then this writer will add a few comments of the significance of John 3:16 in combating each.

You will find the following quoted at [www.carm.org](http://www.carm.org) website of *Christian Apologetics & Research Ministry*.<sup>1</sup>

Gnosticism traces its roots back just after the beginning of the Christian Church. Some researchers state that evidence of its existence even predates Christianity. Whichever the case, the error of gnosticism had affected the culture and church of the time and possibly even earned a mention in 1 John 4.

The word "gnosticism" comes from the Greek word "gnosis" which means "knowledge." There were many groups that were Gnostic and it isn't possible to easily describe the nuances of each variant of Gnostic doctrines. However, generally speaking, Gnosticism taught that salvation is achieved through special knowledge (gnosis). This knowledge usually dealt with the individual's relationship to the transcendent Being.

A more detailed Gnostic theology is as follows. The unknowable God was far too pure and perfect to have anything to do

with the material universe which was considered evil. Therefore, God generated lesser divinities, or *emanations*. One of these emanations, Wisdom desired to know the unknowable God. Out of this erring desire the *demiurge* an evil god was formed and it was this evil god that created the universe. He along with *archons* kept the mortals in bondage in material matter and tried to prevent the pure spirit souls from ascending back to god after the death of the physical bodies. Since, according to the Gnostics, matter is evil, deliverance from material form was attainable only through special knowledge revealed by special Gnostic teachers. Christ was the divine redeemer who descended from the spiritual realm to reveal the knowledge necessary for this redemption. In conclusion, Gnosticism is dualistic. That is, it teaches there is a good and evil, spirit and matter, light and dark, etc. dualism in the universe.

What we know about Gnosticism is gained from the writings of Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Tertullian, Origen, and some later manuscripts discovered in the eighteenth century such as the "Codex Askew, Codex Bruce, the Berlin Gnostic Codes and, most recently, the Nag Hammadi collection."<sup>1</sup> Nag Hammadi is a town in Upper Egypt near ancient Chenoboskion and 13 codices were discovered about 1945.

The danger of gnosticism is easily apparent. It denies the incarnation of God as the Son. In so doing, it denies the true efficacy of the atonement since, if Jesus is not God, He could not atone for all of mankind and we would still be lost in our sins.

There is debate whether or not this is a Christian heresy or simply an independent development. The evidence seems to point to the later. Nevertheless, the Gnostics laid claim to Jesus as a great teacher of theirs and as such requires some attention. It is possible that 1 John was written against some of the errors that Gnosticism promoted.

**1. Achtemeier, Paul J., Th.D., *Harper's Bible Dictionary*, (San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.) 1985.**

Gnosticism, while its roots may not be in Christianity, is a Christian heresy in the fact that it denies the incarnation. To refute Gnosticism is simple. John 1:1 says that the "Word [Jesus] was God." In addition John 1:14 says the "Word was made flesh." Thus we see the incarnation in John 1:14. John 3:16 simply affirms the incarnation by saying Jesus was the "only begotten."

Look at the following excellent passage as Dr. Ken Matto connects Gnosticism to the New American Standard Version. Also Dr. Matto does

some important work for me in that he deals with John 1:18 and the “only begotten God” heresy.<sup>2</sup> (used by permission)

[http://www.scionofzion.com/nasv\\_gnostic.htm](http://www.scionofzion.com/nasv_gnostic.htm)

**The New American Standard Version**  
**Another Gnostic Version** By Dr. Ken Matto

The New American Standard Version is a book which uses manuscripts corrupted with the Gnostic heresy dating back to the 2nd century AD. With men like Clement of Alexandria and Origen corrupting the Scriptures according to their Gnostic beliefs, what we have today are the descendants of these evil corruptions. The Gnostics disbelieved the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ and this is why we see His divine name and title dismembered in many verses. Unfortunately too many Christians listen to men like James White, Kenneth Barker, or D.A. Carson and just take their words as if they are Gospel. What they say and what you see will always be different! You will see some major corruptions in the NASV in this short article. Please keep in mind that we are dealing only with a small part of the corruption in the NASV, there is much more, but I am focusing only on this subject.

**John 1:18**

KJV - No man hath seen God at any time; **the only begotten Son**, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.

NAS: No one has seen God at any time; **the only begotten God** who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him.

This verse is very revealing verse showing the Gnostic influence on the modern versions. The Textus Receptus clearly reads in the Greek **[Greek words and letters deleted]** which is “monogenês huios.” It means the “only begotten son.” Let us look and see if there is a history of the words being translated that way.

Wycliffe Bible (1382) - No man sai euer God, no but the `oon bigetun sone, that is in the bosum of the fadir, he hath told out.

Tyndale Bible (1525) - No ma hath sene God at any tyme. The only begotte sonne which is in ye bosome of ye father he hath declared him.

Matthews (1537) - No man hath seen God at any time. The only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.

Geneva Bible (1560) - No man hath seene God at any time: that onely begotten Sonne, which is in the bosome of the Father, he hath declared him.

King James (1611) - No man hath seene God at any time: the onely begotten Sonne, which is in the bosome of the Father, he hath declared him.

We have plainly seen that there is over 600 years of testimony that the phrase is “only begotten son.” Let us look at the NASV rendering and why they changed it and the reason behind it.

In the Greek which underlies the NASV the words have been changed to (monogenas theos) which means “only begotten God.” It may sound theologically correct but analyze that statement. It is saying that God has been begotten, in other words, they are claiming that Jesus was a created being. He never ceased to be God, even on earth. God always is and can never be created, since He is from everlasting to everlasting. When I look at the UBS Greek textual note on this verse, the names Origen and Clement appear in the footnote. Both of these men were heretics and Gnostics which denied the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. I am speaking of Clement of Alexandria, Egypt where both he and Origen had corrupted the Bible manuscripts with Gnostic heresies which resulted in continued transmission of the corruption which we still have in the NASV. The NASV along with the NIV has been corrupted with the Gnostic heresy and yet Christians and pastors accept these corrupt books and call them God’s Word. This is why S. Franklin Logsdon, the chief translator of the NASV had renounced the translation as vile corruption. God never did, nor will He ever hand over His Word to unbelievers. The 1611 King James Bible was the last translation made which was done by all true Christians with impeccable credentials. The modern Bibles have been translated by unbelievers, sodomites, Roman Catholics (The NASV is a Roman Catholic book as all modern translations are), Gnostics, Unitarians, Occultists, those who reject the literal creation and other parts of the Bible, etc. Tell Me, when you really get down and compare the unqualified translators of today

and their view of the Lord Jesus Christ to the KJB translators who were all saved and godly men, which Bible should you be reading? You know as well as I do. (used by permission)

The next two heresies “Arianism” and “Adoptionism” are twin heresies. There is a difference but both can be refuted in the same manner. It is widely known that to train a man to identify counterfeit money, you never have to expose the trainee to the counterfeit. If a man knows the real thing the counterfeit is easily identifiable. And this is true, so much the more, in dealing with Christ and the true things of God.

We continue from [www.carm.org](http://www.carm.org) and *Christian Apologetics & Research Ministry*.<sup>3</sup>

Arianism developed around 320, in Alexandria Egypt concerning the person of Christ and is named after Arius of Alexandar. For his doctrinal teaching he was exiled to Illyria in 325 after the first ecumenical council at Nicaea condemned his teaching as heresy. It was the greatest of heresies within the early church that developed a significant following. Some say, it almost took over the church.

Arius taught that only God the Father was eternal and too pure and infinite to appear on the earth. Therefore, God produced Christ the Son out of nothing as the first and greatest creation. The Son is then the one who created the universe. Because the Son relationship of the Son to the Father is not one of nature, it is, therefore, adoptive. God adopted Christ as the Son. Though Christ was a creation, because of his great position and authority, he was to be worshipped and even looked upon as God. Some Arians even held that the Holy Spirit was the first and greatest creation of the Son.

At Jesus' incarnation, the Arians asserted that the divine quality of the Son, the Logos, took the place of the human and spiritual aspect of Jesus, thereby denying the full and complete incarnation of God the Son, second person of the Trinity.

In asserting that Christ the Son, as a created thing, was to be worshipped, the Arians were advocating idolatry. (used by permission)

Well, this is easy enough. A combination of John 1:1 and John 1:14 clearly defeat Arianism. *John 1:1 - 3 (KJV)* “<sup>1</sup>In the beginning was the Word, and the **Word was with God**, and the Word was God. <sup>2</sup>**The same was in the beginning with God.** <sup>3</sup>All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.” *John 1:14 (KJV)* “<sup>14</sup>And the Word

was **made flesh**, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.” Jesus (the Word) was “with” God in the beginning and thus not created by God. And the Bible goes on to say, “All things were made by him...”

These modern and despicable versions open the door to the perversion of “adoption” by any and all of their mistranslations of John 3:16. Yes, and these perverts know and understand the issue here. We have already dealt with the heresy of “begotten by the resurrection” in reference to John 3:16 and in the writings of John.

Again, we continue from [www.carm.org](http://www.carm.org) and *Christian Apologetics & Research Ministry* as they address the “adoption” issue.<sup>4</sup>

Adoptionism is an error concerning Christ that first appeared in the second century. Those who held it denied the preexistence of Christ and, therefore, His deity. Adoptionists taught that Jesus was tested by God and after passing this test and upon His baptism, He was granted supernatural powers by God and adopted as the Son. As a reward for His great accomplishments and perfect character Jesus was raised from the dead and adopted into the Godhead.

This error arose out of an attempt by people to understand the two natures of Jesus. The scriptures tell us that Jesus is both God and man: *“for Him dwells all the fullness of deity in bodily form,”* (Col. 2:9). This is known as the doctrine of the Hypostatic Union where in the one person of Christ, there are two natures: God and man.

Theodotus of Byzantium was the most prominent adherent to this error.

Adoptionism was condemned as a heresy by Pope Victor (A.D. 190-198).

### **8th Century revision**

Adoptionism was later revived in the 8th Century in Spain by Elipandus, archbishop of Toledo, and Felix, bishop of Urgel. This was a variation of the first error but it held that Christ was the Son of God in respect to his divine nature, but that as a man, he was only adopted as the first born of God.

In 798 Pope Leo III held a council at Rome that condemned adoptionism as a heresy. (used by permission)

And again, this can be answered by the simple previous response to Arianism above. John 3:16 says that the Son is the “only begotten” and thus “made flesh.” Note, Jesus, if “begotten”, could not be adopted. Again, Satan has no new tricks and Satan is always the same trickster and occasionally dresses in a new costume.

---

Dr. Jack Moorman has some excellent comments on Adoptionism. The following statement was copied from the **Dean Burgon Society Webpage**.

Dr. Jack Moorman, is one of God's choice servants. He labors in the United Kingdom as a missionary of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. He is not only a pastor and one who prints and distributes thousands of gospel tracts in various locations in the area of London, but he is also a prolific writer.

FOREVER SETTLED, was one of his first volumes. He used it to teach his students at a Bible College in South Africa where he served the Lord as a missionary before going to England. He has five other excellent books "IN DEFENSE OF TRADITIONAL BIBLE TEXTS", as well as a new book on BIBLE CHRONOLOGY--THE TWO GREAT DIVIDES.

All of these are available from the Dean Burgon Society.

*The Dark Secret* by Pastor Jack Moorman discusses **Adoptionism**: Here are some quotes from *The Dark Secret Behind the Text of the Modern Versions*.<sup>5</sup>

The Name "Jesus" is frequently disassociated from the titles "Lord" and "Christ." Whereas in the AV we will read "Jesus Christ" or the "Lord Jesus Christ," in the Modern Versions "Jesus" is often made to stand alone or not at all. **In fact, our Savior's full title "Lord Jesus Christ" is found 84 times in 81 verses in the AV and only 60 times in 60 verses in the NIV, 62 times in 62 verses in the NRSV, and 63 times in 63 verses in the RSV.** A noticeable difference is clearly apparent!

The name "Jesus" is frequently removed from statements of Deity and works of Deity.

Dr. Moorman goes on to list a host of examples and then concludes.

This separation of "Jesus" from "Christ" occurs far too often to look for any cause other than deliberate editing in certain N.T. manuscripts. That there was a strong movement in the early centuries which could result in such a systematic editing, there can be no doubt! The foremost error regarding the Person of Christ, is of course, to deny His true Deity and true Humanity. The chief means by which this was done, and which finds expression down to our

---

own day, is technically known as "Adoptianism" or "Spirit Christology." Here: Jesus of Nazareth, an ordinary man of unusual virtue, was "adopted" by God into divine Sonship by the advent of the "Christ-Spirit" at His baptism. Therefore, Jesus became Christ at His baptism, rather than, the fact that He was always the Christ from eternity. And though united for a time, Jesus and Christ were separate personages. Many names and groups are associated with this wicked teaching, foremost of whom were the Gnostics.  
(used by permission)

## Chapter 21: John 3: 16 And Glorious Doctrinal Truths Related To Salvation

For this book to be complete, there should at least be some consideration of the other doctrines found in John 3:16. This verse presents the glorious salvation offered to man. Also, John 3:16 refutes some other heresies that relate to salvation and the word of God.

### For God so loved

“**For God so loved...**” Let us look at the love of God. Yes, this is the most addressed aspect of God in the Christian realm and thus, we will lightly touch on the thought here. However, the song, The Love Of God, is a great, but brilliantly brief outline of the love of God.

Frederick M. Lehman wrote this song in 1917 in Pasadena, California, and it was published in *Songs That Are Different*, Volume 2, 1919. The lyrics are based on the Jewish poem *Haddamut*, written in Aramaic in 1050 by Meir Ben Isaac Nehorai, a cantor in Worms, Germany; they have been translated into at least 18 languages.

### The Love Of God

The love of God is greater far  
Than tongue or pen can ever tell;  
It goes beyond the highest star,  
And reaches to the lowest hell;  
The guilty pair, bowed down with care,  
God gave His Son to win;  
His erring child He reconciled,  
And pardoned from his sin.  
*Refrain: O love of God, how rich and pure!  
How measureless and strong!  
It shall forevermore endure  
The saints' and angels' song.*  
When years of time shall pass away,  
And earthly thrones and kingdoms fall,  
When men, who here refuse to pray,  
On rocks and hills and mountains call,  
God's love so sure, shall still endure,  
All measureless and strong;  
Redeeming grace to Adam's race—  
The saints' and angels' song.

Could we with ink the ocean fill,  
 And were the skies of parchment made,  
 Were every stalk on earth a quill,  
 And every man a scribe by trade,  
 To write the love of God above,  
 Would drain the ocean dry.  
 Nor could the scroll contain the whole,  
 Though stretched from sky to sky.

In an old Bible at home, my wife has written a quote from an old sermon. It simply says, “Love is an act.” And yes, God demonstrated his love for us, when He gave his Son as a sin sacrifice on the cross of Calvary. Christ took our place. He was our substitute. The Bible says plainly in ***John 15:13***, “Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.”

It has been said that the word “so” is the longest word in the dictionary. May I say, the theme of the love of God will never be exhausted. No, I do not understand it. But God “so loved” you and me. Calvary shows us the height, depth, and breadth of that love. It is unconditional love. It is divine love. It is love that has furnished salvation for you and me.

### the world

“**the world...**” Here is a word that is quite plainly not believed in many professing Christian circles. **As previously and more fully documented in chapter 3**, John Gill completely reverses the meaning of John 3:16. Gill advocates for the sick doctrine of double predestination. Gill writes all of the garbage quoted below just to simply say—God loves only the predestined for heaven or “the objects of God’s special love,” and this verse only applies to the chosen. Listen to the following perverted quotes of Gill.

“not every man in the world is here meant,…”

“or all the individuals of human nature;…”

“for all are not the objects of God’s special love…”

“nor is Christ God’s gift to every one;…”

“which is not the case of every man.”

“Nor is human nature here intended,…”

“yet not for the sake of all men,…”

“it will not be easily proved, that human nature is ever called the world:  
 nor is the whole body of the chosen ones,…”

“and God’s elect among them, are meant; who are often called “the world”, and “the whole world”,…”<sup>1</sup>

Think of it! All of this perverted rubbish to explain that God did not simply mean exactly what He said in John 3:16. Gill, a scholar in many aspects and considered one of “The Divines” of yesteryear, could not see the simple truth that Christ died for all mankind. Gill offers no scriptural back up for his statements in his comments on this passage because a multitude of verses clearly refute his conjecture. This kind of perversion is arrogant, wicked, and sick beyond belief. Yet, the works and writings of Gill are considered a prize possession in many seminary circles. The Bible defines the world here: 1 John 2:2 (KJV) <sup>2</sup>And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for *the sins of the whole world*.

Edwin H. Palmer is “the executive secretary of the New International Version of the Bible (NIV) and general editor of the NIV Study Bible.” He is also the author of *The Five Points of Calvinism*. In this book, advocating for double predestination, Mr. Palmer paraphrases John 3:16 like this:

“It was just because God so loved the world of elect sinners that He sent His only begotten Son that the world might be saved through Him (John 3:16-17).”<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Palmer’s God could create the heavens, fling the stars into their precision orbs, form the earth, and write the DNA of man. However, Mr. Palmer’s poor ole God could not even write His most notable verse and make it plain enough for all of us to understand. In the previous paragraph quoted above and in his book, Mr. Palmer says, “Since the objects of the Father’s love are particular, definite, and limited, so are the objects of Christ’s death. Because God has loved certain ones and not all,…”<sup>3</sup>

Why did God just not tell us, He did not love all of us and make it plain in John 3:16? Why on earth would God put “whosoever” in John 3:16? Was it to deliberately deceive us? Maybe God did not have the nerve to tell millions he predestined them to hell. Maybe God was ashamed of His actions. I speak foolishly.

Mr. Palmer, “the executive secretary of the *New International Version* of the Bible (NIV) and general editor of the NIV Study Bible,” has a sick and perverted view of God. It is absolutely nauseating that thousands of pastors carry this garbage into the pulpits and quote this corrupt garbage Sunday after Sunday. Many mean well, do not believe in “double predestination,” yet unwittingly expose their congregations to a strain of viruses that is corrupting every sphere of modern Christianity. Oh! By the way, Mr. Palmer adds to John 3:16 in the above quote. He is not done changing John 3:16 and as we will see when he removes “begotten” from John 3:16 in the NIV.

Yes, John 3:16 was written for the whole world and to the whole world. The verse is simple and straightforward. God is God. and the God of

love and integrity. God is honest, and His word is true. Oh! The devil is the deceiver. The Devil is the one who will say one thing and mean another.

There is on one end of the scale of Christian thought as it relates to salvation, the premise of “free will”. On the other end of the scale is the premise of what we shall term “double predestination,” that states God has forever predestined every person’s fate, either to heaven or hell. In the middle, you will find the concept and the complete and correct doctrine—that of “eternal security.” Very briefly, the positions look like this.

The doctrine of free will says that man comes to God of his own volition and is saved by grace. This is absolutely true. However, the “free will” position says that if that man sins enough to cross God’s “sin line” (my own term) then that person loses their salvation and/or “falls from grace.” Generally, the Methodists and the Free Will Baptists hold to this view. This is a general summary and certainly not true in every case.

Yes, the Bible teaches that a man comes to God on His own volition. God, always first seeks the sinner, and sends the Holy Spirit to convict the sinner, and to draw him to Christ. When God calls, every man responds by an act of his own will. The order is... ***Acts 20:21 (KJV)*** ...**repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.** Repentance is an act of the will. God has never let a rebel and unrepentant sinner into his family and never will. Note: the only kind of life the Bible offers is eternal life.

The true doctrine of eternal security (also called “assurance” or termed “once saved always saved”) says a sinner comes to God through their own volition and is saved. The saved are eternally secure in their salvation. Currently, this view is held by the majority of Baptists, many Brethren, and many (most, I think) Presbyterians. This is the position the writer holds. This is the forthright teaching of John 3:16. This position in no way gives the Christian a license to sin. This view, when seen from the entire Biblical perspective, serves as a real deterrent to sin. All Christians, upon conversion, receive a new nature. This new nature will help the Christian live pleasing to God. In the event, the Christian follows the old nature, and that event will happen to every Christian at some point in their Christian life on this earth, then the Bible teaches that God will chastise the erring Christian until they return to Him in obedience. If chastisement does not work, God will take his child home so that the erring child does not bring disgrace to Lord Jesus Christ, who bought the sinner, and paid for the sinner with His own blood. See ***Hebrews 12:6 through Hebrews 12:11 and 1 Corinthians 5:1 through 1 Corinthians 5:5*** for some passages that support this view.

 ***Hebrews 12:6 through Hebrews 12:11 (KJV)*** <sup>6</sup>**For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.** <sup>7</sup>If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is

he whom the father chasteneth not? **<sup>8</sup>But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons.**

<sup>9</sup>Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live? <sup>10</sup>For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. <sup>11</sup>Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby.

 **1 Corinthians 5:1 through 1 Corinthians 5:5 (KJV)** <sup>1</sup>It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife. <sup>2</sup>And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. <sup>3</sup>For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed, <sup>4</sup>In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, **<sup>5</sup>To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.**

This "eternal security" position believes in predestination. However, the doctrine of predestination applies **only** to the Christian and supports the doctrine of eternal security.

The last perverted and false view of salvation is the premise of "double predestination." Double predestination is also termed under the headings of Calvinism, hyper-Calvinism, 5-point Calvinism, predestination, or absolute sovereignty of God. This position says that all men are either predestined to hell or heaven and there can be no altering of the destination. "Reformed Theology" is another term that encompasses this position. Men who hold this position say that God is absolutely sovereign. In addition, they claim that man in the fall lost all his will to do anything morally good. Man cannot even have faith unless God, for all essential purposes, forces it on him. They have several passages from the Bible which they over interpret and twist to quote from. However, the strongest passage of the hyper-Calvinists is **Ephesians 1:1 through Ephesians 1:14**. We will take their passage and look at their predestination points in scripture in this passage by **bolding** them. And as you would expect, this very section has some phrases that support free will that the hyper-Calvinists fail to mention or properly emphasize. These sections that teach free will or man's responsibility will be both **bolded and underlined**.

 **Ephesians 1:3 through Ephesians 1:14 (KJV)** <sup>3</sup>Blessed *be* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly *places* in Christ: <sup>4</sup>**According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world**, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: <sup>5</sup>**Having predestinated us** unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, <sup>6</sup>To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved. <sup>7</sup>In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; <sup>8</sup>Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; <sup>9</sup>**Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself:** <sup>10</sup>That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; *even* in him: <sup>11</sup>**In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will:** <sup>12</sup>That we should be to the praise of his glory, **who first trusted in Christ.** <sup>13</sup>**In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth,** the gospel of your salvation: in whom also **after that ye believed,** ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, <sup>14</sup>Which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.

We will pull these phrases out for a little speculation and inspection.

### Phrases That Are Used To Support Double Predestination

- ◆ **According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world**
- ◆ **Having predestinated us**
- ◆ **Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself**
- ◆ **In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will**

### Phrases That Are Used To Support Free Will and Man's Responsibility in Salvation

- ◆ **who first trusted in Christ**

- ◆ In whom ye also trusted,
- ◆ after that ye heard the word of truth
- ◆ after that ye believed,

Yes, God “hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world... Having predestinated us...according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself...being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will...”

This surely shows us that predestination occurred before the foundation of the world. But just who is predestined? Let us read on!

“Who hath blessed **us**...hath chosen **us** in him...that **we** should be holy...Having predestinated **us**...wherein he hath made **us** accepted...In whom **we** have redemption...he hath abounded toward **us**...Having made known unto **us**...In whom also **we** have obtained...That **we** should be...In whom **ye** also *trusted*, after that **ye** heard the word of truth...after that **ye** believed, **ye** were sealed... Which is the earnest of **our** inheritance...”

Fifteen times in this short passage the Bible talks about “**us, we, ye, and our.**” Who do these pronouns refer to? The *Book of Ephesians* is the book of the church, wrote to the church, and for the church. It is the love letter of the Lord Jesus Christ to his bride. The church is the bride of Christ. Ephesians writes to the Christian about the riches we presently have in Christ. This letter to the *Ephesians* is wrote to the universal church in one part and directed to local congregations in the remainder. The “us, we, ye, and our” passages refer to the saved—the saints of God. The predestined are those who have trusted Christ. Not one word here or anywhere else in the Bible, when properly interpreted gives us any indication that God allows anyone to be born with no hope and predestined to hell.

Here is the strongest passage in the word of God for the hyper-Calvinists and this passage establishes that the predestined are Christians, the born again, the saved. How did they get saved? It is the same for every man. It is through faith. These promises are for those listed as follows--“**who first trusted in Christ...In whom ye also trusted...after that ye heard the word of truth...after that ye believed.**” You might want to pay special attention to “**who first trusted**” and “**after that ye heard the word of truth**” and “**after that ye believed.**” Faith is man’s responsibility. We have the free will to choose to trust Christ when He calls. Man also has the option to refuse.

Evangelist Ronnie Owens is a friend of our family. Brother Ronnie is also the greatest personal soul winner that I know. God has given him a special anointing to preach the gospel and draw a multitude to Christ. In his

message, *Predestined for Hell—I Think Not*, Brother Ronnie agrees with my assessment of predestination when he says, “So when you are saved, you are predestined to heaven.”

It has been pointed out by many scholars that John 6:37 teaches both the sovereignty of God and the free will of man. Here it is. **John 6:37**, “**All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.**”

You will find a pot full of commentaries that say the sovereignty of God and the free will of man run though eternity on parallel tracts (like railroad tracks) and they can never cross. It is said that both are contradictory, and yet true. It is also said that only God Himself can reconcile these truths.

I bought that for years and now methinks it might not be that hard. When the Bible talks of a mystery, it speaks of something that is revealed in the Bible. The Bible is a revelation. We have already established from the Bible itself, that the Bible is a simple book and totally complete in that, the Bible defines and explains itself.

“All that the Father giveth me shall come to me” is the first portion. The question that everyone would have answered is, “Who has the Father given?” And the answer is, “him that cometh.”

The hyper-Calvinist will say that in John 6:37, “All that the Father giveth me” is stated first and that produces “him that cometh.” But the previous verses state, **John 6:32-35**, “Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. (33) For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the **world**. (34) Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. (35) And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: **he that cometh** to me shall never hunger; and **he that believeth** on me shall never thirst.”

The context is “the world” to “he that cometh” and “he that believeth.” We repeat! The old adage “a text without context is pretext” is absolutely true. Context must be considered on at least four levels:

1. The context of the immediate passage
2. The context within the specific book of the Bible
3. The context of the Bible when taken as a whole.
4. The contexts of the usage of Greek and English words in other passages of the Bible.

Search the Bible. There are no restrictions on “him that cometh” and we have the glorious promise that if we come “I will in no wise cast out.”

My children were present as young adults when one pastor preached that the day he came to the Lord was the day he was predestined to be saved. This pastor said he would have been saved whether he wanted to be saved or

not. This same pastor believed little children were predestined from their birth to damnation and hell. Let me say and repeat, God has never forced salvation on anyone against his or her will and never will. Neither will God let an unrepentant rebel who refuses and spurns His Son into Heaven.

However, God welcomes “whosoever will” to come. The Bible even encourages the vilest of sinners to come. Finish the chapter in John 6, and yes, you find the invitation from our very Lord Jesus. His very words are to **“every one”** and **“any man.”**

Ah! What does this have to do with John 3:16? It is all right there, **“For God so loved the world ...”** None are excluded. These hyper-Calvinists fail to note the precise harmony of the Gospels. The Gospels were written for different purposes and to different people. Yet, all scripture is given for our admonition. Dozens, yes dozens of commentators thoroughly document the following.

- ◆ Matthew presents Christ as the King and was written to the Jew and the nation of Israel.
- ◆ Mark presents Christ as a servant and was written to the Roman.
- ◆ Luke presents Christ as the Son of Man and was written to the Greek.
- ◆ John—the book of the Son of God, and God the Son, was written to the world.

For a person to believe in double predestination, that person would have to deny the entire message of the book of John and thus deny the Bible itself. The following gives the purpose of the book of John.

 **John 20:31 (KJV)** <sup>31</sup>But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.

The question here is, “Just who is the **“ye”** (note: “ye” is plural in the KJV) in the above verse?” Well, it is just any **“ye”** that will believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.

In addition, the doctrine of repentance violates the hyper-Calvinistic premise that man is so depraved that he has lost his free will to the bondage of sin and has no ability to come to Christ. Look at this.

 **Acts 17:30 (KJV)** <sup>30</sup>And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent:

Repentance is an act of the will. How could, and why would, God command men to repent if they had no will or ability to repent? Repentance is literally “a change of mind.” Again, repentance is an act of volition. Is

God going to command “all men everywhere” to do something they could not do?

The following are a dozen or more of other verses/passages in context (of literally hundreds) that refute double predestination. These absolutely deal the deathly head blow to this damnable doctrine of double predestination and the Bible contains hundreds more.

- 📖 **2 Peter 3:9** The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, **not willing** that **any** should perish, but that **all** should come to repentance.
- 📖 **1 Timothy 2:3** For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; 4 **Who will have all men to be saved**, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. 5 For there is one God, and one mediator **between God and men**, the man Christ Jesus; 6 Who gave himself **a ransom for all**, to be testified **in due time**.
- Mark 16:15 (KJV)** <sup>15</sup>And he said unto them, Go ye into **all the world**, and **preach the gospel to every creature**.
- 📖 **Luke 24:47 (KJV)** <sup>47</sup>And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among **all nations**, beginning at Jerusalem.
- 📖 **1 John 2:2 (KJV)** And he is the propitiation for our sins: and **not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world**.
- 📖 **John 10:9 (KJV)** <sup>9</sup>I am the door: by me **if any man** enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture.
- 📖 **John 6:40 (KJV)** <sup>40</sup>And this is the **will of him that sent me**, that **every one** which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.
- 📖 **John 12:46 (KJV)** <sup>46</sup>I am come a light into the **world**, that **whosoever** believeth on me should not abide in darkness.
- 📖 **1 John 4:14 (KJV)** <sup>14</sup>And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son *to be* the **Saviour of the world**.
- 📖 **Romans 10:8 through Romans 10:13 (KJV)** <sup>8</sup>But what saith it? The word is nigh **thee**, *even* in **thy** mouth, and in **thy** heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach; <sup>9</sup>That if **thou** shalt confess with **thy** mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in **thine** heart that God hath raised him from the dead, **thou** shalt be saved. <sup>10</sup>For with the heart **man** believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. <sup>11</sup>For the scripture saith, **Whosoever** believeth on him shall not be ashamed. <sup>12</sup>For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over **all** is rich unto **all** that call upon him. <sup>13</sup>For **whosoever** shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.
- Romans 11:32 (KJV)** <sup>32</sup>For God hath concluded them **all** in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon **all**.

📖 **Rev. 22:17 (KJV)** <sup>17</sup>And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let **him** that heareth say, Come. And let **him** that is athirst come. And **whosoever** will, let **him** take the water of life freely.

📖 **John 3:15 through John 3:18 (KJV)** <sup>15</sup>That **whosoever** believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. <sup>16</sup>For God **so loved the world**, that he gave his only begotten Son, that **whosoever** believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. <sup>17</sup>**For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.** <sup>18</sup>**He that believeth** on him is not condemned: but **he that believeth** not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

Who are the **Whosoever(s)**, the **thee(s)**, the **if any man(s)** and the **all (s)?** They are just as you would think. They are just any possible person that wishes to come to Jesus—no matter how bad—how vile or how wretched, who will come with a heart of repentance and faith. You should insert our text John 3:16 with the above verses.

John Wesley did not see the doctrine of eternal security. But Wesley, in his sermon *Free Grace*, was right when he summed up the doctrine of the hyper-Calvinists as “by virtue of an eternal, unchangeable, irresistible decree of God, on part of mankind are infallibly saved, and the rest infallibly damned; it being impossible that any of the former should be damned. or that any of the latter should be saved.” Hear Wesley’s response, “This is the blasphemy clearly contained in the horrible decree+ of predestination! And here I fix my foot. On this I join issue with every assessor of it. You represent God as worse than the devil; more false, more cruel, more unjust... Such blasphemy this, as one would think might make the ears of a Christian to tingle! It destroys all his [God’s] attributes at once: It overturns both his justice, mercy, and truth; yea, it represents the most holy God as worse than the devil, as both more false, more cruel, and more unjust.” The whole sermon by John Wesley entitled *Free Grace* can be found on a host of websites and published in many books and publications.

Some of you, who are familiar with these hyper-Calvinists doctrine of the absolute sovereignty of God and double predestination, know that one of the ancient arguments against them says that these tenets make God the author of sin. At that point the hyper-Calvinists cry “foul” and in this case rightly point to their confessions and the Bible. I was online and there was a discussion among these hyper-Calvinists about this issue. One blogger stated that “God had to be the author of sin or sin came in and God could not stop it.” Another blogger responded that he “preferred to believe that God was the author of sin” because that view revealed a “stronger God.”

This is just my illustration to show the utter nonsense that can be

brought in to the Christian realm by starting down the man made theological interpretation slope of hyper-Calvinism.

The hyper-Calvinists fail in their interpretation of scripture by interpreting every scripture in light of their “eternal decree” view. Note, if the Bible is true:

1. All scripture must be interpreted in light of all other scripture.
2. There can be no contradictions in the Bible. When one scripture interpretation contradicts another, then one or the other interpretation is wrong.
3. The scriptures are God’s revelation to man. God reveals Himself as a God of love and invites all to come. And Jesus said, in *John 5:40 (KJV)*, “And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.”

As you are probably aware, hundreds of books have been written from both pro and con points of view on the predestination issue. We have just scratched the surface. Some will no doubt point out that predestination and election cannot be thoroughly discussed without dealing with the issues of God’s sovereignty, foreknowledge, and foreordination. Ah! This is true. Let me say, I believe these all of these doctrines. However, they do not, when properly interpreted, exclude God’s offer of salvation to all of the lost world of sinners. And yes, this writer believes that God must convict a sinner of his sin and draw the sinner to Himself. But man must receive Christ by faith and faith is not a work. See Galatians 2:16. Our point here is simple. These doctrines (predestination and election) in no way nullify the Biblical doctrine of free will and man’s responsibility to trust Christ. Nor does the doctrine of free will diminish God’s total and complete sovereignty in any way.

Dave Hunt wrote his very fine book entitled *What Love Is This?* with the basic premise that dogmatic “double predestination” perverts the entire concept of the love of God. And yes, it does. Also, Laurence Vance in his book *The Other Side of Calvinism* documents the arrogance, darkness, and perversion of a brand of Calvinism that teaches “double predestination.” These are two great books that should be a part of every Christian’s repertoire.

Finally, from a personal view, many Calvinists or hyper-Calvinists are saved and Godly men and uplift the Lord Jesus Christ. Many of these men hold to the KJV and do an excellent job in defense of the KJV. Some of these Calvinists have been very gracious in granting this writer the use of some of their excellent quotes and articles in this book. They believe in getting the Gospel to all people in every nation. While in my mind, and based upon my understanding of the Bible, I believe they are dead wrong on their views of predestination, these men deserve the utmost commendation for their work for the Lord. However, John Calvin carries as much weight in many Calvinist circles as the Bible itself. It is widely known and freely acknowledged among

most Calvinists that the main tenets of Calvin's doctrine come from Augustine and the Catholic Church—an exceedingly corrupt well. Also, in reading the biography of Calvin, there was no new birth experience recorded.

### **That he gave is only begotten son**

**“That he gave is only begotten son...”** shows us that salvation and eternal life are a gift. God gave His son to die at Calvary for you... and for me. This sums up the whole purpose of the Bible. And if a gift, we do not have to do anything, pay any price, do any work, sign any note, or make any promises for it. Read on and the next section bleeds into this section.

### **That whosoever believeth in him**

**“That whosoever believeth in him...”** simply says that salvation comes through faith, believing, and/or trust in Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. True faith puts trust in His finished work on the cross. Martin Luther brought in the reformation through the clear teaching of “salvation through faith.” This doctrine is the heart of the gospel. Salvation is not based upon our works before we are saved, nor our works after we are saved, nor our promise or commitment to do something at the point of salvation. We serve God out of a heart of love because “He first loved us.”

Salvation is based upon repentance toward God, and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ. Before a sinner is saved, that person's works and commitment are not a factor. A sinner has nothing to commit and no ability to keep the commitment. Any honest sinner knows that.

The person who trusts Christ and believes in the “only begotten” Son of God is the one who is saved. Christ finished our salvation on the cross. He did the work. He died for me. He rose from the dead proving God is perfectly satisfied with His work on the cross. All my works are as filthy rags. If God is satisfied with the work of Christ on my behalf, Yes! Yes! Yes! I am satisfied too.

My friend Bill said on occasion, “I looked at the cross and I had nothing to offer.” The old song *Rock of Ages* explains the position of a sinner and the path to salvation much better than I can.

Rock of Ages, cleft for me,  
Let me hide myself in Thee;  
Let the water and the blood,  
From Thy wounded side which flowed,

Be of sin the double cure;  
 Save from wrath and make me pure.  
 Not the labor of my hands  
 Can fulfill Thy law's demands;  
 Could my zeal no respite know,  
 Could my tears forever flow,  
 All for sin could not atone;  
 Thou must save, and Thou alone.  
 Nothing in my hand I bring,  
 Simply to the cross I cling;  
 Naked, come to Thee for dress;  
 Helpless look to Thee for grace;  
 Foul, I to the fountain fly;  
 Wash me, Savior, or I die.  
 While I draw this fleeting breath,  
 When mine eyes shall close in death,  
 [*originally* When my eye-strings break in death]  
 When I soar to worlds unknown,  
 See Thee on Thy judgment throne,  
 Rock of Ages, cleft for me,  
 Let me hide myself in Thee.  
 By Augustus M. Toplady

The believer according to the blessed word of God is saved. The unbeliever is not saved. Salvation is not of works. The believer is changed by the new birth and will have works, but these works do not merit any part of salvation.

 **Galatians 2:16 (KJV)** <sup>16</sup>Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

 **Romans 3:23 through Romans 3:30 (KJV)** <sup>23</sup>For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; <sup>24</sup>Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: <sup>25</sup>Whom God hath set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; <sup>26</sup>To declare, *I say*, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. <sup>27</sup>Where *is* boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. <sup>28</sup>Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. <sup>29</sup>*Is he* the God of the Jews only? *is he* not also of the Gentiles?

Yes, of the Gentiles also: <sup>30</sup>Seeing *it is* one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.

Some (many) say, they believe salvation is by faith but then you must work to secure heaven. No! It is one or the other and the following is one of the proof texts. Also, study the prior texts in combination with the text below.

 **Romans 11:6 (KJV)** <sup>6</sup>And if by grace, then *is it* no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if *it be* of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.

Surely, Every true born again Christian understands that salvation is based solely on the grace of God and faith in Jesus Christ His Son and His finished work through his death, burial, and resurrection.

 **Ephesians 2:8 through Ephesians 2:9 (KJV)** <sup>8</sup>For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: *it is* the gift of God: <sup>9</sup>Not of works, lest any man should boast.

 **Romans 10:9 through Romans 10:10 (KJV)** <sup>9</sup>That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. <sup>10</sup>For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.

Yes, all of this is in perfect agreement with our most glorious and noble theme verse, John 3:16. We will not comment on “**in him**” because He is the very theme of this book and the Book of Books and we have commented in other passages herein that amply cover the subject.

### **Should not perish but have**

“**Should not perish but have...**” gives us absolute proof that we will never be in danger of eternal destruction in hell again. Now some people believe that a person cannot be for sure and for certain that they are saved until after they are dead. Not so! The whole verse is present tense. Salvation is instantaneous. The song *To God be the Glory*, quoted previously, says “that moment.” Yes, the very moment anyone trusts Christ and His death as their sin payment, that person immediately receives eternal and everlasting life.

There is a serious problem in our culture today that was almost previously unheard of in the days of yesteryear. Some do not think that man commits sins. Some think that today’s modern man is too refined, too

educated, and too cultured to sin. But the Bible says in *Romans 6:23 (KJV)* **<sup>23</sup>For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.**

The Bible talks about a physical death and an eternal spiritual death. Go to the graveyard. Look out there. All die. Death takes its toll on all ages, all nations, all races, all social classes, the religious and the irreligious, rich and poor, both sexes, tall and short, narrow and wide, and we could go on and on. The graveyard provides us with a tremendous object lesson. There is a heaven to gain and a hell to shun. The Bible says in *Revelation 21:8 (KJV)* **<sup>8</sup>But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.** You see, the very fact of physical death as a curse on mankind and taught by the Bible provides irrefutable proof that there is also second death in hell. Ah! There is no need to fear for those who are in Christ. He has promised us everlasting life.

### everlasting life

“Everlasting life...” as taught in the Bible is an absolute and positive hope. The Bible is no fantasy book. Heaven is a place with a street of gold, many mansions, and the river of life. It has been said that if this life is all there is, this is a mistake. Where there is desire, there is always something to meet that desire. Where there is thirst, there is water. Where there is hunger, there is food. Where there is a need for companionship, there is a mate. We could go on and on. Everyone desires everlasting life and a second chance without the pain and sorrow of this life. And yes, we who know the Lord will have it. Read the following and let these words paint a picture in your mind. This is what God has promised! Read on about these promises!

 *Revelation 21:9 through Revelation 21:27 (KJV)* <sup>9</sup>And there came unto me one of the seven angels which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will show thee the bride, the Lamb’s wife. <sup>10</sup>And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God, <sup>11</sup>Having the glory of God: and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal; <sup>12</sup>And had a wall great and high, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel: <sup>13</sup>On the east three gates; on the north three gates; on the south three gates; and on the west three gates.

<sup>14</sup>And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. <sup>15</sup>And he that talked with me had a golden reed to measure the city, and the gates thereof, and the wall thereof. <sup>16</sup>And the city lieth foursquare, and the length is as large as the breadth: and he measured the city with the reed, twelve thousand furlongs. The length and the breadth and the height of it are equal. <sup>17</sup>And he measured the wall thereof, an hundred *and* forty *and* four cubits, *according to* the measure of a man, that is, of the angel. <sup>18</sup>And the building of the wall of it was *of* jasper: and the city *was* pure gold, like unto clear glass. <sup>19</sup>And the foundations of the wall of the city *were* garnished with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation *was* jasper; the second, sapphire; the third, a chalcedony; the fourth, an emerald; <sup>20</sup>The fifth, sardonyx; the sixth, sardius; the seventh, chrysolite; the eighth, beryl; the ninth, a topaz; the tenth, a chrysoprusus; the eleventh, a jacinth; the twelfth, an amethyst. <sup>21</sup>And the twelve gates *were* twelve pearls; every several gate was of one pearl: and the street of the city *was* pure gold, as it were transparent glass. <sup>22</sup>And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. <sup>23</sup>And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb *is* the light thereof. <sup>24</sup>And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. <sup>25</sup>And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there. <sup>26</sup>And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it. <sup>27</sup>And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither *whatsoever* worketh abomination, or *maketh* a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.

 **Revelation 22:1 through Revelation 22:21 (KJV)** <sup>1</sup>And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. <sup>2</sup>In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, *was there* the tree of life, which bare twelve *manner of* fruits, *and* yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree *were* for the healing of the nations. <sup>3</sup>And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him: <sup>4</sup>And they shall see his face; and his name *shall be* in their foreheads. <sup>5</sup>And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light: and they shall reign for ever and ever.

<sup>6</sup>And he said unto me, These sayings *are* faithful and true: and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel to show unto his servants the things which must shortly be done. <sup>7</sup>Behold, I come quickly: blessed *is* he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book. <sup>8</sup>And I John saw

these things, and heard *them*. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which showed me these things.

<sup>9</sup>Then saith he unto me, See *thou do it* not: for I am thy fellowservant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God. <sup>10</sup>And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand. <sup>11</sup>He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still. <sup>12</sup>And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward *is* with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. <sup>13</sup>I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. <sup>14</sup>Blessed *are* they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. <sup>15</sup>For without *are* dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie. <sup>16</sup>I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, *and* the bright and morning star. <sup>17</sup>And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely. <sup>18</sup>For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: <sup>19</sup>And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and *from* the things which are written in this book.

<sup>20</sup>He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen.

Even so, come, Lord Jesus. <sup>21</sup>The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with you all. Amen.

## Chapter 22: Concluding Thoughts about the Doctrinal Perversions of John 3:16 and “The One vs. The Holy One” Issue

In the previous chapters of this book, all the arguments of these modern translators to justify their miss-translations and perversion of John 3:16 have been refuted. However, there is an additional dark side to some of the erroneous renderings of John 3:16. G.A. Riplinger devotes a 21 page chapter entitled “The One vs. The Holy One” in her book *New Age Versions* to the complete documentation of this dark side.

In an attempt to write my own section, this author spent more time and effort than in other portions of the book to develop my own material concerning this. I quite simply fell far short of developing the proper back-up documentation of “The One vs. The Holy One” issue. However, the published report from The Dean Burgon Society's 1992 Annual Meeting by Dr. Robert Barnett, Vice President of the Dean Burgon Society, did my work for me in fine fashion as they summarize Riplinger's findings on this issue. You should know there are several that make an effort to refute Riplinger's findings. However, Riplinger, in my research, was found to be totally correct in her connection of “The One” and the NIV rendering of “one and only” to the New Age Movement. Read on for this mini and shocking expose. If this makes you mad, get your own copy of *New Age Versions* and read “the rest of the story.”

G. A. Riplinger traces the changing of the Holy One of Israel to "The One" of Eastern mysticism. New Age author Naomi Goldenberg in her *Changing of the Gods* has asserted: God is going to change...we women are going to bring...the end of Him." The 'he' of Christianity is being replaced with the neuter 'One' of Hinduism in modern Bible versions. Riplinger says "The One" is used in hundreds of places in modern Bibles where there is no underlying Greek or Hebrew support.

Riplinger unravels this 'mystery' from *The Encyclopedia of Mysticism and Mystery Religions*. "The One' is the term for the Ultimate in many mystical religions and philosophies. The New Age meanings: "1. 'The One' or 'the Only One' is Lucifer, the angel of this planet's evolution. 2. 'The one' or 'the Living One' is all of reality as described in pantheism or monism. 3. 'The Coming One' or 'The Mighty One' is Lord Maitreya's New Age Christ(antichrist)."

Blavatsky made it clear that "The One" excludes the God of our Bible, "One is not Jehovah. The Jewish Deity is...never the One Absolute All. No God...called Jehovah...can be the One. The One is superior to Elohim....The Unknown Unmanifested One, since it abounds in both sexes is - male and female - nor yet the Christian

'Father' as the latter is a male and not androgyny."

While NIV chief Edwin Palmer asserts the terms 'one' and 'only' are "modern and elegant" substitutions, history reveals they are reserved for Satan. "Layard's *Babylon and Niveviah* (London, 1853) traces the origin of the 'One Only' to the serpent "the one Only God of the Babylonians." MACROBIUS, *Saternalia* written in A.D. 1521 confirms the historical association of the term 'one only' with Satan: "A serpent...According to the fundamental doctrine of the mysteries (is) ...the one only god...Satan, then was recognized as the one only god."

"The One" has so filled our culture, Riplinger said, "A study of college students on 48 campuses identified a greater proportion who believe God and the material world are one and the same, than believe in the Christian view of God as a distinct supernatural 'Being'." This shift is what esoteric Alice Bailey has called "the Plan." Both New Age books and new Bible versions are urging Christians to drop 'the Son' for 'the One'. He is not called Holy, but the god of both the evil and the good.<sup>1</sup>

The purpose of *The Dean Burgon Society* is to defend the traditional Bible texts. Their position on the KJV is as follows, "The Authorized King James Bible has been, and continues to be, the God honored, most accurate, and best English translation of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, and preserved original language words of God."<sup>2</sup> *The Dean Burgon Society* web page is an excellent resource.

These new versions are not just filled with innocent errors. They are totally perverted and corrupt. **Again, The premise of this book is: The perversion and subversion of John 3:16 and other critical passages provide irrefutable proof that these new versions are contaminated with doctrinal error that stem from roots of biblical apostasy and heresy.**

**Section III—History of Truth & Subversion**  
**Chapter 23—Methods Of Translation—**  
**Legitimate And Illegitimate**

A short study of the versions of the Bible is necessary here. Since there are a host of excellent books, articles, and material available that will help us to identify perverted versions of the Bible, this study will use this material and guest authors as we have done on plenty of previous occasions.

First, we look at the superiority of the KJV and start on a positive note.

Second, we will look at the perversions of the Greek. The most popular Greek versions in use today are derived from the totally corrupt work of Wescott and Hort. Moreover, most Greek Lexicons have been corrupted. This corruption is found in the fact that the definitions and meanings of the words have fallen prey to religious politics, opinions, and modern re-interpretation.

Third, we will examine theories of translation. Some of which corrupt the word of God. This subject is somewhat complicated. Here a brief overview is provided. At the end of this book we have provided some recommended books and articles for some most interesting and valuable additional reading on the topics in this portion of study. Most Christians do not know how we got our Bible. You need to know. My hope is that Christians will recognize the need to know their history and especially the history of God's preservation of his word. Again, the references at the end of this book will give you access to a host of vital information. Also, much of the information is free. You only need to be connected to the Internet for a storehouse of free information.

**The Study Of Bible Translation, By Timothy Binion**

The Original languages Hebrew (small portions written in Aramaic) and Greek were chosen by God to reveal His Divine will. Thousands of Hebrew and Greek manuscripts were preserved by God to insure accuracy of the words that are Divinely inspired of God. Translators bring these words from Hebrew and Greek manuscripts to our own language (Receptor Language). One of three primary methods (also called theories or philosophies) of translation is adopted to bridge the historical distance or gap between the original and receptor languages. Every receptor language whether French, German, Spanish, English etc . . . must first discover which method the translators have used in order to chose the best translation. One must question how these translators dealt with the

differences in our understanding of words, grammar, idioms, culture and history. The degree to which one is willing to go in order to bridge the gap between two languages have flooded the market with different translations and challenge us in choosing the best English version. For example, should the word "torch" be translated "flashlight" or "lamp," should "holy kiss" be translated the "handshake of Christian love?" Some translations may use modern day expressions rather than the words, phrases and languages that reflect what is found in the original text.

There are three main theories of translation used or adopted in bridging the original and receptor languages; **Literal, Dynamic Equivalent, and Free or Paraphrase.**

**1) Literal:** The attempt to translate by keeping as close as possible to the exact words and phrasing in the original language, yet still make sense in the receptor language. A literal translation will keep the historical distance intact at all points.

**2) Dynamic Equivalent:** The attempt to translate words, idioms, and grammatical constructions of the original language into precise equivalents in the receptor language. Most keep historical distance but update matters of language, grammar and style.

**3) Free or Paraphrase:** The attempt to translate the ideas from one language to another, with less concern about using the exact words of the original text. This type of translation tries to eliminate as much of the historical distance as possible.

The problem with a Free translation should be quite apparent. The translator updates the original author too much and becomes a private interpretation or commentary. Though some interpretations may be necessary in translating to the receptor language, the least amount of personal interpretation the better the translation.

A Free translation is always done by a single translator. The Living Bible is a Free translation and uses words like "flashlights" in Ps. 119:105; "handshakes" in 1 Peter 5:14; "pancakes" in Gen. 18:6; "special abilities" (spiritual gifts Greek word *charismata*) in 1 Corinthians 12 - 14; and Rome (in the place of Babylon) in 1 Peter 5:13 (the translator thinks Babylon was a code word for Rome conforming scripture to Roman Catholic tradition).

Most of us do exchange Bible day words for more current day understanding in issues of Weight, Measurement and Currency. We change bathes, ephahs, homers, shekels, talents, subit, span, denarius or penny into pounds, inches and dollars to understand how big, heavy or how much something costs. Any group of translators that change these original weight, measurement and currency words

within the text generally feel the liberty to change more significant words and thereby interpret for you what God has said. I personally want a English Bible that is as true to the original text as possible so I can form my own opinions of cultural and historical relevance.

New Translations tend to add euphemisms or words that are less expressive or direct but considered less distasteful or less offensive. Matters of sex and private circumstances fall into this category. For examples compare Gen 31:35 in the (NIV, NASB, KJV, RSV) and 2 Sam. 13:14 (KJV, NIV).

Perhaps the most critical part of translation is finding the right English word that means the same as the Hebrew or Greek word. For example in 2 Timothy 3:16 we read "All scripture [is given by inspiration of God, and is] (one Greek word "theopheoustos") profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:" The NIV translates "theopheoustos" "is God-breathed". Some new translations may in places better reflect the original meaning of a Hebrew or Greek word but the overall method used by the translators determine our translation choice.

A translator must also work with Grammar and Syntax. The Word order and genitive constructions are at times altered to meet modern day English grammar. For example thousands of times in the Old Testament the KJV translators woodenly followed the Hebrew word order and all verses that begin with the word "and" in the Hebrew begin with "and" in the KJV. However, If you read from a NIV you will find in Genesis chapter 1 the word "and" removed. Do you want one single word that God has given us, left out? NO! On the surface this may be a better form of English but the thing we must keep mind is that we are not dealing with poetry or a bibliography this is the Word of God. Since we are building life and death matters on the translation we need every word given in English, even if it does not make sense to its translators. The Holy Spirit within the believer ultimately provides the understanding and not the translator.

It was this type of liberty in making the text make sense that led to the R.S.V 1946 N.T. (1952 whole Bible Revised Standard Version a bunch of Liberal Bias Scholars) changing Isaiah 7:14 to read "Young Woman" rather than a virgin shall conceive. This is why we don't need scholars interpreting the text but translating it as it is found in the original text. However, since translation is in itself a (necessary) form of interpretation, we want to chose the translation that has the least amount of changes from the original text. The grammar, history and culture should be bridged by the Holy Spirit

filled reader rather than its translator. We must use the most literal version available. This is why the King James Version 1611 remains the best choice for believers today. Not because the translation was divine or poetic but because it is over all the best literal translation of the original languages. The New American Standard runs a close second and claims "to adhere as closely as possible to the original languages". In my opinion if you must read another translation the New American Standard is by far better than the others. The NIV on the other hand is too dynamic and leaves out important words like "propitiation" (1John 2:2). The Free or paraphrase versions are totally unacceptable for preaching or study.<sup>1</sup> (used by permission)

**Tim Binion, Pastorim.org, P.O. Box1034, Hendersonville, TN 37075 From website "anchor your life" <http://www.pastortim.org/> This site is dedicated to providing both understanding and direction for saint and sinner. Many people live in areas where the truth is no longer preached or they have difficulty finding a sound Church to attend. This web site enables you to hear and see sermons preached at Victory Missionary Baptist Church, where I pastor.**

The following, after reading the above, gives us some light about the procedures and care taken in the translation of the KJV. Legitimate Bible translators of any age must recognize the word of God as the infallible, inerrant, and inspired word of God. The KJV translators were such men. They possessed the right view of the word of God, sound ethics, and unparalleled scholarship. The KJV translators were unique for their time and in my opinion have no peers in our age or any other age. The following was copied from the website [www. jesus -is-lord.com](http://www.jesus-is-lord.com).

### THE RULES FOR TRANSLATING

The King was for appointing fifty-four learned men to this great and good work; but the number actually employed upon it, in the first instance, was forty-seven. Order was also taken, that the bishops, in their several dioceses, should find what men of learning there were, who might be able to assist; and the bishops were to write to them, earnestly charging them, at the king's desire, to send in their suggestions and critical observations, that so, as his Majesty remarks, "our said intended translation may have the help and furtherance of all our principal learned men within this our kingdom." Seventeen of the translators were to work at Westminster, fifteen at Cambridge, and as many at Oxford. Those who met at each place

were divided into two companies; so that there were, in all, six distinct companies of translators. They received a set of rules for their direction.

1. The first instructed them to make the "Bishop's Bible," so called, the basis of their work, altering it no further than fidelity to the originals required...
2. The second rule requires that the mode then used of spelling the proper names should be retained as far as might be.
3. The third rule requires "the old ecclesiastical words to be kept," such as "church" instead of "congregation."
4. The fourth rule prescribes, that where a word has different meanings, that is to be preferred which has the general sanction of the most ancient Fathers, regard being had to "the propriety of the place, and the analogy of faith."
5. The fifth rule directs that the divisions into chapters be altered as little as may be.
6. The sixth rule, agreeably to Dr. Reynolds's wise suggestion at Hampton Court, prohibits all notes or comments, thus obliging the translators to make their version intelligible without those dangerous helps.
7. The seventh rule provides for marginal references to parallel or explanatory passages.
8. The eighth rule enjoins that each man in each company shall separately examine the same chapter or chapters, and put the translation into the best shape he can. The whole company must then come together, and compare what they have done, and agree on what shall stand. Thus in each company, according to the number of members, there would be from seven to ten distinct and carefully labored revisions, the whole to be compared, and digested into one copy of the portion of the Bible assigned to each particular company.
9. The ninth rule directs, that as fast as any company shall, in this manner, complete any one of the sacred books, it is to be sent to each of the other companies, to be critically reviewed by them all.
10. The tenth rule prescribes, that if any company, upon reviewing a book so sent to them, find any thing doubtful or unsatisfactory, they are to note the places, and their reasons for objecting thereto, and send it back to the company from whence it came. If that company should not concur in the suggestions thus made, the matter was to be finally arranged at a general meeting of the

chief persons of all the companies at the end of the work. Thus every part of the Bible would be fully considered, first, separately, by each member of the company to which it was originally assigned; secondly, by that whole company in concert; thirdly, by the other five companies severally; and fourthly, by the general committee of revision. By this judicious plan, each part must have been closely scrutinized at least fourteen times.

11. The eleventh rule provides, that in case of any special difficulty or obscurity, letters shall be issued by authority to any learned man in the land, calling for his judgment thereon.
12. The twelfth rule requires every bishop to notify the clergy of his diocese as to the work in hand, and to "move and charge as many as, being skilful in the tongues, have taken pains in that kind, to send his particular observations" to some one of the companies.
13. The thirteenth rule appoints the directors of the different companies.
14. The fourteenth rule names five other translations to be used, "when they agree better with the text than the Bishop's Bible." These are Tyndale's; Matthew's, which is by Tyndale and John Rogers; Coverdale's; Whitchurch's, which is "Cranmer's," or the "Great Bible," and was printed by Whitchurch; and the Geneva Bible. The object of this regulation was to avoid, as far as possible, the suspicious stamp of novelty. To the careful observance of these injunctions, which, with the exception of the first five, are highly judicious, is to be ascribed much of the excellence of the completed translation.

To these rules, Which were delivered to the Translators, there appears to have been added another, providing that, besides the directors of the six companies, "three or four of the most ancient and grave divines in either of the Universities, not employed in translating be designated by the Vice-Chancellors and Heads of Colleges, to be overseers of the Translation, as well Hebrew as Greek, for the better observation of the fourth rule."

The learned Selden says, that when the Translators met to compare what they had done, each of them held in his hand a Bible in some language. If any thing struck any one as requiring alteration, he spoke; otherwise the reading went on. The final revision was made, not by six men, as the tenth of the above rules would seem to indicate, but by twelve. At least, such was the statement made in the Synod of Dort in--1618, by Dr. Samuel Weir, who was one of the most active of the Translators. It seems to have been carried through

the press by Dr. Miles Smith and Bishop Bilson, aided perhaps by Archbishop Bancroft and other prelates. All the expense of making and printing the translation was defrayed by Robert Barker, "Printer to the King's most excellent Maiestie." The copyright thus cost him three thousand five hundred pounds; and his heirs and assigns retained their privilege down to the year 1709...Popery, apparently believing that Ignorance is the mother of devotion, and especially ignorance of the Word of God, would fain have supplanted it by priestly inventions and monkish corruptions...

The printing of the English Bible has proved to be by far the mightiest barrier ever reared to repel the advance of Popery, and to damage all the resources of the Papacy. Originally intended for the five or six millions who dwelt within the narrow limits of the British Islands, it at once formed and fixed their language, till then unsettled; and has since gone with that language to the isles and shores of every sea. And now, during the lapse of almost two and a half centuries, it has gladdened the hearts, and still gladdens the hearts of millions upon millions, not only in Great Britain, but throughout North America and the Indies, in portions of Africa, and in Australia. At the present day, the English is probably the vernacular tongue of more millions than of any other one language under heaven; and the English Bible has brought and still brings home the knowledge of God's revealed truth to a myriad more of minds than ever received it through the original tongues. The Translators little foresaw the vast results and immeasurable influence of what they had thus done, both for time and for eternity. Venerated men! *their very names are now hardly known to more than a few persons*; yet, in the providence of God, the fruits of their labors have spread to far distant climes; have laid broad and deep the foundations of mighty empires; have afforded to multitudes strength to endure adversity, and grace to resist the temptations of prosperity; and only the revelations of the judgment-day can disclose how many millions and millions, through the instrumentality of their labors, have been made wise unto salvation.<sup>2</sup>

\*Report of the Committee on Versions, made to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society, and adopted May 1st, 1851.

**The above was copied from the website [www. jesus -is-lord.com](http://www.jesus-is-lord.com).**

## **Chapter 24—How Did This Happen? A Short History of Ancient Perversion**

**Writer’s Note:** In this chapter, we are featuring a guest author, **Dr. Thomas Holland**, who gives us an excellent, but brief overview of the history of the various attempts to destroy the Bible. This writer researched a multitude of articles and found a host of excellent material. However, they were too long for the format of this book or too brief to cover the points necessary for a good basic understanding of the issues. We have used a complete lesson (“Lesson 4: Early Heresies and the Western and Alexandrian Line”) from Dr. Holland’s *Manuscript Evidence* in this chapter. The following article by Dr. Holland fits the exact context of this endeavor and he is to be commended and thanked for his excellent labors. This article is well documented and well grounded. You can find this article at <http://www.purewords.org/kjb1611/html/lesson04.htm>. Dr. Holland warns the student that the material is somewhat lengthy. However, this excellent material is the most concise and well written overview covering this history that this writer could find. This lesson traces heresies in the early church as well as the development of the Greek text that underlies the NIV and other modern perversions of the Bible.

### **Lesson 4: Early Heresies and the Western and Alexandrian line from *Manuscript Evidence* by Dr. Thomas Holland**

(NOTE: The student should be forewarned that the material in these next two lessons is lengthy but essential in the understanding of textual criticism and our approach to that study.)

**Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.**

(Matthew 7:17-20)

### **Early Heresies**

The Bible warns that there would be those who would "corrupt the word of God" (2 Corinthians 2:17) and handle it "deceitfully" (2 Corinthians 4:2). There would arise false gospels with false epistles (2 Thess. 2:2), along with false prophets and teachers who would not only bring in "damnable

heresies" but would seek to "make merchandise" of the true believer through their own "feigned words" (2 Peter 2:1-3). It did not take long for this to occur.

In the days of the Apostles, and shortly afterwards, several doctrinal heresies arose. Docetism, Marcionism, Gnosticism and Allegoricalism were four of these heresies. Their early beginnings are referred to in the New Testament in such places as Galatians 1:6-8; 1 John 4:3; 2 John 1:7; and Jude 1:3-4. These heresies not only plagued the early Church, but are still with us today, in modern form, in many contemporary Christian cults. These false doctrines had an influence on the transmission of scripture and account for some of the differences in the line of manuscripts.

### **Docetism**

This was a form of Gnosticism which taught that Christ's body was a phantom and not physical. Only the spiritual was good, while the physical was evil. The nature of Christ was two-fold, spiritual and physical. Jesus was the physical, Christ was the spiritual. The Christ departed Jesus at the crucifixion, and left him on the cross to suffer and die. The Docetics (and Gnostics) wrote their own *Gospels* including *The Acts of John* and *The Gospel of Peter*. The Gospel of Peter was cited by Justin Martyr, Origen, and Eusebius, but was not discovered by scholars until 1886. While excavating the grave of a monk, a French archaeological team discovered this manuscript in Egypt. Only a small portion of it remains, but what does give a differing account of the crucifixion than the four Gospels. This separation of the Christ from Jesus is seen in the following quotation.

And many went about with lamps, supposing that it was night, and fell down. And the Lord cried out, saying, My power, my power, thou hast forsaken me. And when he had said it he was taken up. And in that hour the veil of the temple of Jerusalem was rent in twain. (Gospel of Peter, verse 5).

Thus, according to the Docetics, the power of Jesus, the Christ, left him while he was on the cross.

The account of the resurrection is also Docetic.

And in the night in which the Lord's day was drawing on, as the soldiers kept guard two by two in a watch, there was a great voice in the heaven; and they saw the heavens opened, and two men descend from thence with great light and approach the tomb. And that stone which was put at the door rolled of itself and made way in part; and the tomb was opened, and both the young men entered in. When therefore those soldiers saw it, they awakened the centurion and the elders; for they too were hard by keeping guard. And as they declared what things they had seen, again they see three men come forth from the tomb, and two of them supporting one, and a cross following them: and of the two the head reached unto the heaven, but the head

of him who was lead by them overpassed the heavens. And they heard a voice from the heavens saying, Thou has preached to them that sleep. And a response was heard from the cross, Yea. (Gospel of Peter, verses 9-10).

The Docetics used and corrected the Gospel of Mark as demonstrated by Irenaeus,

Those who separate Jesus from Christ and say that Christ remained impassible while Jesus suffered, and try to bring forward the Gospel According to Mark, can be corrected out of that, if they will read it with a love of the truth. (Ireneaus' Against Heresies, cited from *Early Christian Fathers Vol 1*; translated by Cyril C. Richardson and published by The Westminster Press, page 382).

The Latin manuscript *k* may reflect such tampering and has been suggested so by Dr. Edward F. Hills. Mark 16:4 reads as follows in *k*,

Suddenly, moreover, at the third hour of the day, darkness fell upon the whole world, and angels descended from heaven, and as the Son of God was rising in brightness, they ascended at the same time with him, and straightway it was light.

This citation from *k* matches the citation from the Gospel of Peter about the resurrection. It also contains the short ending to Mark and omits verses 9-20, as many modern translations and their Greek texts do. We can conclude from this that the Docetics used a copy of Mark which would read like many contemporary translations.

### **Marcionism**

Marcion was influenced by the Gnostic, but not to the degree of fully embracing Gnosticism. Instead, he developed his own religious following, vowing to complete the work of St. Paul and separate Judaism from Christian teachings. However, he did so in a very anti-Semitic way. In 140 AD he went to Rome and established his doctrines, teaching that the God of the Old Testament could not have been the Father of Jesus Christ, because Christ speaks of His Father as a God of love and the God of the Jews was a God of wrath. Marcion taught that Jehovah, the God of the Old Testament, created the world, but that all created flesh was evil. The soul was created by a greater god over Jehovah. This other god created the spiritual realm and was the true Father of Jesus Christ. To release man's soul from his flesh, this greater god sent Christ. Christ appeared, in the form of a thirty-year-old man, in an unreal-spiritual body, not a physical one. Salvation was gained by renouncing Jehovah and all things physical. Marcion rejected the Hebrew Scriptures, and their quotations in the New Testament. The followers of Marcion issued their own New Testament composed of Luke and Paul's letters. This would account for some of the variations in these books among the manuscripts, seeing that the followers of Marcion would want these books to reflect their doctrines.

The same is true today when contemporary cults slightly alter scripture to reflect their own private interpretation.

Again, Irenaeus points out that "Marcion cut up that According to Luke" (Irenaeus' *Against Heresies*, p. 382). This would account for the large number of changes found in varying manuscripts of Luke and the large number of verses omitted (as shown in lesson three). It is, for example, understandable why the phrase "And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet." (Luke 24:40) would be omitted by Marcion, since he did not believe in the physical resurrection of Jesus but only in a spiritual resurrection. In fact, the apparatus of the United Bible Society's Greek text points out that this verse is omitted by both Marcion and Codex D (UBS, 2nd ed., p. 317). This verse is omitted from the text of the NEB and RSV. Thus we see that Codex D, which is a Western line of manuscripts in the Gospels, and the RSV reflect some of the tampering done by Marcion and his followers.

### **Gnosticism**

Gnosticism was by far the most influential heresy faced by the early Church. Not only did the Gnostic corrupt many readings found in the New Testament, but offered their own writings as inspired scriptures, such as the *The Gospel of Thomas*, *The Gospel of the Ebionites*, *The Acts of Andrew*, and *The Gospel of Mary (Magdalene)*. Gnosticism had a variety of forms and sects which broadened its base and growth. Historian Will Durant calls Gnosticism "the quest of godlike knowledge (gnosis) through mystic means" (*The Story Of Civilization* Vol. III, p. 604).

As in Docetism and Marcionism, the Gnostics taught that the physical was evil and the spiritual was good. Thus, a good god (spiritual) could not have created a physical world, because good can not create evil (that is the spiritual would not create the physical). So the Gnostic god created a being (or a line of beings called *aeons*) removing himself from direct creation. One of these aeons, or gods, created the world. The so-called *Christian Gnostics* believed that Jesus was one of these aeons who created the world. Some Gnostic taught that Jesus did not have a physical body. When he walked on the earth, he left not footprints because he never really touched the earth (he being spiritual and the world physical). Others taught that only our spiritual bodies were important, so the physical body could engage in whatever acts they desired because only the spiritual body would be saved. Still other Gnostics taught that the physical body was so evil that it must be denied in order for the spiritual body to gain salvation, thus shunning marriage and certain foods (1 Timothy 4:1-3).

The influence of Gnosticism can be seen in some of the heresies of today. For example, many of the teachings stated above are found, in revised

form, in the teachings of the Watchtower of the Jehovah's Witnesses. To the Jehovah's Witness, Jesus is a created god, not God manifest in the flesh. It is no wonder that the Watchtower's New World Translation omits "God manifest in the flesh" in 1 Timothy 3:16 and replaces it with "He was made manifest in flesh." The Greek text which underlines the NWT has made the change, so it is natural for the Watchtower to prefer the reading which reflects its doctrine. The same is true of John 1:18 where the NWT reads, "the only-begotten god" (Gk. *monogenes theos*). Again, this is because the Greek text of the NWT reads differently from the Greek text of the KJV, "only begotten Son" (Gk. *monogenes heios*). What is amazing is that in both of these examples, the NASV agrees with the NWT because they are both based on the same Greek text. Thus, false doctrine has influenced the various manuscripts, just as it influences translations today. The phrase "only begotten god" is supported by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Jerome, papyrus 66 and the Alexandrian line of manuscripts. The phrase "only begotten Son" is quoted by Chrysostom, Tertullian, Basil, the Old Latin and Old Syrian translations and the majority of all Greek manuscripts.

Another example of some Gnostics teachings concerns the dual sexual nature of God. In her book, *The Gnostic Gospels*, Elaine Pagels points out that the some Gnostic taught that God was both Father and Mother. Pagels writes,

One group of gnostic (sic) sources claims to have received a secret tradition from Jesus through James and through Mary Magdalene. Members of this group prayed to both the divine Father and Mother. . . Since the Genesis account goes on to say that humanity was created male and female (1:27), some concluded that the God in whose image we are made must also be both masculine and feminine--both Father and Mother. (pp. 58-59).

Pagels also points out that Clement of Alexandria was influenced by this false doctrine of a masculo-feminine God. "Clement," writes Pagels, "characterized God in feminine as well as masculine terms" (p.81). She then cites Clement as writing,

The Word is everything to the child, both father and mother, teacher and nurse. . . . The nutriment is the milk of the Father. . . and the Word alone supplies us children with the milk of love, and only those who suck at this breast are truly happy. For this reason, seeking is called sucking; to those infants who seek the Word, the Father's loving breasts supply milk. (p. 81).

It would seem that both Clement and the Gnostics would be pleased with the modern *politically correct* Inclusive Version (published by Oxford Press). The Lord's prayer reads, "Our Father-Mother in heaven, hallowed be your name. Your dominion come, Your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven." All references to God in this translation reflect the masculo-feminine doctrine of the Gnostics and Clement of Alexandria.

### **Allegoricalism**

The majority of early Church Fathers, especially from the Alexandrian and Western line, relied heavily upon Allegoricalism. This is not an organized heresy, as the other three are; instead it is a general interpretation of the scriptures. To allegorize scripture means to interpret the word spiritually and not literally. To the Allegoricalist, the words of scripture are not as important as the meaning or teaching of scripture. The word is not to be taken literally, but carries a deeper, spiritual message. This is why many of the early Church Fathers did not use precise quotations from the New Testament, as much as they did allusions and loose citations. What the Bible means, to them, was more important than what it said.

This form of spiritualizing the scriptures is not only reflected in many of the writings of the early Church Fathers, but is a prominent view of Biblical interpretation today. It is the primary view of both moderate and liberal theologians, and the developed interpretation of the Roman Catholic Church. It is also reflective of how one translates the scriptures as well as interprets. If the message is more important than the words, than all we need to do is translate the message and not the words. This is the difference between two methods of translation, the *formal equivalent* (that is, word for word translation), and *dynamic equivalent* (that is, thought for thought translation). Examples of formal equivalent translations would be the KJV (of the Traditional text) and the NASV (of the Alexandrian text). Dynamic equivalent translations would be illustrated by versions like the NIV, TEV, and NRSV.

### **The Line of Modern Translations**

Jesus taught us that if a tree is corrupt, the fruit will be corrupt. Likewise, if a tree is good, the fruit will be good (Matthew 7:17). He was speaking of false prophets. False prophets and false teachers corrupt the scriptures (2 Peter 2:1-3). We are told we can recognize these false prophets and teachers by their fruits. An apple tree produces apples, a fig tree brings forth figs. So the fruit of the false prophet is false prophecies and the fruit of the false teacher is false doctrine. If a man's doctrine is in suspect of being corrupt, we must conclude that he will do the same to the scriptures (2 Corinthians 2:17). So, if a man's teachings are good and sound, we can expect that those sound teachings came from sound scriptures. The two go hand in hand.

In the transmission of scripture, we must understand that there will always be a line of perversion as there will be of preservation. According to our Lord, we must become **fruit inspectors**. The remainder of this lesson and the next will demonstrate both lines in operation.

The following are a few of the Western (Rome) and Alexandrian

(Egypt) Church Fathers stating some of their doctrines and influences upon the study of textual criticism. Additionally, the same is shown concerning a few contemporary scholars who have likewise influenced the study of textual criticism and laid the foundation for modern translations of the Bible.

### **Tatian (110-180 AD)**

Tatian, a disciple of Justin Martyr, was a doctrinal apologist and textual scholar. In 170 AD he produced a harmony of the Gospels known as the *Diatessaron* (Greek meaning, *through the four*). It is thought that this harmony was written in Greek and translated into Syriac, but it is possible that it was originally written in Syriac. The Bishop of Syria, Theodoret, thought it so corrupt that he had all 200 known copies destroyed. Today, we only have a fragment of Tatian's *Diatessaron* along with two Arabic translations and a commentary on it.

Geisler and Nix point out that Tatian "came under the influence of Gnosticism after the death of Justin." (*A General Introduction To The Bible*, p. 351). Eusebius records several of Tatian's heretical views in his *Ecclesiastical History*. Eusebius writes,

He (Tatian) established his own type of doctrine, telling stories of invisible Aeons (the line of gods the Gnostics believed in), like the followers of Valentinus, and rejecting marriage as corruption and fornication similarly to Marcion and Saturninus. And as his own contribution, denied the salvation of Adam. . . . Tatian composed in some way a combination and Collection of the gospels, and gave this the name of The *Diatessaron*, and this is still extant in some places. . . (from the Loeb edition, Vol. I p. 397. The *still extant* would show that the *Diatessaron* was still in use in the fourth century when Eusebius wrote).

Tatian's harmony omits verses such as Matthew 21:44; Luke 23:17; 24:12; and John 7:53-8:11. However, since we do not have the original *Diatessaron*, but only two Arabic translations and one commentary, it is hard to say how much influence the *Diatessaron* had on any line of manuscript. Nevertheless, in the *Diatessaron*, we see that Gnosticism had an influence on the transmission of scripture within the first hundred years of the completion of the New Testament.

### **Clement Of Alexandria (150-215 AD)**

Titus Flavius Clement was born of pagan parents in Athens, Greece. He was influenced by Christian doctrine, yet held that the Greek poets were likewise inspired by God but in a diminutive sense. He went to Alexandria, Egypt, and became head of the Catechetical School located there in about 200 AD. A few years later he was forced to leave Egypt under the persecution of Septimius Severus. He died in Cappadocia around 215 AD.

There are approximately 2,400 New Testament quotations by Clement in his writings. Alexander Souter states that Clement "is not a very careful quoter of Scripture, but . . . it is known that in the Gospels he used a text closely related to Codex Bezae (D)." (*The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p. 81). Dr. Kurt Aland states that Clement's citations disagree with the Traditional text (from which the KJV came from) 56% of the time. Twenty-four percent of the time his citations agree with the Alexandrian line of manuscripts, with 29% being in common with both. Only 15% of the time does Clement choose the reading of the Traditional text. ("The Text of the Church" from the *Trinity Journal*; Fall 1987, p. 139).

The point here is that Clement is quoted with authority for his citations of scriptures by modern textual scholars, and that Clement uses a text which is not in alignment with the Traditional text. The question we must ask ourselves is, what were the teachings of Clement and do they agree with Biblical doctrines found in the New Testament?

We have already learned that Clement was influenced by the Gnostics in his view of God as both Father and Mother. Below are a few additional teachings of Clement as cited from his *The Instructor Of Children* (about 202 AD). All quotations are cited in *The Faith of the Early Fathers*, edited by W. A. Jurgens and published by the Liturgical Press of Collegeville, Minnesota. Many of the dogmas of the Roman Catholic church can be found in the teachings of Clement of Alexandria.

**Baptism:** "When we are baptized, we are enlightened. Being enlightened, we are adopted as sons. Adopted as sons, we are made perfect. Made perfect, we are become immortal. ..It is a washing by which we are cleansed of sins; a gift of grace by which the punishment due our sins are remitted; an illumination by which we behold that holy light of salvation--that is, by which we see God clearly." (p.178). Thus, salvation follows baptism.

**Eucharist:** "(The Church is) calling her children about her, she nourishes them with holy milk, that is, with the Infant Word. ..The Word is everything to a child: both Father and Mother, both Instructor and Nurse. 'Eat My Flesh,' He says, 'and drink My Blood.' The Lord supplies us with these intimate nutriments. He delivers over His Flesh, and pours out His Blood; and nothing is lacking for the growth of His children. O incredible mystery!" (p.179)

That is to say, to drink the Blood of Jesus is to share in His immortality. The strength of the Word is the Spirit, just as the blood is the strength of the body. Similarly, as wine is blended with water, so is the Spirit with man. The one, the Watered Wine, nourishes in flesh, while the other, the Spirit, leads us on to immortality. The union of both, however, --of the drink and of the Word,--is called the Eucharist, a praiseworthy and excellent gift. Those who partake of it in faith are sanctified in body and in soul. By the will

of the Father, the divine mixture, man, is mystically united to the Spirit and to the Word." (p. 179). Therefore, the Eucharist is necessary for salvation, it is the receiving of Christ, as taught by Clement.

**Scripture:** "Divine Scripture, addressing itself to those who love themselves and to the boastful, somewhere says most excellently: 'Where are the princes of the nations, and those who rule over the beasts which are upon the earth; they that take their diversion among the birds of the air; they that hoard up silver, and the gold in which men trust--and there is no end to their acquiring it; they that work in silver and in gold and are solicitous? There is no searching of their works; they have vanished and have gone down into Hades.'" (p.179). What Clement calls "Divine Scripture" is the Old Testament Apocrypha book of Baruch 3:16-19. Thus he believed it to be inspired.

**Deity of Man:** "That which is true is beautiful; for it, too, is God. Such a man becomes God because God wills it. Rightly, indeed, did Heraclitus say: 'Men are gods, and gods are men; for the same reason is in both.'" (p.179). Like Mormonism, Clement taught man becomes a god.

**Nature of God:** "Nothing exists except that which God causes to be. There is nothing, therefore, which is hated by God; nor is there anything hated by the Word. Both are one." (p.179) How does this align with Luke 14:26; John 12:25; Romans 9:13; Heb. 1:9 and Revelation 2:6? Clement sounds like he is quoting the doctrine of Marcion in rejecting the fact that God can hate.

### **Origen (185-254 AD)**

When Clement left Alexandria because of the persecution, Origen succeeded him as head master at the Catechetical School. Origen developed the allegorical interpretation of scripture. He took the Bible symbolically, yet what is clearly symbolic he took literally. For example, upon reading Matthew 19:12, he castrated himself. As a textual scholar, he produced the *Hexapla* which was a Bible containing six translations of the Old Testament, including the famous Septuagint (also known as the LXX). He considered the Old Testament Apocrypha as inspired scripture and included them in his Hexapla. Additionally, Origen considered some New Testament Apocrypha books as inspired, such as *The Shepherd of Herman* and *The Epistle of Barnabas* (see *The Lost Books of the Bible*, World Bible Publishers; pp.145 & 197).

#### **Historian Will Durant notes that:**

The literal meaning of Scripture, argued Origen, overlay two deeper layers of meaning--the moral and the spiritual--to which only the esoteric and educated few could penetrate. He questioned the truth of Genesis as literally understood: he explained away as symbols the unpleasant aspects of Yahveh's (Jehovah) dealings with Israel; and he dismissed as legends such stories as that of Satan taking Jesus up to a high mountain and offering him the kingdoms of the world. (*The Story Of Civilization*, Vol. III; p.614)

Thus Origen held to this same doctrine as proclaimed by the heresy of Marcion.

Further, Durant quotes Origen as saying, "Who is so foolish as to believe that God, like a husbandman, planted a garden in Eden, and placed in it a tree of life. . .so that one who tasted of the fruit obtained life?" (*Ibid.*, p. 614).

Additional doctrines of Origen can be seen in the following quotations from his work, *The Fundamental Doctrines*. As with Clement, the citations come from Jurgens' *The Faith of the Early Fathers*.

**Jesus Christ:** "Secondly, that Jesus Christ Himself, who came, was born of the Father before all creatures; and after He had ministered to the Father in the creation of all things,--for through Him were all things made." (p. 191). Thus Christ is a created being. This follows the teachings of the Gnostics, the Docetics, and is seen today in the teachings of the Jehovah's Witnesses.

"For it is just as unsuitable to say that the Son is able to see the Father, as it is unbecoming to suppose that the Holy Spirit is able to see the Son. It is one thing to see, another to know. To see and to be seen belongs to bodies. To know and to be known belongs to an intellectual being. That, therefore, which is proper to bodies, is not to be attributed to either the Father or to the Son; but that which pertains to deity is common to the Father and the Son." (p. 193). Again, the influence of Gnosticism can be seen in this citation. This is the same heresy which John warns against in both 1st and 2nd John.

**The Holy Ghost:** "Third, they handed it down that the Holy Spirit is associated in honor and dignity with the Father and the Son. In His case, however, it is not clearly distinguished whether or not He was born or even whether He is or is not to be regarded as a Son of God." (p. 191). Thus, the Holy Ghost becomes one of the aeons of Gnosticism.

**Salvation:** "After these points, it is taught also that the soul, having a substance and life proper to itself, shall, after its departure from this world, be rewarded according to its merits. It is destined to obtain either an inheritance of eternal life and blessedness, if its deeds shall have procured this for it, or to be delivered up to eternal fire and punishment, if the guilt of its crimes shall have brought it down to this." (p. 191). This is teaching another gospel (Galatians 1:8) which claims salvation by works.

**Restoration from Eternal Fire:** "Now let us see what is meant by the threatening with eternal fire. . .It seems to be indicated by these words that every sinner kindles for himself the flame of his own fire and is not plunged into some fire which was kindled beforehand by someone else or which already existed before him. . .And when this dissolution and tearing asunder of the soul shall have been accomplished by means of the application of fire, no doubt it will afterwards be solidified into a firmer structure and into a

restoration of itself." (p.196). Much like the teachings of Mormonism, Origen believed in restoration for those in **eternal fire** (hell).

**The Sun and Stars:** "In regard to the sun, however, and the moon and the stars, as to whether they are living beings or are without life, there is not clear tradition." (p. 192). Again, early Mormonism taught that the planets, moons, and stars were alive.

Here is a man of questionable doctrine. This is not a matter of differing interpretations of scriptures; this is a matter of false teaching. Like the current teaching of the Watchtower, Origen believed in the dualistic nature of Jesus Christ. Like the teachings of the Mormons, Origen believed in a restoration for those in hell, and wonders if the sun, stars, and moon have life. If someone had the beliefs of Origen, we surely would not be content to have him revising or editing our Bibles. Yet this is what has happened. And, if one does not believe that personal doctrine will interfere with translation, make a close examination of the NWT produced by the Watchtower. Or, for that matter, why do we classify translations of the Bible as *\*liberal\** and *\*conservative\**? \* Does this not show that theological bias still enters into the process of current translations of the Bible? If it does so today, then it did so in the days of Origen as well.

Origen's position as a textual critic is unquestionable. Not only because of the Hexapla, but because of his many scriptural quotations. Origen was one of the most prolific writers of his day, writing over 6,000 items and books. In these he makes almost 18,000 quotations and allusions from the New Testament. His citations are both Alexandrian and Western in nature. Dr. Aland shows that Origen's scriptural citations are mostly Alexandrian just like modern translations of the Bible are (*The Text of the Church*, p. 139).

Further, we can see the influence Origen had on other manuscripts. One of the subscriptions in Codex Sinaiticus (which we discussed in lesson two, and will expand on later in this lesson) states, "Taken and corrected according to the Hexapla of Origen. Antonius Collated: I, Pamphilus, corrected." (Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p.23). Pamphilus, along with Eusebius, was a disciple of Origen. Therefore, we can see the influence Origen had on Codex Sinaiticus as stated in a footnote of that codex.

### **Eusebius (263-340 AD)**

Eusebius Pamphili, Bishop of Caesarea, was a church historian and textual critic who was responsible for writing the *Ecclesiastical History* of the church in 325 AD. His work provides us with many accounts of what was occurring in the early church, and especially during the canonization of Scripture. However, as noted by Historian Will Durant, Eusebius sometimes glossed over some facts, as he did in his work on the *Life of Constantine*.

Durant calls it, "honest dishonesty" (*The Story of Civilization*, Vol. III; p.663) and says, "One would never guess from this book that Constantine had killed his son, his nephew, and his wife." (*Ibid.*) Additionally, Durant states that, "Some exaggeration may have crept into the report" (*Ibid.*, p. 649) concerning Eusebius' account of early Christian martyrs. For example, in recording the martyrdom of Polycarp, Eusebius states that when Polycarp was stabbed that, "there came out a dove" from the wound.

He also produced a form of the Gospels dividing them into paragraphs and numbering them for cross-reference (they were not divided as we have verse and chapter divisions today in our Bibles, but did provide a basis of division). Concerning the canon of Scripture, Eusebius questioned the authenticity of James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and the book of Jude. In regard to 2 Peter, he noted, "But the so-called second Epistle we have not received as canonical, but nevertheless it has appeared useful to many" (*Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. I; p. 193). To Eusebius, these scriptures were good books, but not inspired.

Emperor Constantine ordered Eusebius to produce fifty copies of the Bible. Constantine stated these copies were to "be written on prepared parchment in a legible manner" (Geisler and Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, p. 181). Some have suggested that the famous manuscripts Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were two of these fifty copies, and these two manuscripts provide the basis of many of the changes in modern translations today. This was the view of Tischendorf, Hort, and Souter as they comment on the subject. If this is true, than Eusebius not only produced the famous Alexandrian manuscripts, but also advocated a text type that supports this same line of manuscripts. And from the many citations of Eusebius, it is certain that he did favor the Alexandrian family.

Eusebius was influenced by Origen of Alexandria. He and Pamphilus "founded at Caesarea a library of biblical and patristic writings on papyrus rolls, the nucleus of which consisted of Origen's voluminous writings, especially his editions and interpretations of biblical books." (Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p. 23). Pamphilus was educated at Alexandria and was a disciple of Origen; Eusebius was Pamphilus' "pupil and protege" (*Ibid.* p.84). No doubt, the views and textual changes of Origen found their way into the textual work of Eusebius.

### **Jerome (340-420 AD)**

Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus, known to us as St. Jerome, was responsible for producing the Latin Vulgate. Pope Damasus requested Jerome to produce a new Latin Version of the Old and New Testament in 383 AD. Reluctantly, Jerome agreed knowing that his version would not be welcomed considering that Christendom had already begun to divided itself in regard to

which line of manuscript, and which translation, best reflected the original autographs. In 405 AD Jerome finished the Latin Vulgate and gave the Roman Catholic Church its official Latin Bible.

Most textual scholars believe that Jerome revised the Old Latin manuscripts according to his knowledge of Hebrew and Greek. (Jerome was one of the first scholars to be fluent in both Biblical languages). However, we do not possess many Latin versions which predate the Vulgate of Jerome and what we do have are fragmentary. As illustrated in the citations of Tertullian, Alexander Souter wrote, "It is perfectly clear from references in Tertullian, who wrote at Carthage (mainly in Latin, but also in Greek) between AD 195 and 218, that Latin translations of at least some parts of Scripture existed in his time." (*The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p.35). The vast majority of Old Latin manuscripts which we now possess were written after the Vulgate and are divided into two groups, African and European.

Jerome was influenced by the work of Eusebius. Again, Souter notes, "It would seem, therefore, that we must look to Egypt for the origin of (Codex Sinaiticus) also. St. Jerome at Bethlehem had a MS.(i.e. manuscript) closely related to (Sinaiticus), in St. Matthew's Gospel, as we learn from his references in his commentary on that Gospel." (*Ibid.*, p. 23). Sir Frederic Kenyon agrees and adds, "[Jerome] did so with reference to the oldest and best Greek manuscripts he could find, most of which seem to have belonged to what we have called the Alexandrian family. Indeed, the Codex Sinaiticus is the Greek manuscript which most conspicuously agrees with the Vulgate." (*The Story of the Bible*, p. 110).

It should be noted, however, that Jerome was more willing to reach a compromise and not make as many changes to the text as one finds in the Alexandrian line. Kenyon continues and notes, "Jerome, however, more cautious than our own Revisers (i.e. the RV of 1881) was sparing in his alterations; he tells us himself that he often left passages untouched which he might have corrected, in order to preserve the familiar form, and only made changes where he thought them material." (*Ibid.*) This would account for several verses in the Vulgate which follow the Traditional text instead of the Alexandrian. This is also noted by Dr. Edward F. Hills in his book, *The King James Version Defended*, regarding the Vulgate as a possible "movement toward the Traditional (Byzantine) Text" (p.187).

One thing is certain; the Latin Vulgate of Jerome became the standard Bible of the Roman Catholic Church and remained so for centuries. It is a clear connection between the Alexandrian line of manuscripts and the Westcott and Hort theory of textual criticism which will be discussed shortly. Despite that it sometimes reads in favor of the Traditional text, it is an early official translation which supported the Alexandrian line, and only agrees with the Traditional text as a compromise. In 1546 at the Council of Trent, the

Roman Catholic Church made the Vulgate the official Bible of Catholicism. As far as the Catholic Church was concerned, there was therefore no need for additional textual studies or translations in the language of the people. This was a Latin Church and it had its Latin Bible with the mass in Latin. For the centuries that followed, all that was necessary was the Vulgate. And this remained the position of the Roman Catholic Church until the 1960's with the Second Vatican Council.

### **Tischendorf (1815-1874 AD)**

Constantin von Tischendorf is responsible for providing the Protestant world with two of the oldest known uncials, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. These two manuscripts date somewhere between 325-350 AD. In lesson two we briefly discussed the contents of these two manuscripts. It is important to understand that both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus are two of the best examples of the Alexandrian line of manuscripts, and are responsible for a number of changes found in modern versions of the Bible. "These two manuscripts formed the basis of the text prepared by the 19th century scholars Westcott and Hort, and the parallel text used by the editors of the Revised Version." (*Eerdmans' Handbook to the Bible*, p.73). Tischendorf, along John Anthony Hort and later Alexander Souter, believed these two codices to be part of the 50 scriptures ordered by Constantine and produced by Eusebius.

Tischendorf "edited more New Testament documents and more editions of the New Testament than any other scholar (of his day)" (Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p.102). By the age of twenty-nine, he had already produced three editions of the Greek New Testament. Believing the Alexandrian line of manuscripts reflected the better readings, Tischendorf set off in search for additional manuscripts.

In 1844 he visited the monastery of St. Catherine located at Mt. Sinai. While there he "saw in a basket a number of leaves of vellum with fine and obviously very early uncial writing on them, which he was informed were about to be destroyed, as many similar leaves had already been." (Kenyon, *The Story of the Bible*, pp. 57-58). He was allowed to keep forty-three leaves which he noted were from the Greek Septuagint. He recognized that these were of the same line as Codex Alexandrinus, but about a hundred years older than that manuscript. A second visit to the monastery occurred in 1853 with nothing found. However on his third visit, in 1859, on the last night of his stay, Tischendorf was shown the codex which has come to be known as Sinaiticus. He was denied custody of the manuscript at that time. He went to Cairo to speak to the Superior who granted him the codex. A camel-rider was sent to the monastery and retrieved the manuscript, but it was not until nine months later, after Tischendorf paid a good sum, that he was given the codex.

As the student recalls, Sinaiticus contains over half of the Old Testament and all of the New except for large passages such as Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11, along with several other verses as demonstrated in lesson three. It has the Old Testament Apocrypha laced within it as scripture and the New Testament Apocrypha books of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas, also listed as inspired scripture.

Codex Vaticanus, which was known to have been in the Vatican Library since 1475, receives its name because it is the property of the Vatican. No Protestant minister or scholar was permitted to view this codex for four hundred years until a facsimile was produced by Rome in 1890. There were two exceptions to this rule. They are S.P. Tregelles, who viewed it in 1845 and reproduced a memorized copy of it. And Constantin Tischendorf who viewed it between 1843 and 1866. Vaticanus is missing Genesis 1:1-46:28; 2 Kings 2:5-7,10-13; Psalm 106:27-138:6; Mark 16:9-20; John 7:53-8:11; and Hebrews 9:14 to the end of Revelation. Both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are of the Alexandrian line of manuscripts.

### **Westcott and Hort**

Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892) produced a Greek New Testament in 1881 based on the findings of Tischendorf. This Greek NT was the basis for the Revised Version of that same year. They also developed a theory of textual criticism which underlined their Greek NT and several other Greek NT since (such as the Nestle's text and the United Bible Society's text). Greek New Testaments such as these produced the modern English translations of the Bible we have today. So it is important for us to know the theory of Westcott and Hort as well as something about the two men who have so greatly influenced modern textual criticism.

In short, the Westcott and Hort theory states that the Bible is to be treated as any other book would be. Sir Frederic Kenyon sets forth the idea as follows:

Where alternative reading exist he (i.e. the textual scholar) will therefore tend to choose the harder rather than the easier, the shorter rather than the longer, the reading that differs from that in another Gospel rather than one which coincides; because, if alteration has taken place, it is likely to have been in the direction of the easier, longer, and harmonized readings. Such seems in particular to be the character of the Alexandrian text. (The Story of the Bible, p.111).

The Bible is therefore looked upon as a naturalistic book without Divine intervention preserving the text from corruption. In fact, according to Kenyon, where the text does not harmonize with the rest of the Bible is probably the correct reading. In such logic we can see the seeds of humanism

replacing the spirituality of the Bible.

Westcott and Hort believed the Greek text which underlined the KJV was perverse and corrupt. Hort called the Textus Receptus **vile** and **villainous** (*Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, Vol. I, p.211). They believed the Traditional text did not exist until the fourth century and was created by Lucian of Antioch as an act of the Church council to unify the Western and Alexandrian line of manuscripts. This mixing of the two lines and filling them with additional texts is called *conflation*. The manuscripts of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are considered *neutral* by Westcott and Hort as stated in their book, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. So, according to this theory, the text of the KJV is conflated by using both the Western and Alexandrian line, and adds to the Bible with its own additions. The manuscripts of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, which is suppose to be a neutral text, would reflect what the original autographs said.

There are several problems with the theory. First, as will be seen [in Lesson Five], many of the early Church Fathers' citations reflect the Traditional text with the fuller readings long before the forth century. Second, there is no evidence that there ever was a council or even a conference of scholars in Antioch to produce this "conflated" text. Even Kenyon, who supports modern versions, wrote, "We know the names of several revisers of the Septuagint and Vulgate, and it would be strange if historians and Church writers had all omitted to record or mention such an event" (*Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, p.302). Thirdly, since God has told us that we are not to add to His word, it would be a strange thing indeed for Him to support a Greek line of manuscripts and bless an English translations of the Bible that added to His word. Yet the line of manuscripts which Bible-believing Christians have read, used, and believed for almost two thousand years is of the Traditional text. And no English translation has been so greatly used and blessed by God as the KJV has. If the KJV has so grossly added to the word of God as claimed by Westcott and Hort, why has God blessed it so richly for the past 400 years? Additionally, if Westcott and Hort are the fathers of modern textual criticism and the restorers of the true text, should we not know something of their beliefs to see if they are consistent with scripture? This would be harmonious with the teaching found in Matthew 7:17.

### Scriptures:

"I reject the word infallibility of Holy Scriptures overwhelmingly." (Westcott, *The Life and Letters of Brook Foss Westcott*, Vol. I, p.207).

"Our Bible as well as our Faith is a mere compromise." (Westcott, *On the Canon of the New Testament*, p.vii).

"Evangelicals seem to me perverted. . . There are, I fear, still more

serious differences between us on the subject of authority, especially the authority of the Bible." (Hort, *The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, Vol. I, p.400)

Dr. Wilbur Pickering writes that, "Hort did not hold to a high view of inspiration." (*The Identity of the New Testament Text*, p.212)

Perhaps this is why both the RV (which Westcott and Hort helped to translate) and the American edition of it, the ASV, translated 2 Tim. 3:16 as, "Every scripture inspired of God" instead of "All scripture is given by inspiration of God," (KJV).

### **Deity of Christ:**

"He never speaks of Himself directly as God, but the aim of His revelation was to lead men to see God in Him." (Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John*, p. 297).

"(John) does not expressly affirm the identification of the Word with Jesus Christ." (Westcott, *Ibid.*, p. 16).

"(Revelation 3:15) might no doubt bear the Arian meaning, the first thing created.<<(Hort, *Revelation*, p.36).

Perhaps this is why their Greek text makes Jesus a created god (John 1:18) and their American translation had a footnote concerning John 9:38 "And he said, Lord I believe and he worshipped him." which said, "The Greek word denotes an act of reverence, whether paid to a creature, as here, or to the Creator." Thus calling Christ "a creature."

### **Salvation:**

"The thought (of John 10:29) is here traced back to its most absolute form as resting on the essential power of God in His relation of Universal Fatherhood." (Westcott, *St. John*, p. 159).

"I confess I have no repugnance to the primitive doctrine of a ransom paid to Satan. I can see no other possible form in which the doctrine of a ransom is at all tenable; anything is better than the doctrine of a ransom to the father." (Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter 1:1-2:17*, p. 77).

Perhaps this is why their Greek text adds "to salvation" in 1 Peter 2:2. And why their English version teaches universal salvation in Titus 2:11 "For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men," (ASV).

### **Hell:**

"(Hell is) not the place of punishment of the guilty, (it is) the common abode of departed spirits." (Westcott, *Historic Faith*, pp.77-78).

"We have no sure knowledge of future punishment, and the word eternal has a far higher meaning." (Hort, *Life and Letters*, Vol. I, p.149).

Perhaps this is why their Greek text does not have Mark 9:44, and

their English translation replaces "everlasting fire" [Matthew 18:8] with "eternal fire" and change the meaning of *eternal* as cited by Hort in the above quote.

**Creation:**

"No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history--I could never understand how anyone reading them with open eyes could think they did." (Westcott, cited from *Which Bible?*, p. 191).

"But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with. . .My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable." (Hort, cited from *Which Bible?*, p. 189)

**Romanism:**

"I wish I could see to what forgotten truth Mariolatry (the worship of the Virgin Mary) bears witness." (Westcott, *Ibid.*)

"The pure Romanish view seems to be nearer, and more likely to lead to the truth than the Evangelical." (Hort, *Life and Letters*, Vol. I, p. 77)

In defending Westcott and Hort, James R. White writes:

Anglican piety, especially in the context of the times in which Westcott and Hort lived, provided all sorts of ammunition for demonstration that neither of these men was a fundamentalist Baptist, a point that Westcott and Hort would certainly have admitted. The fact that the KJV was translated by 'baby-sprinkling' Anglicans does not seem to bother those who bring up Westcott and Hort, however." (*The King James Only Controversy*, pp. 122-123 fn).

It is one thing to have doctrinal differences on baby-sprinkling and perhaps a few other interpretations. It is another to be a Darwin-believing theologian who rejects the authority of scriptures, Biblical salvation, the reality of hell, and makes Christ a created being to be worship with Mary his mother. Yet, these were the views of both Westcott and Hort.

**Since 1881:**

James R. White is correct in stating, "modern textual criticism has gone far beyond Westcott and Hort" (*Ibid.*, p.122). While Westcott and Hort may be considered the parents of modern textual criticism, we must also recognize the efforts produced by their *children*. We have had several Greek New Testaments appear, such as the Nestle text, Aland text, and the United Bible Society's text all with various editions.

There have been several findings since the discovery of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. Perhaps the most famous deals with textual criticism of the Old

Testament with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Concerning the New Testament there is the John Rylands fragments known as papyrus 52 (P52), a Greek manuscript which some date between 117 and 138 AD. They were discovered in Egypt and contain five verses from the gospel of John. They now reside at the John Rylands Library in Manchester, England.

Sir Alfred Chester Beatty provided several papyrus manuscripts known as P45, P46, and P47. They date to around 250 AD or later and are a mixture of Western and Alexandrian readings. Also we have the findings of M. Martin Bodmer with P66, P72, and P75. These also date to around the same time as the Beatty manuscripts and have a mixture of Western and Alexandrian readings. Although with both, there are times when these papyrus "shows frequent independence" (*A General Introduction to the Bible*, p.270) and have Traditional text readings in them. Dr. Wilbur N. Pickering has provided us with statistical evidence by quoting Dr. G. D. Fee findings, which show that these manuscripts do support the Traditional line at times and stand in opposition to the Western and Alexandrian, information which the modern textual scholar somehow forgets to provide us with.

Pickering notes a comparison of John 1-14 and states, "P66 agrees with the TR (i.e. the Textus Receptus Greek text) 315 times out of 663 (47.5%), with P75 280 out of 547 (51.2%)" (*The Identity of the New Testament Text*, p. 56). He also noted that out of 43 places where all these manuscripts have the same passages of scripture, P45 agreed with the Traditional text 32 times, P66 agreed 33 times, and P75 agreed 29 times (Ibid. p. 55). This being the case, these manuscripts are a mixture of textual families.

Modern scholars are quick to point to these manuscripts as proof that the Alexandrian line is the oldest and closest to the original autographs. However, this is no surprise to the Bible-believing student as we are aware that corruption of scripture date much earlier than 200 AD. As stated at the beginning of this lesson, even at the time of the Apostles, there were those who sought to corrupt the word of God. All these Greek manuscripts mentioned were discovered in Egypt and have more to do with Clement of Alexandria and Origen than the original autographs, and they show how textual critics of the second and third century were willing to alter the word of God.

We have now discussed the line which has produced the modern versions of the Bible. In our next lesson we will do the same with the line that produced the Authorized King James Version of 1611. It will then be left to the student to decide which tree he or she will partake when digesting God's infallible Word.

**Yours in Christ Jesus, Thomas Holland**

**Psalm 118:8**

**Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved!<sup>1</sup>**

---

(The previous article is used by permission.)

**Writer's Concluding Note:** In an article by **Terence H. Brown** entitled "**God Was Manifest In The Flesh (1 Timothy 3:16)**", we find the following very accurate and insightful statement. "The denial of the eternal Godhead of the Lord Jesus Christ has troubled the Church in every period of its history. Although the opponents of the truth have been known by different names, Arians, Socinians, Unitarians, Jehovah's Witnesses and others, **they have had many things in common, [emphasis is mine]** including an intense hostility to the doctrine set forth in this text of Holy Scripture."<sup>2</sup> Mr. Brown is arguing for the KJV rendering of **1 Timothy 3:16** in the above article. The article is in perfect harmony with our thesis here and you should read the article on the internet.

You should know that **1 Timothy 3:16** is one of those verses that have been perverted by the above groups for centuries. This idea that heretics hold "many things in common" should not be new to you. We have been here before. Remember the quick and easy test for an antichrist.

 **1 John 4:3 (KJV)** "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that *spirit* of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world."

Surely, we do not want to be counted with the Arians, Socinians, Unitarians, Jehovah's Witnesses and others who hate the Lord Jesus Christ and deny His deity. Count me with the crowd who loves the Lord Jesus Christ and wants to honor Him as God.

## Chapter 25— A Short History of Bible Preservation

**Writer’s Note:** In this chapter, we are again featuring a guest author, **Dr. Thomas Holland**. Dr. Holland provides us an excellent overview of the history of the inspiration and preservation of the very words of the Bible. This chapter uses “Lesson 5: The Traditional Text Line” from Dr. Holland’s *Manuscript Evidence*. This is a follow up lesson and continuation of the last chapter. You can find this article at <http://www.purewords.org/kjb1611/html/lesson05.htm>. This lesson traces the development of the Greek text that underlies the KJV.

### **Lesson 5: The Traditional Text Line from *Manuscript Evidence* by Dr. Thomas Holland**

**For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe. (1 Thess. 2:13)**

### **Inspiration and Preservation**

The Biblical approach to textual criticism stands in direct contrast to the concepts and theories of modern textual scholars and their accepted texts and translations. While textual evidence and studies is by no means to be ignored, neither is the guiding presence of the Author of Holy Writ. The pure naturalist approach only considers the physical evidence and man's intellectual understanding of that limited evidence. The Biblical approach not only considers the physical evidence, but also looks beyond to see the spiritual evidence as well. Without Divine intervention, there is no preservation (Psalm 12:6-7). And, unless we are unfairly accused, intervention differs from inspiration.

Here, we shall take a brief pause to define the difference. Too often those who believe the KJV to be the preserved word of God for the English-speaking people without proven error are said to believe that the KJV translators were inspired in the same sense that the original writers were inspired. Some have even suggested we must additionally believe that men, such as Erasmus, who produced Greek texts that were the bases for the KJV must likewise be inspired, and that even the copyist who copied the Traditional text in Greek (called the Byzantine text) were also Divinely inspired. This tendency to overstate the view of the Bible-believer has recently been dogmatically expressed by James R. White in his book, *The King James Only Controversy*. "Most King James Only advocates. ..believe that the KJV itself, as an English language translation, is inspired and therefore

inerrant." (p.3). And that some "truly believes that God supernaturally inspired the King James Version in such a way that the English text itself in inerrant revelation." (p.4). Additionally, concerning the Greek Textus Receptus, White writes, "Anyone who believes the TR to be infallible must believe that Erasmus, and the other men who later edited the same text in their own editions (Stephanus and Beza), were somehow **inspired**, or at the very least **providentially guided** in their work. Yet, none of these men ever claimed such inspiration." (p.58).

The last statement comes closest to the truth, for there is a difference between being guided by God and being inspired by God. An illustration of this can be seen in any publication of the KJV. A publisher may or may not be guided by God in publishing the text of the KJV; however, this does not indicate that he was Biblically inspired. Simply because one copied the Traditional Text does not mean he was Biblically inspired to do so. This may indicate providential guidance, but is not indicative of scriptural inspiration. It is also of interest that White consistently associates inspiration with inerrancy or infallibility. While it is true that the inspired word of God is inerrant, it does not mean that just because something is inerrant it is therefore inspired. Because a person or position is 100% correct does not mean that either one is Biblically inspired. A child may finish a test without error, but this does not mean the child was inspired supernaturally. Yet because God is truth and does not err, when He inspires as He did the writers of Holy Scripture, He did so without the intervention of human mistakes and errors.

Webster defines inspiration as "Any influence (that) . . .inspires," and that inspires means to, "stimulate to activity" ( *New American Webster Handy College Dictionary*, 1981 ed.). In a general sense of the word, therefore, we must say that the translators were **inspired** only in that they were moved to produce the work. However, that is not how the word is used in the theological and Biblical sense. Biblical inspiration means "that the writers were so empowered and controlled by the Holy Spirit in the **PRODUCTION** (the emphasis is mine) of the Scripture as to give them divine and infallible authority." (Dr. Emery Bancroft, *Elemental Theology*, Zondervan Pub. 1960, p.8). Preservation, on the other hand, has to do with the keeping of what has already been divinely produced. It is the assurance that the God who gave the word without error in the first place was able to keep the word without error for us today.

Admittedly the differences between the two may at first seem indistinguishable, especially when we arrive at the same answers to the following questions. Is the Bible inspired by God? The Biblical answer is yes (2 Tim. 3:16). Has the Bible been preserved by God? Again, the Biblical answer is yes (Psalm 12:6-7). According to the verses just given, was the Bible inspired by God with error? Of course not since God is not a God of

error. Was the Bible preserved by God with error? Again, the verses would tell us no because the context of Psalm 12 says the preserved word is pure. Both inspiration and preservation start with God and end with inerrancy. The difference is this: inspiration deals with inception, or what was originally given and produced by God. Preservation is a process of God taking what He gave and keeping it for all generations. The Bible-believing Christian believes his Bible was both inspired by God without error and preserved by God without error. It was infallibly given and remains that way today (1 Peter 1:23). It is, therefore, not only the work of man, but the very word of God.

Such was the attitude of the New Testament Christian as stated by the Apostle Paul in 1 Thessalonians 2:13. The word which was preached and received among them was considered not just the word of man, but as it is in truth, the word of God. This attitude is essential for at least two reasons. First, it excludes the approach that all texts and or translations are simply a work produced by good men. It demands that we recognize the ongoing providence of God in preserving what He has given and is able to provide us with His word without error. It requires us to ask ourselves if the Bible we received is the word of God? If so, is it truth without any mixture of error, or does it contain copyist and translational errors that have crept in throughout the centuries? Is it the very word of God, or the best translation available from the very best manuscripts? If it has textual, copyist, or translational error, it fails the test as set up by the Holy Scriptures themselves. Second, this passage offers evidence in helping us to see where this preserved word is. The proof is two-fold, in that it is not only **RECEIVED** by the born-again believer, but it **EFFECTUALLY WORKS** in the born-again believer.

### The Apostles

The Biblical approach by the Apostles differs from that of the modern textual critic. Their attitude in the citation of scripture is one of "thus sayeth the Lord," and, "it is written." Not "the older manuscripts read," or "a better translation would be." They believed that the scriptures of both testaments were not only divinely inspired but kept and preserved by the guiding hand of the living Lord. They also warn against those who would change and corrupt the word of God. And that the purpose of those who would do so was to make merchandise of the believers faith. The Bible, to the Apostles, is incorruptible (1 Peter 1:23) in spite of the many who would seek to corrupt it (2 Corinthians 2:17).

### The Believers In Antioch

The Church at Antioch has a noteworthy position in scriptures. It is the first place where the born- again believer is called a Christian, "And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." (Acts. 11:26). It is also interesting to see that where both Antioch and Alexandria are mentioned in the

same passage, Antioch is listed as a place of service, while Alexandria is listed as a place of disruption.

And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolls a proselyte of ANTIOCH: Whom they set before the apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them. And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith. And Stephen, full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people. Then there arose certain of the synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and ALEXANDRIANS, and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen. And they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake. (Acts 6:5-10)

The Bible-believer finds this rather interesting in that the line of modern translations has its source in Alexandria, while the Traditional Text has its source in Antioch of Syria where the disciples were first called Christians. And, as we examine the Biblical text of these believers in Antioch we find that it reflects the same text as found in our English Authorized Version of 1611.

#### **Ignatius (d. 107 AD)**

Saint Ignatius (or Theophorus) was the bishop of Antioch, Syria. Historian Will Durant states that with Ignatius, "began the powerful dynasty of the post-apostolic **Fathers** " (*The Story of Civilization*, Vol. III, p. 611). Additionally, Church Historian Earle Cairns informs us that Ignatius "was arrested by the authorities because of his Christian testimony and sent to Rome to be killed by beasts in the imperial games." (*Christianity Through the Centuries*, Zondervan Pub., 1967 ed., p. 78). While on route to his martyrdom, this wonderful saint wrote seven letters, six to different churches (Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians, and Smyrnaeans), and one epistle to Saint Polycarp.

Ignatius was both sound in doctrine and spirit. He knew several of the Apostles personally and sought to follow their examples as believers in Christ. Dr. Michael Green states, "There was a conscious attempt by Ignatius and Polycarp, for instance, to imitate (St.) Paul. . ." ( *Evangelism in the Early Church*, Eerdmans Pub. 1970, p.133). Green further states that, "Something indeed of St. John's theology can be traced through Ignatius. . ." ( *Ibid.* ). And, in his epistle to the Romans, Ignatius himself makes reference to both Peter and Paul stating, "I do not, as Peter and Paul, command you." (2:6). Paul wrote, "Wherefore I beseech you, be ye followers of me." (1 Corinthians 4:16) Ignatius lived this admonition.

His doctrine is Biblical. The Trinity is proclaimed by Ignatius. He

states that Christians should be found, "in the Son, and in the Father and in the Holy Ghost" (Magn. 4:4). He refers to Christ as, "our God" (Roma.1:13 and Smyr. 1:2), thus repeatedly affirming the Deity of Jesus Christ. Concerning Biblical salvation he writes, "Let not man deceive himself; both the things which are in heaven and the glorious angels, and princes, whether visible or invisible, if they believe not in the blood of Christ, it shall be to them to condemnation." (Smyr. 2:12). His personal profession of faith is found throughout all of his epistles, but eloquently and scripturally stated in his letter to the Trallians: "Stop your ears therefore, as often as any one shall speak contrary to Jesus Christ; who was of the race of David, of the Virgin Mary. Who was truly born and did eat and drink; was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate; was truly crucified and dead; both those in heaven and on earth, being spectators of it. Who was also truly raised from the dead by his Father, after the same manner as he will also raise up us who believe in him by Christ Jesus; without whom we have no true life." (Trall.2:10-12).

Ignatius reflects a Christian attitude in regard to others and rejects the anti-Semitism that was reflected by the heretic Marcion, and even from some of the comments later made by Origen. Instead, Ignatius agrees with scripture and braves the walls of racism in a day when the Jews were despised by the Gentile nations. He writes, "That he (Christ) might set up a token for all ages through his resurrection, to all his holy and faithful servants, whether they be Jew or Gentiles, in one body of his church." (Smyr. 1:6).

As he reflects his death, Ignatius writes, "For I am the wheat of God and I shall be ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ. Rather encourage the beasts that they may become my sepulcher; and may leave nothing of my body; that being dead I may not be troublesome to any." (Roma.2:3-4). In fact, he seemed concerned that the believers in Rome would somehow try to stop his execution and states, "Suffer me to be food to the wild beasts; by whom I shall attain unto God." (Roma. 2:2). He firmly proclaims, "I would rather die for Jesus Christ, than rule to the utmost ends of the earth." (Roma.2:14).

Sadly, the scriptural citations made by Ignatius are often ignored or belittled as unimportant in the study of textual criticism. Geisler and Nix simply write, "Although (Ignatius) did not give references to particular citations from the Scriptures, he did make many loose quotations and allusions to them." (*A General Introduction to the Bible*, p.100). It is true that Ignatius does not cite chapter and verse (nor did any of the other Church Fathers or Apostles for that matter) and often simply makes allusions. However, it should be remembered that he was not writing a theological dissertation. He was on his way to be martyred and was most likely citing scriptures from memory. What is often overlooked is the content of these Biblical citations and allusions. In reference to his writings, Souter says, "[It] hardly [has] any

bearing on the choice between variants in the passages of the New Testament." (*The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p.76). With this brief statement, the writings of Ignatius are dismissed as having no impact on the study of textual criticism. Perhaps this is because the Biblical citations used by this early Church Father does not disagree with the text of the Authorized Version. In fact, the text of Ignatius reflects the reading found in the Traditional Text.

An example of this is found in Ignatius' letter to the Ephesians. It will be remembered by the student that there is a textual variant of great importance found in 1 Timothy 3:16. The KJV reads, "God was manifest in the flesh." Modern versions, using the Alexandrian Text, read, "He was revealed in flesh" (NRSV). There is a difference between saying **He** and saying **God**. The KJV makes a clear proclamation of the Deity of Jesus Christ in this verse. What is important here is that Ignatius apparently used a Bible which reflected the reading found in the KJV. He writes, "There is one physician, both fleshly and spiritual; made and not made; God in the flesh" (Ephe. 2:7) and "God himself being made manifest in the form of a man." (Ephe. 4:13). Ignatius uses the Greek word for God (Theos), and for flesh (sarki) in the first citation and the Greek word for manifest (using the form **phanerosas**) in the second, as does the Greek text of the KJV in 1 Timothy 3:16. If Ignatius had used the Greek word **ieos** (he), the supporters of modern versions would no doubt have claimed that Ignatius was using a Greek text which supported the reading found in the Alexandrian and Western line of manuscripts. The fact is that Ignatius' text reflects the Traditional reading, found in the KJV and the Majority Text, and not the Alexandrian found in Codices Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and modern translations.

It is also interesting to read the phraseology of Ignatius in reference to the person of Jesus Christ. Over and over he refers to the Second Person of the Trinity as the "Lord Jesus Christ." This full use of the title and person of Christ is found in almost every letter of Ignatius and used several times over in those letters. I state this because the student will remember that James White (and others who would call the Traditional Text a fuller text) raised a theory called the **expansion of piety**. As stated in lesson three, modern versions often shorten the phrase to Christ, or Jesus Christ, or Lord, while the KJV more often uses the whole phrase, Lord Jesus Christ. It would seem from the writings of Ignatius that he had been influenced by the fuller text as it is found in our KJV.

### Polycarp (70 to 155 AD)

Polycarp was not only the Bishop of Smyrna but also, "had special opportunities to know the mind of the disciples because he had been a disciple of (St.) John." (Cairns, *Christianity Through the Centuries*, p.79). His martyrdom in 155 AD is recorded by both Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical*

*History* and John Foxe in his *Book of Martyrs*. He was first placed at the stake to be burned, and he sang hymns waiting for the fire to consume him. However, the fire burned around him but did not burn Polycarp. He was then ordered to be stabbed until dead and his remains burned.

The witness of Polycarp is important in the study of textual criticism for the following reasons. First of all, he cites about sixty New Testament quotations in his one letter, Polycarp to the Philippians. Over half of these are citations from Paul's epistles, showing his acquaintance with the Apostle and the acceptance of Paul's letters as scripture in the early Church. Second, he was a contemporary of the Apostles and would have had access to either the original writings of the Apostles or copies that were written shortly after the originals. Thirdly, like Ignatius, the Biblical citations do not differ with the Traditional Text in favor of the Alexandrian or Western readings. In fact, even more so than Ignatius, the citations of Polycarp reflect the readings found in the Traditional Text as it differs with the Alexandrian Text.

Most of what Polycarp writes deals with Christian living, yet he does state his profession of faith early in his letter: "knowing that by grace ye are saved; not by works, but by the will of God through Jesus Christ" (Phili. 1:5), and, "he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also raise up us in like manner" (Phili. 1:8). He makes a good profession and stands against the dualism of the Gnostics in stating:

"For whosoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, he is Antichrist: and whoever does not confess his suffering upon the cross, is from the devil. And whosoever perverts the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts; and say that there shall neither be any resurrection, nor judgment, he is the first-born of Satan. Wherefore leaving the vanity of many, and their false doctrines; let us return to the word that was delivered to us from the beginning" (Phili. 3:1-3).

### **1 John 4:3**

The Biblical quotation from Polycarp to confront Gnosticism is a citation from the Traditional Text. 1 John 4:3 reads, "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." The Alexandrian line omits the phrase "is come in the flesh" in verse three. The verse deals with the lack of confession, not the Believer's profession that is found in verse two. As quoted above, Polycarp writes, "whosoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," matches what John wrote, "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." In fairness to the verse, some have suggested that Polycarp is really citing 2 John 7 and not 1 John 4:3. This, however, does not seem to be the view of Dr. J. B. Lightfoot. In his book, *The Apostolic Father*, Lightfoot cites the quotation is from 1 John 4:3 (Macmillan

and Comp. Pub., p. 171), as does Archbishop Wake in his translation of Polycarp (*The Lost Books of the Bible*, World Pub., p. 194). Their observations are well taken as that the Greek of 1 John 4:3 matches the Greek citation of Polycarp. However, the Greek of 2 John 7 does not match Polycarp. The Greek phrase as it stands in the Traditional Text reads, "en sarke eleluthota" (in flesh come). Polycarp writes, "en sarke eleluthenai" (in flesh come). Both use the same tense of the Greek participle. 2 John reads, "epxomenon en sarki" (coming or is come in flesh). The Greek tense differs from that of Polycarp. 1 John and Polycarp use the perfect tense, 2 John uses the present tense. English does not have a perfect tense, but in Greek it means a present state resulting from a past action (i.e. because Christ came in the flesh, He is now in the flesh). It is therefore clear in both the Greek and English that Polycarp was citing 1 John 4:3, and that his citation matches the KJV and opposes the modern versions which omit this phrase.

#### **Romans 14:10**

Polycarp writes, "and must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ; and shall every one give an account of himself." (Phili. 2:18) The allusion comes from Romans 14:10 which reads, "But why doest thou judge thy brother? or why doest thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." (KJV) This passage, therefore, confirms the Deity of Christ because verse twelve informs us that, "every one of us shall give account of himself to God." (KJV). The Alexandrian line changes "judgment seat of Christ" to "judgment seat of God." This not only leaves out the cross-reference concerning the Deity of Christ, but it is obviously not the Greek text used by Polycarp in the very first few years of the second century. Both the KJV and Polycarp use the Greek word "Kristou" (of Christ). The Alexandrian line of manuscripts, which stand in the minority, use the Greek word "Theou" (of God). Since this passage is the only passage that speaks of the judgment seat of Christ, Polycarp must have received his reading from a text which read like the Traditional Text. This again shows that the older reading, closest to the original autographs, reads like that found in the majority of Greek and other manuscripts as translated in the KJV.

#### **Galatians 4:26**

Here we find the phrase, "which is the mother of us all" in the KJV. The Alexandrian line of manuscripts simply reads, "and she is our mother." (NIV). The Greek word "panton" (of us all) is omitted from the Alexandrian manuscripts, while the majority of all Greek manuscripts has it in them. Polycarp writes, "which is the mother of us all" and uses the Greek word "panton." Geisler and Nix list Galatians 4:26 as a citation by Polycarp (*A General Introduction to the Bible*, p.349), as does Lightfoot (*The Apostolic*

*Fathers*, p. 169). Where did Polycarp get the phrase if not from the Traditional Text? Plainly, the disciple of St. John, and friend of St. Paul, was using a Greek text like the Traditional Text.

### **The Expansion of Piety**

Once again, the expansion of piety theory falls short in the light of Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians. In this short letter consisting of only four chapters, Polycarp uses the triune phrase, "Lord Jesus Christ" seven times (1:1, 2, 3, 6; 4:10, 11, 20). This seems rather amazing since the Apostle Paul in his letter to the Philippians used the phrase only three times (1:2; 3:20; 4:23). However, in his letter to the Ephesians, Paul uses "Lord Jesus Christ" the same number of times as Polycarp. In this light, the thought that the multiple use of "Lord Jesus Christ" from a shorter version was added by the Byzantine monks around 1,000 AD seems rather far fetched. It is obvious from Polycarp that the expanded phrase was in common use at the time of the New Testament and shortly thereafter. Further, because of the expansion used by Polycarp, it seem more likely that this was the common expression used in reference to our Lord. Not only is the theory invalid, but the common text used by first century Christians reflected that which would be found in the Traditional Text throughout the centuries. Thus the admonition found in 1 Thessalonians 2:13 remains intact.

### **Early Translations**

In addition to the Traditional Text, we have many early and old translations of the Bible which are either classified as Byzantine (i.e. Traditional Text) or have readings which differ from the Alexandrian Text in favor of the Traditional Text. After Kurt and Barbara Aland point to around 180 AD as the beginning of when these translations began, they state, "It must be emphasized that the value of the early versions for establishing the original Greek text and for the history of the text has frequently been misconceived, i.e., they have been considerably overrated." (*The Text of the New Testament*, Eerdmans Pub., 1987 p.182). Yet, one could say the same about copies of copies of Greek manuscripts as well. Perhaps the concern stated by the Alands is because so many of the early translations have readings which match the KJV and its Majority Text in Greek. An early translation must have had a source. If the early translation has a certain reading, and later Greek manuscripts have the same reading, we can conclude that the source for the early translation had the reading as well, even if we no longer have that source.

### **Old Syrian**

There are several old translations which are called Syrian because they are in the Aramaic language. The history of the Syrian versions is a rich

history, much like the history of the Latin translations. Dr. Bruce Metzger writes, "Until the middle of the nineteenth century the Peshitta held the field as the earliest Syriac version of the New Testament." ( *The Early Version of the New Testament*, Clarendon Press, 1977 p. 36). This is important because Antioch in Syria, the birth place of the word Christian, produced an early translation of the Bible which agreed with the Traditional Text.

The Peshitta (which means clear or simple) is the standard Syriac version. Geisler and Nix state, "It is important to note at this point that the Peshitta was 'the authorized version' of the two main opposed branches of Syriac Christianity, the Nestorians and the Jacobites, indicating that it must have been firmly established by the time of their final cleavage, well before the fifth century." ( *A General Introduction to the Bible*, p.318). In fact, the chart they give on page 265 of their book dates the Peshitta close to the year 200 AD. They also note that the Peshitta was, "brought into conformity with the Byzantine text type." ( *Ibid.*, p.318). Thus the Peshitta bears testimony to the Traditional Text from which the KJV was translated. Aland justly states, "The Peshitta version as it is presented in the British and Foreign Bible Society edition is the most widely attested and most consistently transmitted of the Syriac New Testament versions. The Syriac church still preserves it and holds it in reverence in this form today." ( *The Text of the New Testament*, p. 190). In fact, the tradition of the Syrian church is that the Peshitta was the work of St. Mark while others claim the Apostle Thaddeus (Jude) translated it.

In 1901 textual scholar F. C. Burkitt questioned the early date of the Peshitta and assigned it as the work of the bishop of Edessa, Rabbula, in the fifth century. Metzger notes, "The hypothesis of the Rabbulan authorship of the Peshitta New Testament soon came to be adopted by almost all scholars, being persuaded perhaps more by the confidence with which Burkitt propounded it than by any proof other than circumstantial evidence." ( *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, pp. 55-56). The view of Burkitt has been attacked by other scholars such as Arthur Voobus who compared Rabbula's citations with the Peshitta and found several differences. It has also been argued by Edward Hills that Rabbula could not have been the translator because the division within the Syrian church took place during the time of Rabbula with Rabbula being the leader of one of these sects. Yet both sides claim the Peshitta as holy scripture. Hills writes, "It is impossible to suppose that the Peshitta was his (Rabbula's) handiwork, for if it had been produced under his auspices, his opponents would never have adopted it as their received New Testament text." ( *The King James Version Defended*, p.174). To this Metzger adds:

The question who it was that produced the Peshitta version of the New Testament will perhaps never be answered. That it was not Rabbula has been proved by Voobus's researches. . . In any case, however, in view of the

adoption of the same version of the Scriptures by both the Eastern (Nestorian) and Western (Jacobite) branches of Syrian Christendom, we must conclude that it had attained a considerable degree of status before the division of the Syrian Church in AD 431. (Metzger, pp.59-60).

If the Peshitta does date to around 200 AD, or before, we have an answer to those who wonder about the text of the New Testament early in its transmission. James R. White asks, "If we were to transport ourselves to the year AD 200 and look at the text of the New Testament at that time, ignoring for the moment what was to come later, what would we find?" ( *The King James Only Controversy*, p.152). According to the Peshitta translation, we would find a text like the Authorized Version produced in 1611. This is confirmed by Souter who writes, "Thus it happens that the Peshitta Syriac rarely witnesses to anything different from what we find in the great bulk of Greek manuscripts." ( *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p.60). And, based upon our lesson so far, we would find early Christians, like Ignatius and Polycarp, using a Bible with 1 Timothy 3:16, Romans 14:10; Galatians 4:26, and 1 John 4:3 reading just like the KJV, the Traditional Text, and the Peshitta.

### Old Latin

Bruce Metzger writes, "At the close of the nineteenth century several scholars suggested that Antioch in Syria was the place where the Old Latin version(s) originated. . .scholars today are inclined to look to North Africa as the home of the first Latin version of the New Testament." ( *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, p. 288). The Old Latin versions are divided into two camps, African and European. Within the Old Latin there are "variants among the manuscripts (which) make a coherent history of the text all but impossible to determine." ( *A General Introduction to the Bible*, p.334). Today, the earliest manuscripts we have in the Old Latin date to the fourth century.

Regardless of the history of the varying Old Latin manuscripts, there are readings within the Old Latin which support the Traditional Text. For example, Mark 1:2 reads, "As it is written in the prophets," and then quotes two prophets, Malachi and Isaiah. The Alexandrian line reads, "As it is written in the Prophet Isaiah" and then quotes from two prophets. The first reading is found in the KJV and the Traditional Greek Text. It is also found in the Peshitta. Among the Old Latin manuscripts (which are classified with small Roman letters for the most part), we find the same reading as in the Traditional Text in the Old Latin manuscripts a (4th century), aur (7th cen.), b (5th cen.), c (12th cen.), d (5th cen.), f (6th cen.), ff2 (5th cen.), and q (7th cen.). The same is true of the longer ending to Mark. While the Alexandrian line omits verses 9-20 of chapter sixteen, it is found in the majority of Greek

manuscripts, the Peshitta, and almost all Old Latin manuscripts. In fact, the Old Latin manuscript k is the only one which has the shorter ending, and it was k which added the Gnostic reading about the resurrection which read like the Gospel of Peter (see lesson four). The same is also true to the passage in John 7:52-8:11 concerning the woman caught in the act of adultery. The majority of Old Latin witnesses contain this passage and read like the KJV and the Traditional Text.

### **Ethiopic Version**

This version dates to the beginning of the fourth century. While it does contain a mixed reading at times, it is classified as being basically Byzantine in origin. Thus the witness to Africa was also of the Traditional Text. Geisler and Nix state, "This translation adheres closely, almost literally, to the Greek text of the Byzantine type" (*Ibid.*, p. 324). They also classify the Armenian Version, Georgian Version, and the Slavonic Version of the same textual family, that of the Traditional Text (*Ibid.*, pp.323-328).

### **Gothic Version**

This early Germanic version dates to the first part of the fourth century. It was translated by Wulfilas who "made use of a manuscript of the early Byzantine text differing little from what we find in the Greek manuscripts." (Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, p.206). Alexander Souter says of the Gothic Version, "The translation of the New Testament was made from Greek MSS. such as Chrysostom used, of the official Constantinopolitan (i.e. Traditional Text) type." (*The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p.69). Thus the Gothic version reflects the Traditional Text and the English KJV.

Hence, we can see from the old early translations that they reflect the Traditional Text from which came the King James Version. The early translations which these believers received as the word of God, which effectually worked in them, was like our Authorized Version of today.

### **Chrysostom (345-407 AD)**

John Chrysostom was both a great Biblical expositor and preacher. His parents were Christians and came from Antioch. Chrysostom began his career as a lawyer, until his conversion in 368 AD. He then began to preach to gospel of Jesus Christ. He was ordained in 386 AD and preached in Antioch until 398. It was then that he became Bishop of Constantinople. (The student should note that there is in the study of textual criticism a clear connection between Antioch and Constantinople, and that manuscripts coming from these two places bear a remarkable resemblance). The Bible he used was of the Traditional text.

Even though Cairns describes him as courteous, affectionate, and kindly natured (*Christianity Through the Centuries*, p.152); he was not ashamed to boldly proclaim the truth, no matter who was offended. While at Constantinople, one he offended was the wife of emperor Arcadius, empress Eudoxia. He had preached against her manner of dress and that she placed silver statues of herself throughout the city. And, like the preaching of John the Baptist, his sermon came at a personal cost. He was banished from the city in 404 AD, and while in exile, he died in 407.

Chrysostom left about 640 sermons which are still in existence. Church Historian Ross MacKenzie states that Chrysostom was, "A writer of pure, almost Attic style, John is one of the most attractive of the Greek preachers, and his eloquence gained him the name of Chrysostom (Golden Mouth)." (*The New Grolier Multimedia Encyclopedia*, 1993 ed.) Cairns adds to this by simply stating, "It is little wonder that he was and still is hailed as the greatest pulpit orator the Eastern Church ever had." (*Christianity Through the Centuries*, p.152).

Because of the massive amount of homilies left by Chrysostom, and because of his expository style of preaching, it is very easy to see the text type used by him. Souter states that the type of text Chrysostom used is reflected by Codex K, which is of the Byzantine line. However, it should be noted that K dates to several hundred years after Chrysostom, thus showing its continued use through the centuries. Souter writes that Chrysostom Greek text, "is roughly that of the great bulk of our manuscripts." (*The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p.85). Thus, the Greek text of John Chrysostom is the Traditional Text from which came the KJV.

This is clearly seen in his writings, but for purpose of illustration I have chosen to compare his homilies on the Sermon on the Mount with the focus on Matthew chapter 6:1-15. There are, within this passage, two very notable differences between the two major lines of manuscripts. They are found in verses 1 and 13.

Verse 1

<p>Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them: otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven. (KJV).</p>	<p>Take heed that you do not your justice before men, to be seen by them: otherwise you shall not have a reward of your Father who is in heaven. (Douay-Rheims Version).</p>	<p>Be careful not to do you 'acts of righteousness' before men, to be seen by them. If you do, you will have no reward from your Father in heaven. (NIV).</p>
---	--	---

The Authorized Version uses the word **alms** (Gk. eleemosunen),

while the NIV uses the phrase **acts of righteousness** (Gk. dikaiosunen), and the DRV **justice** . As one can see from either the English or the Greek, these are two different words, with two different meanings. They are also reflective of the two textual lines, in that the Alexandrian reading uses **righteousness** while the Traditional line uses **alms**. There is no question as to which one Chrysostom uses. He comments on the text by saying, "And mark how Christ began, as though he were speaking of some wild beast, hard to catch, and crafty to deceive him who was not very watchful. Thus, 'take heed,' saith he, 'as to your alms.' So Paul also speaks to the Philippians, 'Beware of dogs.'" (Jaroslav Pelikan edition, *The Preaching of Chrysostom*, Fortress Press, p.130). He then quotes the passage "For which same cause he saith, 'Take heed that ye do not your alms before men,' for that which was before mentioned, is God's almsgiving." (*Ibid.*, p.131).

### Verse 13

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. (KJV).	And lead us not into temptation. But deliver us from evil. (DRV)	And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one. (NIV).
---	--	---

For years the omission of the phrase "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen." marked the difference between Protestant and Catholic versions of the Lord's prayer. However, today, even conservative translations such as the NIV and NASV have chosen the Alexandrian reading of Catholicism instead of the Traditional text which is supported by the majority of all Greek uncials and minuscules.

Chrysostom, in the late fourth century, plainly used the reading as it is found in the majority of all Greek and Syrian manuscripts. He writes, "Having then made us anxious as before conflict, by putting us in mind of the enemy, and having cut away from us all our remissness; he again encourages and raises our spirits, by bringing to our remembrance the King under whom we are arrayed, and signifying him to be more powerful than all. 'For thine,' saith he, 'is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory.'" (*Ibid.*, p.145). He then expounds the phrases "the power" and "the glory," which would be rather hard to do if his Bible did not contain them. Once again we see the Bible of this great preacher was like the one translated into English in 1611.

### The Three Cappadocian Fathers

John Chrysostom was not alone in his use of the Traditional text.

Basil of Caesarea (329-379 AD); Gregory of Nazianzus (330-389 AD) and Gregory of Nyssa (330-395 AD, the brother of Basil) used the same text line. These three Church Fathers are called the Cappadocian Fathers. These three men are noted for their strength in doctrine and opposition to the heresy of Arianism (which denied the Trinity). All three strongly supported the doctrine of the Trinity and were noted as strong theologians. All are also associated with the Orthodox Church of Constantinople. All three had Christian parents, and Gregory of Nazianzus' father was a bishop.

The Greek and Old Latin manuscripts used by these men reflect the text of the Traditional line. Souter states that their Greek text originated "probably in Constantinople" while the Latin "in North Italy." (*The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p. 9). Souter lists the Gospel manuscripts of N, O, Sigma, and Phi, reflecting "the text used by the great Cappadocian Fathers. . . in the last third of the fourth century." (*Ibid.*, p. 30). These manuscripts (N, O, Sigma, and Phi) are from the sixth century and reflect the readings found in the Traditional text.

It is little wonder then, that when we find differences between the Traditional text and the Alexandrian text, that the Cappadocian choose the readings as they are found in the KJV and not the ones reflected in the NIV or NRSV. The following are a few examples.

Matthew 17:21 is omitted in the NIV and NASV, but is in the KJV and supported by the Traditional Text and the Cappodocian Fathers.

Mark 1:2 the KJV reads "prophets" as does the citations of the Cappodocian Fathers. Modern versions choose the Alexandrian reading of "Isaiah the prophet" and then quote from Malachi.

Mark 16:9-20. The longer ending, as it is found in the KJV, is also in the Greek Gospels of the Cappodocian Fathers.

Luke 2:14. While the Nestle Text of the Alexandrian line renders the phrase as, "men of goodwill," the KJV and the Cappodocian Fathers render it as, "good will toward men."

John 5:4 is omitted in the Alexandrian Text, but found in the Greek text of the Cappodocian Fathers.

This siding with the Traditional Text is not just limited to the Gospels, although there are several examples. It should also be noted that, like Ignatius, the Cappodocian Fathers used **God** (Gk. Theos) in 1 Timothy 3:16.

### The Church Under Fire

Throughout the centuries there have been those strong in the faith who were willing to suffer and die for the cause of Christ. Their histories have been written with honor by men like John Foxe in his book of Martyrs; their names have been reduced to that of heretic by those who persecuted them. Among such groups of Bible-believers were the Paulicians, the Bogomiles, the

Anabaptists, the Waldenses, and the Albigenses to name a few. They are mentioned here only because the scriptures they used were those of the Traditional Text or a translation which reflected the readings found in the Traditional Text. They received the word of God, as it is in truth the word of God, and it worked effectually within them (1 Thess. 2:13).

Most of those mentioned above were and are labeled as heretics in order to justify their mass murders. A case in point would be the Albigenses, so named because they originated in southern France near the old city of Albige. To this date they are listed in most histories of the Church as a heretical sect which practiced dualism. It has been claimed that the Albigenses believed in two gods, one good and one evil, much like the old Gnostic heresy. However, this is simply not the case. Historian for the American Baptist Convention, Henry C. Vedder, writes, "The (Roman) church was not at all careful to distinguish between them, and they were often included under the name of Albigenses in one sweeping general condemnation. That name, however, does not properly denote the evangelical heretics, who never confounded themselves with these dualistic heretics, and indeed sympathized with them as little as they did with Rome." (*A Short History of the Baptist*, Judson Press, 1907, p.103).

The true "heresy" of these Bible-believing French folk was that they would not conform to Rome and its teachings. They believed each Christian had the right to read the Bible in their own language for themselves. Pope Innocent III declared war on them and began what was infamously known as the Inquisition. Edward Peter notes, "The severity and frequent brutality with which the northern French waged the Albigensian Crusade led to the killing of many heretics without formal trial or hearing." (*Inquisition*, The Free Press; 1988, p. 50). In this dark period of time, unnamed thousands died at the hand of Rome because they wished to place the Bible into the hands of the common man.

Catholic historians and theologians today argue that this simply is not so. The Right Reverend Henry Graham (*Where We Got The Bible: Our Debt to the Catholic Church*), Revelation Dr. L. Rumble, and Fr. Charles Carty (*Bible Quizzes To A Street Preacher*) state that most people in the Middle Ages could not read, so there was no need for the Bible in the language of the common man because he could not read it if he had it. They further state that since those who could read all read Latin, there was no need to have any other translation other than the Latin Vulgate by Jerome. This, however, by no means justifies the mass torture and murder of thousands of people. Additionally, it overlooks several simple truths. First, just because someone could not read for themselves would not stop them from wanting a Bible in their own language so someone else could read it to them. If there were only Latin Bibles, those who could not understand Latin were without hope of even

hearing the word of God. Second, history has shown that once the Bible is translated into the language of the people, the people learn to read. Time and again the Bible has been the basic text book for individuals to learn their own language in written form.

Another example are the Waldenses, who are often linked in history with the Albigensians. Some have suggested that the name Waldenses came from Peter Waldo, around 1176 AD. Waldo was a Bible-believing merchant turned preacher. Others believe the name comes from the Italian or Spanish word for valley, thus stating they originated in the valley region of northern Italy. Regardless of where they derived their name, they strongly stood against many of the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church.

Catholic and Orthodox historians David Knowles and Dimitri Obolensky list for us the "heresies" of which the Waldenses were guilty: "[The Waldenses] became definitely heterodox, regarding the Bible as the supreme authority and denying the real presence in the Eucharist. . .the Waldenses, the 'proto-Protestants', continued to influence religious history throughout the middle ages and despite persecution remain in existence at the present day." *The Christian Centuries*, Vol. 2, Paulist Press, 1969, p. 369). What they did believe in was that the Bible was the final authority for the born-again believer. That any one who was called of God could preach the word without authority from Rome. That salvation was not by works, but by the grace of God alone, and that baptism should follow belief and not applied to infants. Thus, the principles of 1 Thessalonians 2:13 were established in their lives.

Knowles and Obolensky further state, "Already in Milan and Lyons the Humiliati and the Waldenses were beginning to show the characteristics of their class: desire for associations of prayer and good works outside the liturgical framework; love of preaching and Bible-reading in the vernacular; dislike of . . .(the) sacramental aspects of religion; disputes about the Eucharist; praise of poverty; impatiences of hierarchical control." (*Ibid.*, p.224.) In addition they "believed that every man should have the Bible in his own tongue and that it should be the final authority for faith and life." (Cairns,*Christianity Through the Centuries*, p.248). Thus, they copied and translated the Bible in the vernacular and freely published these manuscripts. Therefore, their aid in using the Traditional Text and providing vernacular translations of it must not go unnoticed in the Biblical study of textual criticism.

Because of Believers like the Albigenses, the Waldenses and others, the Bible was translated into Provencal or Old French, Old High German, Slavonic, Old and Middle English, and other languages as well as Old Latin and Gothic. Through them, and others, we can see the Traditional Text not only translated into the language of the people, but translated into the lives of

those who read it.

One such translation is the West Saxon Gospels which date to this period of time. This is the oldest version of the Gospels in English (that is in Old English which differs from that which we use today). The following example comes from Luke 15:16 and shows that this version of the common man followed the Traditional Text which later produced the Authorized Version.

<p>And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat: and no man gave unto him. (KJV).</p>	<p>And he would gladly have fed on the pods that the swine ate, and no one gave him anything. (RSV).</p>	<p>Da gewilnode he his wambe gefyllan of pam beancoddum be oa swyn aeton; and him man ne sealde. (West Saxon)</p>
--	--	---

The subtle difference comes from the variance between the two line of manuscripts. The Greek Textus Receptus reads, "gemisai ten kailian autou apo" (to fill his belly with). The United Bible Societies' Text reads, "xortasthenai ek" (fed out of). This reading is supported by P75, Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus. All the Byzantine manuscripts, most Old Latin manuscripts, the Peshitta, and the Armenian, support the Traditional Text. It is plan from the reading of the West Saxon Gospels which one they follow. The words "wambe gefyllan" mean "stomach filled" which matches the text of the KJV.

**The Majority Text**

By the Majority Text, we mean the Traditional Text which has been used by Bible-believing Christians throughout the centuries and is reflected in the majority of Greek manuscripts. This Text has also been called the Syrian Text, the Constantinople Text, and is usually referred to as the Byzantine Text. It is this text which produced what has commonly been called the Textus Receptus or Received Text. It was this type of Greek Text which underlined the Authorized King James Version. We have already seen that this text type was used by early Christians and was the basis for early translations. It is the text which has predominated the history of Bible based Christianity and, for that matter, the majority of Christendom throughout the ages.

The main objection to the Majority Text is that it is a late text, of which most of the manuscripts within this textual family date after the ninth century. However, as we have already seen, the readings found within the Traditional Text date to manuscripts of the second century and some even to the first century. Additionally, the earliest citations made shortly after the completion of the New Testament reflect the readings found in the Traditional Text, and not the Alexandrian.

The question may be asked, Why do we have so many copies which have such a late date? There are several reasons of which I shall name three. First, because it is the Traditional Text. It was the one received by the early Church and the body of believers. Naturally, it would be the one to endure throughout the centuries and be massively copied and translated. Second, the reason why we do not have as many old manuscripts of this type is simply because it was the one used. Those manuscripts which were corrupted would not be used by the early born-again believers. They would see the corruptions and reject them. However, the Bibles which they did use would reflect that use. Just as the Bible you use today is quickly worn by use, so would the early manuscripts used by Bible-believing Christians. Third, the climate where the Traditional Text was formed is not as conducive for maintaining manuscripts as the climate in Egypt. Nevertheless, on this point it must also be noted that the origin and keeping of the New Testament did not lay in Egypt but elsewhere. Places such as Asia Minor, Palestine, Greece, and Rome would be where the New Testament originated and was kept. Alexandria originated none of the autographs nor was it the caretaker of any New Testament book or epistle. It therefore lays with the majority of manuscripts which were received and used by born-again believers (1 Thess. 2:13).

We now have over 5,000 manuscripts of the New Testament. A manuscript may be the whole New Testament, or it may only be a few books. At times it may even be a portion of a book or even a fragment. But all together we have well over 5,000 of these manuscripts. Dr. Zane Hodges, of Dallas Theological Seminary, has pointed out that "somewhere between 80-90 percent- -contain a Greek text which in most respects closely resembles the kind of text which was the basis of our King James Version." ("The Greek Text of the King James Version," found in *Bibliotheca Sacra* 124 (1968) p.335). Dr. Wilbur Pickering states, ". . . one may reasonably speak of up to 90% of the extant MSS belonging to the Majority text-type." (*The Identity of the New Testament Text*, Nelson Pub., 1980 ed., p.118).

The agreement within this vast host of manuscripts is astounding. It becomes even more astounding as one recognizes that the Traditional Text has been with us throughout the history of the New Testament Church, and that this text is represented in various locations throughout the world. Yet this text has few variances within the bulk of its witnesses. This is, of course, in direct opposition to the Alexandrian Text which is the minority text. The Alexandrian Text, with only a few Greek manuscripts "disagree as much (or more) among themselves as they do with the majority (text). For any two of them to agree so closely as do P75 and B is an oddity." (*Ibid.* ) In the Biblical definition of things, this is itself evidence that the Alexandrian Text is not the instrument God used in preserving His word. Namely, because there is a higher degree of variance within its own family based upon a much smaller

portion of manuscripts. Since God is not the Author of confusion (1 Corinthians 14:33), we can conclude that God is not responsible for this line.

It is from this wealth of manuscripts that men such as Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536), Robert Stephanus (1503-1559), Theodore Beza (1519-1605), and Bonaventure and Matthew Elzevirs (1624) produced Greek Texts which were greatly used by God and His Church. The Greek Text produced by Erasmus was the text which Martin Luther used to produce his German Bible. This text, along with those produced by Stephanus, were the basis for the Italian Bible of Giovanni Diodati (1576-1649) and the French Bible of Louis Second. They were also used by Casidoro de Reina (1520-1594) and Cipriano de Valera (1531-1602) and their Reina/Valera Spanish Bible. These texts and translations, along with earlier English translations and the Greek Text of Beza, formed the basis of our KJV.

These texts and their translations did not go unrewarded by God. The Greek text of the Reformers was that of the Traditional Text. Every Protestant Church which was formed during this period of Church history, used the Traditional Text or a translation based on it. The underground Church which did not need to leave Rome because it was never a part of it, used the Traditional Text as its Bible. The Traditional Text produced reform and revival. It has proven itself to have worked effectually within the community of believers who have received it as the very word of God. And, consequently, it has affected history and culture itself. Dr. Fred Craddock and Dr. Gene Tucker of Emory University have corrected stated, "Translations of the Bible, such as the Authorized Version (or King James Version, 1611) and Martin Luther's translation of the Bible into German (first completed in 1534) not only influenced literature, but also shaped the development of languages." (cited from *Encarta* by Microsoft, 1995 ed).

Thus we have briefly seen the history of the Traditional Text and how God has used it throughout the Church. In lessons to come we will explore this period of time which produced the KJV in order to better understand the history of the KJV itself. Also, we will be looking at the Greek Septuagint of the Old Testament and its citations in the New. Plus, we will study those missing verses listed in lesson three to find the textual and doctrinal support for them.

**Yours in Christ Jesus, Thomas Holland**

**Psalm 118:8**

**Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved!<sup>1</sup>**

(used by permission)

## Chapter 26: Modern Bibles, the Dark Secret - Part 2

**Author's Note:** These new version translators have actually invented a pseudo textual criticism science that allows them to support their new versions. It mirrors what is happening in the school system with the theory of evolution. All of the evidence refutes the theory. The theory is a "theory" because evolution has no science to support it. Yet evolution is presented as a fact. It is exactly the same with the modern perverted view of textual criticism. **Pastor Jack Moorman in his article "MODERN BIBLES, the Dark Secret - Part 2" exposes their dark secret. The first part of the article is excellent and it is recommended reading. I have inserted the outline of "Part One" but "Part Two" completes the tenets needed to show and address the theme, "How did this happen?" Thus, we have reprinted "Part 2" for your review. You will remember that Dr. Moorman has been previously quoted in this book and part of "Part 1" is in the previous quotation.**

### MODERN BIBLES, the Dark Secret - Part 2 by Pastor Jack Moorman© Table of Contents, PART One

#### Introduction

- I. Key Passages Missing
- II. Names of Christ Missing
- III. Further Significant Passages Missing
- IV. Hell Missing
- V. How Many Missing Words?

#### PART Two

- VI. The Theory Behind the Shorter Bibles
- VII. Antioch or Alexandria
- VIII. Timeless or Time-Bound
- IX. The NIV or AV English
- X. Principles of Bible Preservation

#### PART Two

### VI. THE THEORY BEHIND THE SHORTER BIBLES

Are words missing from the Modern Bibles or have they been added to the Authorized Version? This is the question that must now be asked! Have words been deleted, either intentionally or accidentally from the text underlying the Modern Versions, or have they been somehow added to the text of the King James Version?

Scholars who favour the newer translations have had a ready answer for this question, "Conflation." **They've said the King James text conflated or combined readings of the different "text types" or manuscript**

**groupings.** For example, if in a certain passage, one group of manuscripts reads "Peter walked by the sea," but another "John walked by the sea"; the manuscripts which form the basis of the Received Text merely combined the two, "Peter and John walked by the sea." This has been the standard explanation for the Received Text's greater length. But, as is now known, conflation cannot begin to offer any such explanation, and today textual scholars are reluctant to appeal to it.

Conflation is but one aspect of what is known as - *The Westcott and Hort Theory*. Last century about the time when Darwin was trying to show how there could be a creation without a Creator, two Cambridge professors, B.F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort built up an elaborate argument in favour of the shorter text and against the Received Text. Others before had labored to the same end, but Westcott and Hort developed the various facets into a powerful and plausible argument. Their theory of the New Testament text has dominated the views of Bible translators this century. But what is so remarkable: its major tenets have been disproven or diminished by scholars and yet still appealed to by them. Textual Criticism has reached a blind alley with little left to argue the point. One thing has become obvious, they seem no more likely to return to the KJV type of text than an evolutionist whose theories have also been disproven would come back to the Genesis account of creation. Textual critics merely continue to cleave to, and attempt to rehabilitate the wreckage of the Westcott and Hort theory.

Opponents of the Authorized Version have had a very big task on their hands. They must explain the dominance and uniformity of the Traditional/KJV Text. About 90% of known manuscripts fall into this category, and they are strongly cohesive. Further, they must describe the means by which it "became longer."

#### **Here then are the major points of the Westcott and Hort Theory:**

**One:** "In matters of textual criticism the Bible is to be treated like any other ancient book. No special considerations are to be made concerning its claims of inspiration and preservation."

To approach the Scriptures with anything less than the greatest reverence and respect is a reproach to its Author! God has committed Himself to His Book in its inspiration, preservation, and transmission. Textual scholars and translators who have not taken this into account have made a fatal error which reveals itself only too readily in the product.

**Two:** "Because of their age (mid fourth century), the primary basis of the Greek text is to be found in the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts."

These two well preserved manuscripts contain most of the New Testament. Vaticanus has for centuries been in the Vatican library, while Sinaiticus, which was discovered last century in a monastery at the foot of Mt. Sinai, is on display at the British Museum. They exhibit the shorter text and are the chief reason for the new versions being shorter. They are corrupted by Adoptionism. They, with a few allies, constitute the main pillars of the modern Critical Greek Text. They are continually referred to in footnotes as the "oldest and best manuscripts." They are old but certainly not the best! Their great age and good condition can only point to disuse by the early church. How else could they be in such remarkably good condition? We have very little evidence of copies being made from them in subsequent centuries. The comparatively few manuscripts which also exhibit the shorter text frequently disagree with them in other particulars. In fact, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus disagree between themselves over 3000 times in the four Gospels alone. The source of this shorter text seems certain to have been Alexandria, Egypt, and it did not spread and become an accepted text outside of that area. These two primary representatives of the Alexandrian Text remained in their places of disuse for the better part of the Christian era only to be retrieved last century to form the basis of the Modern Bibles.

***Three: "Despite its numerical advantage, the Received or Byzantine Text (as it is called) is merely one of three or four competing text types."***

This was the great "leveler" used by textual critics when faced with the overwhelming numbers of the Received Text. Rather than view manuscripts on a 90 to 10 ratio (that is 90 for the Received and 10 for the others), the Received Text was made merely one of several competing families. The others being said to be the Alexandrian, Western and possibly the Caesarean.

Now for a start, to divide ten percent of the remaining manuscripts among three textual groupings, shows how small each would be. Today it is admitted that because of their lack of uniformity the Western and Caesarean can no longer be regarded as text types. This leaves the Received and Alexandrian. And the Alexandrian is very small as the following shows:

1. There are 88 papyri fragments (2nd, 3rd centuries). Many are too fragmentary to show whether they support the longer or shorter text; coming as they do from the Alexandria area we would expect them to support the latter. Scholars such as Fredrick Kenyon usually single out between nine and thirteen in support of the Alexandrian Text. But, as shown below, the papyri also supports the AV Text.

2. There are 267 uncial or large-lettered manuscripts (4th-10th centuries). Advocates of the Alexandrian Text claim support from only about nine.
3. There are 2401 minuscule or small-lettered manuscripts (10th-16<sup>th</sup> centuries). Supporters of the shorter text are prepared to list only about twenty-two for their side. Thus the Alexandrian manuscripts comprise only a small fraction of those discovered. Further there is wide variation among them; far more so than the great mass of manuscripts which comprise the Received Text. We are actually being quite generous to give as many as 40 manuscripts to the Alexandrian side, for frequently they display the shorter text in only a portion of a manuscript. There is in fact only one cohesive text type; that which underlies the King James Version. Most of what remains is total confusion! We are bound to ask: If the shorter Alexandrian Text used in the modern Bibles is the true one, why did the early church make so few and widely variant copies?

***Four: "The numerical preponderance of the Received Text can be explained by a study of the genealogical descent of its manuscripts. If, for example, of ten manuscripts, nine agree against one, but the nine have a common original, the numerical advantage counts for nothing. It is merely one to one."***

This was the classic argument W/H used to deny the Received Text any preference on the basis of numbers. The argument implies that many of the Received Text manuscripts are but copies of each other or of near ancestors. Surprisingly, W/H merely theorized at this point, they did not present actual data of parent-to-child and ancestral relationships between manuscripts. Research since W/H has shown that the great mass of Received Text manuscripts are not "mimeographed" copies; very few have a parent-child relationship. Instead they are individual representatives of lines of transmission which go deep into the past.

***Five: "The Received Text is fuller due to conflation. It combined the variant readings of other competing text types (usually the Western and Alexandrian). Rather than choose between one or the other, both were used. Much of this took the form of an official revision sanctioned by the Byzantine Church probably under the leadership of Lucan (died 311 A.D.) bishop of Antioch."***

If this were true, then most of the underlined KJV passages in our lists which have been omitted from the modern version-should in fact be combinations of material from existing text types. Yet a search of the Alexandrian and Western texts in these passages reveals that there is seldom enough material for the Received Text to make such a conflation. Thus,

wherever the unique KJV readings came from, it most certainly was not from that source. This is clearly the reason why Westcott and Hort, who were long on theory but short on demonstration, presented only eight "examples" of conflation. And frankly, the eight are not very convincing. To make conflation the reason for the greater length of the KJV would require virtually thousands of clear instances.

Coming to the second part of the argument, that this conflating was officially carried out around the year 300 A.D., history has left not the slightest trace. This historical blank has led modern scholars to speak of the "lengthening" of the Received Text in terms of a "process which occurred over a considerable time, possibly centuries." Yet how such a process-again unnoticed by history carried out by many scribes, over centuries, across a vast geographic area, could achieve the widespread uniformity so apparent in the Received Text manuscripts is beyond imagination.

**Six. "The distinctive Received Text readings (i.e. those we have underlined in the lists) are not generally seen before 350 A.D. For the most part they are absent from the Greek manuscripts, Versions, and Scripture quotations of the Church Fathers."**

For a full discussion see the author's "Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version." *But, to summarize the following may be said.*

### **1. The Greek Manuscripts**

Clearly, Christians through the centuries believed that the longer text was very old, and that it accurately reflected the original, for they continually multiplied copies of it. This they most certainly would not have done had they felt it was merely a secondary and conflated revision. Nevertheless, Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and some of the papyri portions which have survived for over 1650 years often exhibit the shorter text.

Let it be pointed out first that to expect a manuscript to hold up under the copying process for 1650 years is of course to expect the impossible. It is abundantly clear that these few manuscripts endured precisely because they were not so used. Where are the copies? Further, coming as they do from Egypt, they had the benefit of being stored in a dry climate which greatly contributed to their preservation.

There is, however, clear evidence for the longer TR readings in these few very early relics. Harry A. Sturz in his book "The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism" strikes a devastating blow at arguments which seek to minimize the fact that distinctive Byzantine readings do appear in the early papyri. He lists 150 Received Text readings which though not supported by the early Alexandrian and Western manuscripts are read by the mass of later manuscripts and by the early papyri. He lists a further

170 TR readings which again run counter to Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, but in this case find support from the Western manuscripts. These also are supported in the early papyri. In fact Sturz demonstrates papyri support for a total of 839 readings which in varying degrees would be classed as "distinctly Byzantine." As the papyri is available for only 30% of the New Testament, existing evidence allows us to reasonably project that the story would be the same for the rest of the New Testament. What is especially remarkable about this is, the papyri comes from that area where the Alexandrian/shorter text was prevalent. Nearly all of the 267 uncial manuscripts move strongly to the side of the AV Text, with the same being true of the minuscules.

## 2. The Early Versions

The early versions, i.e. where Greek was translated into another language, strongly support the Received Text, both before and after 350 A.D. The three primary versions are the Old Latin, Syriac Peshitta, and Egyptian Coptic. The two former were translated about 150 A.D. and the Coptic about 200 A.D. As might be expected existing manuscripts of the Coptic lean toward the Alexandrian/shorter text. Yet, in a significant number of places the Coptic is found to agree with the Received Text against Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

**The Old Latin**—One view of the origin of the Old Latin is that it was translated in Antioch, Syria, by missionaries to the West. Support for this view is demonstrated by the strong Syrian and Aramaic tendencies in the existing manuscripts. If this is the case then the Old Latin is associated with that city which was not only the missionary center in the Book of Acts, but also the place that history accords as the fountainhead of the Received Text.

The 65 or so existing manuscripts often disagree among themselves and are probably not very good reflections of the original Old Latin text. Those associated with North Africa show some strange additions as well as subtractions. Whereas, the manuscripts connected with Europe are generally favourable to the Received text. It is this African strain of the old Latin that is often termed "the Western text type." One thing is certain; the Old Latin whether European or African does not give much support to the Alexandrian/Modern Version text!

It is the branch of the Old Latin used in northern Italy that attracts our interest most, and establishes one of the crucial chapters in Bible transmission history. This version, known as the Itala, is associated with the Christians of the Vaudois—the valleys of northern Italy and southern France. These noble believers withstood every attempt of Rome to "bring them into the fold." From the days of Pope Sylvester (early 300's) unto the massacres of 1655, they were slaughtered, their name blackened, and their records destroyed; yet they remained true to the Scriptures. They are known by a number of names, but

best as the Waldensians. Research into the text and history of the Waldensian Bible has shown that it is a lineal descendant of the Old Latin Itala. In other words, the Itala has come down to us in the Waldensian form, and is firmly in the Received Text tradition. The same can be said of other Bibles belonging to those groups who remained separate from Rome. Thus, in the Received Text we have the convergence of the Greek speaking East and the non-Catholic Latin-speaking West.

**The Syriac Peshitta**—Coming now to the third primary version, the Syriac Peshitta, we have a curious case of textual history being rewritten. From the days of Westcott and Hort and the establishing of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus as the basis of the new Bibles, every attempt has been made to discredit all pre 350 A.D. evidence for the Received Text. This is nowhere more apparent than with the famous Syriac Peshitta.

The importance of this version and the church it came from cannot be overemphasized. The virtual center of first century Christianity was Antioch in Syria. "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch" (Acts 11:20). Paul's great church planting ministries had their base in Antioch. Syrian Christianity had a close proximity and linkage with many of the churches that had received the inspired New Testament letters. The Syrian church had direct contact with the Apostles and writers of the Scriptures, therefore, the Syrian version may have been written with direct access to the original autographs. Indeed, Bishop Elliott in 1870 wrote, "It is no stretch of imagination to suppose that portions of the Peshitta might have been in the hands of St. John."

Now, in the years following 1870 the good bishop must have bit his tongue for so openly stating this commonly held view concerning the near apostolic age of the Peshitta. For in the movement to bring out a revised Bible, in which he himself played a leading role, the Peshitta posed a major stumbling block. Its manuscripts (now numbering over 259) are in line with the Received Text! Thus, practically by itself the Peshitta could undermine the entire Westcott and Hort superstructure. The answer was to take two other Syriac manuscripts (one discovered in 1842, the other in 1892) which differed from the Peshitta, and call them the "Old Syriac." The Peshitta was then made to be a revision of this so-called Old Syriac. To make the story complete, the Peshitta's date was moved back from 150 to about 425 A.D., with the "revision" being performed by a certain Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa in Syria.

Needless to say, there is not a trace in Syrian ecclesiastical history of such a thing happening. As Arthur Voobus writes "this kind of reconstruction of textual history is pure fiction without a shred of evidence to support it" (*Early Versions of the New Testament*, Estonian Theological Society, 1954, see pp. 90-97). Further, the view is contrary to established facts of history. In

Rabbula's day a massive split occurred in the Syrian Church. The opposing sides were known as the Nestorians and Monophysites (led by Rabbula). Yet, both sides regarded the Peshitta as their authoritative Bible. It is impossible to believe that the side bitterly opposed to Rabbula should at the same time embrace unanimously his "revision" of the Scriptures. Further, such a unanimous acceptance by both parties in the early 400's argues powerfully for the Peshitta's early origin.

Regarding the two sole manuscripts of the so-called Old Syrian text. They are not all that close to each other. One denies the virgin birth of Christ in Matthew 1:16. Nor do they lend particularly convincing support to the Alexandrian Text ' In fact, they contain a significant number of Received Text readings. They are merely corrupted copies, all but ignored by the Syrian church, yet with the Received Text base still discernible.

The other European versions-the Gothic (350 A.D.), Armenian (early 400's), and Georgian (mid-400's)-follow the Received Text. Even the Ethiopic (400), despite its proximity to Egypt, is basically Received Text. Therefore, in the early versional history support for the Received Text, in contrast with the Alexandrian Text, is overwhelming.

### **3. The Scripture Quotations of the Early Church Writers**

Westcott and Hort confidently declared that ecclesiastical writers before 350 A.D. did not quote from the longer type of text. Their confidence rested in part on what is an immediate disadvantage for the Received Text. Most early writers (or at least those whose writings exist now) were located near those areas where the shorter text was prevalent (Alexandria), and where most divergences have been noted in the manuscripts-(North Africa and the West).

In this entire inquiry it cannot be overstressed that in early textual history the Received Text is most directly associated with those places that were either the senders or recipients of the original New Testament autographs, i.e. Antioch, Asia Minor, Greece, Macedonia. While volumes of theological literature poured out of Alexandria, North Africa and Italy, very little is available for us prior to 350 from the eastern areas. Yet even with this disadvantage, the Received Text can be shown to prevail in the Alexandrian/Western writings.

Toward the end of last century John Burgon compiled an extensive index of Scripture quotations from the early Church Fathers. In mentioning Burgon we come to the man who so powerfully and eloquently fought against moves in England to replace the Received Text. Attempts have been made to discredit this good man's massive labours. It certainly cannot be done on the basis of his scholarship. After matriculating at Oxford with honours and taking his B.A. and M.A. there, he was to spend most of his adult life at that famous university. Burgon was Fellow of Oriel College, vicar of St. Mary's

(the University Church) and Gresham Professor of Divinity. During his last twelve years he was Dean of Chichester. Unlike many of his contemporaries his was a "scholarship on fire." He believed and loved the Bible, and had a great zeal to defend it. While we cannot go along with his high churchmanship, we acknowledge him as a worthy champion of the Faith, and strongly urge the reading of his books.

Coming now to the index, Burgon cited 4,383 Scripture quotations from 76 writers who died before the year 400 A.D. Edward Miller carried on the work after Burgon's death and put the material in a tabulated form showing the times a Church Father witnesses for and against the Received Text. He found the Received Text had the greater support by 2,630 to 1,753 or 3 to 2. Keeping in mind the Alexandrian and Western localities of these 76 Fathers, we have here quite a strong majority for the Received Text. Had the quotations of the Eastern Fathers been available, all indications are that the support would have been quite overwhelming. But the above evidence shows clearly also that there was a struggle over the text of Scripture in those early centuries. But, there was a clear winner!

Miller concluded his research with the following challenge:

As far as the Fathers who died before 400 A.D. are concerned, the question may now be put and answered. Do they witness to the Traditional Text as existing from the first, or do they not? The results of the evidence, both as regards the quantity and the quality of the testimony, enable us to reply, not only that the traditional Text was in existence, but that it was predominant, during the period under review. Let any one who disputes this conclusion make out for the Western text, or the Alexandrian, or for the Text of B and Aleph (i.e. Vaticanus, Sinaiticus), a case from the evidence of the Fathers which can equal or surpass that which has been now placed before our reader.

Regarding the attempt to discredit Burgon's work by saying that later editors "adapted" the Church Father's quotations to the Traditional Text, Edward Hills writes:

In regard to my references to the Church Fathers, I am sure that if you examine the notes to my *King James Defended and my Believing Bible Study?* you will see that I have taken care to look up all the Burgon's references in the most modern editions available. During the years 1950-55, I spent many weeks at this task... In fact, the newer German editions of the Church Fathers differ little from those of the 17th and 18th centuries. Certainly not enough to affect Burgon's arguments (Letter from Edward F Hills to Theodore P. Letis, February 15, 1980, as quoted in Theodore P Letis, "Edward Freer Hills Contribution to the Revival of the Ecclesiastical Text," unpublished M.T.S. Thesis, Emory University, 1987).

**Seven: "There are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for doctrinal purposes during the early centuries."**

Such a view allowed Hort to treat the text of Scriptures as he would any other work of ancient literature (see point one). If he admitted that there had been a significant attack with fairly wide spread results then he would not (or only with greatest difficulty) have been able to introduce his other theories of genealogy, conflation, official revision, and text types. An unpredictable variable would have been introduced which these neatly packaged theories could not have handled. Textual Criticism approaches the history of the Bible much in the same way an evolutionist does the history of the planet: no direct reaction, no flood, all has been left to natural processes, no direct intervention of any kind!

In the face of widespread testimony of early Church Fathers to the contrary, it is hard to believe that Westcott and Hort were ever very serious about this point. But, the tenet had to be accepted if the rest of the theory was to have a chance of standing.

Tertullian of Carthage is typical of many early Fathers. He accused heretics of tampering with the Scriptures in order to gain support for their special views. Around the year 208 A.D. he urged these men to compare their copies with those in the cities where the Originals had been sent. Tertullian may actually be referring to the original autographs of the Epistles of Paul, but if not they were most certainly first generation copies.

"Run over the apostolic churches, in which the very thrones of the apostles are still preminent in their places, in which their own authentic writings are read. Achaia is very near you, in which you find Corinth. Since you are not far from Macedonia you have Philippi... and the Thessalonians. Since you are able to cross to Asia, you get Ephesus. Since, moreover, you are close upon Italy, you have Rome, from which there come even into our hands the very authority of the apostles themselves."

When the *Living Word*, the Lord Jesus Christ, returned to heaven Satan directed his fury against the *Written Word*. This is the key to understanding the history of the New Testament text. Any theory not taking this into account is totally adrift.

We are faced with the most direct question. Is the longer or the shorter text the offspring of these attempts at corruption? Did the 100 year period when deliberate alteration took place produce the text which more fully presents the Names, Person, and Work of Christ or the one which tends to diminish them? Which would be more likely: a believer adding to the Scriptures, or an enemy of the Faith deleting from the Scriptures? Which would be easier and less liable to immediate detection: adding words and phrases or removing them? Which could be more consistently and uniformly done? And which of these two kinds of text did believers through the centuries

feel convinced to be the right one, and demonstrate their conviction by multiplying copies?

By now, you probably know the answer!

***Eight: "The shorter reading is to be preferred. Corruption by addition is much more likely than corruption by omission."***

**This is clearly a case of devising a theory to fit the shorter Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts.** As with the other theories it has no real basis in fact. Regarding deliberate alteration, it is far easier to remove a word or passage and get away with it (for a while!), than to add material. And when there is no particular attempt to editorialize, constant copying will result in accidental omission far more often than accidental addition.

But apart from the omission of significant words and passages, the Modern Version Text is shorter in another kind of way. It is more terse and not as lucid as the Received Text. And here it betrays the secret that it is not the original text of the first century, but rather one that is altered and secondary.

In Biblical times there were two major kinds of Greek dialect: Classical or Attic (the dialect of Athens on the Attica Peninsula), and Hellenistic or Koine. Though terse and compact, Attic was considered the more "elegant" of the two. It was the language of the golden age of Greece, and was in vogue from about 480 to 323 B.C. After Alexander the Great, the more simple and explicit *Koine* (meaning common dialect) began to be spoken, and became the lingua franca of the eastern Mediterranean region until the fourth century A.D. when it was superseded by Byzantine Greek.

Importantly for us, Koine was the dialect of the New Testament. This is a remarkable evidence of God's providence. The Attic left too much to the imagination, whereas Koine with its greater fullness could be more precise. It was simple, lucid, plain, and full; yet without the affected pretense of the Attic.

As time passed there were attempts to return the Attic to its former place. The second century A.D. was known as the "century of Atticism" when many did revert back to the Attic brevity. And as it was an occasion for attack against the Scriptures that they were written in the less cultured Koine, a significant number of "Christian" scholars were caught up in this. As we might expect, signs point to Alexandria being the prime mover to bring the Scripture Text into line with the Attic dialect. The manuscripts associated with that locality, certainly beyond all others, favour the Attic-like terseness.

When Westcott and Hort convinced textual scholarship to revise the N.T. away from the Received Text and toward Vaticanus and Sinaiticus; the implications of Attic and Koine Greek were not fully understood. Classical brevity was to them an attraction. Subsequent research has shown how wrong they were: the shorter, not the longer, is the altered text!<sup>1</sup> (used by permission)

## Chapter 27: Quick Reference of Versions And Their Relation To Ancient Texts

First, you have already read some very excellent short reviews of this issue. The amount of literature on this subject is overwhelming to the average Christian (me) and hundreds of books have been written on the subject. You will find some of these listed in the “Recommended Reading” section. This chapter summarizes in brief:

1. The King James Version
2. Modern Versions
3. The Majority Text Position
4. Concluding Remarks—KJV advocate camps

### 1. The King James Version

The King James Version of the New Testament is translated from the Textus Receptus or “Received Text.” The Received Text is also called the Majority Text, Byzantine, Traditional Text, Antiochene or Syrian Text. The following are the critical facts concerning the Textus Receptus:

- ◆ **Textus Receptus** is based on the vast majority (90%) of the 5000+ Greek manuscripts in existence. That is why it is also called the **Majority Text**.
- ◆ **Textus Receptus** is not mutilated with deletions, additions and amendments, as is the Minority Text.
- ◆ **Textus Receptus** agrees with the earliest versions of the Bible: **The Waldensian** (AD 120 & onwards) **Peshitta** (AD150) **Old Latin Vulgate** (AD157), the **Italic Bible** (AD157) etc. These Bibles were produced some 200 years before the minority Egyptian codices favoured by the Roman Church. Remember this vital point. In addition we have these ancient versions: **The Gallic Bible** (Southern France) (AD177), **The Gothic Bible** (AD 330-350), **The Old Syriac Bible** (AD 400), **The Armenian Bible** (AD 400) There are **1244 copies** of this version still in existence, **The Palestinian Syriac** (AD 450), **The French Bible** of Oliveton (AD 1535), **The Czech Bible** (AD 1602), **The Italian Bible** of Diodati (AD 1606), **The Greek Orthodox Bible**--Used from Apostolic times to the present day by the Greek Orthodox Church. All the above mentioned Bibles and the vast majority (about 99%) of the **5200 extant New Testament MSS** are in agreement with the text now known as Textus Receptus; the Text which underlies the **Authorized King James Bible**.
- ◆ **Textus Receptus** agrees with the vast majority of the 86,000+ citations from scripture by the early church fathers.

- ◆ **Textus Receptus** is untainted with Egyptian philosophy and unbelief.
- ◆ **Textus Receptus** strongly upholds the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith: the creation account in Genesis, the divinity of Jesus Christ, the virgin birth, the Saviour's miracles, his bodily resurrection, his literal return and the cleansing power of his blood!
- ◆ **Textus Receptus** was - and still is - the enemy of the Roman Church. This is an important fact to bear in mind.<sup>1</sup>

Erasmus's Greek New Testament (1516), Robert Estienne (Stephanus) Greek NT (1546, 1549, 1550, and 1551), Theodore Beza, Greek NT (1604), Elzevirs' Textus Receptus (1633) are the source documents for Scrivener's Textus Receptus (1881) which is published today but is not contained in most modern computer programs. In addition, you may obtain a copy of the **Textus Receptus** in a 800 page paperback entitled **The Interlinear Greek-English N.T.** by Berry obtainable from: Eye Opener Publications, P.O. Box 7944, Eugene, Oregon 97401 U.S.A. This is the Textus Receptus from which the KJV was translated in 1611. Literal modern English words appear between the Greek lines and under each word, making it possible for anyone to make an accurate check of all Bibles versions. The KJV appears in the margins. Notice in how many ways modern translations vary from the Greek text.<sup>2</sup> The **over-over-overwhelming majority of evidence** goes to the **Majority text of the KJV.**

The King James Version of the Old Testament is translated from the Hebrew Masoretic (Text 600-700 AD) and edited by Daniel Bomberg/"First Rabbinic Bible (1516)," and the Ben Chayyim Masoretic text (1524-1525). The Biblia Hebraica by Rudolf Kittel published this text in 1906 and 1912. Kittel's later version in 1937 is from the corrupt Ben Asher Masoretic/Leningrad manuscript (1008).

A short study of our English Bibles is appropriate here. This will give you a skeleton overview. The following is an excellent overview from **David B. Loughran, Bible Versions Part One...File 2 of 7, Stewarton Bible School webpage, Stewarton, Scotland, <http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/sbs777/vital/kjv/index.html>.** This writer has edited the below to fit the context and format of this book.

**John Wycliffe's Translation** (1380-82). This was the first manuscript (hand-written) Bible in the English language. Strictly speaking, it was not a **version**, but a translation into English from the Old Latin Vulgate. Wycliffe, often described as the **'Morning Star of the Reformation,'** was an able Latin scholar. Alas! so hated was he for making Scripture available to the common man that some 44

years after his death his bones were dug up and burned, and his ashes cast into the river Swift.

**William Tyndale's New Testament** (1526) was the first printed Testament in the English language. Unlike Wycliffe's translation, Tyndale's New Testament was translated directly from the Greek **Majority Text**, from which came the Received Text - **Textus Receptus**. More about this Text later. Tyndale's work, in other words, was a '**version**.' The first printings of Tyndale's version were burned at St Paul's Cross (London). At that time it was a grievous offence, punishable by fine, imprisonment or death to even possess a copy of Tyndale's New Testament. It was said of William Tyndale that he was: "*A man so skilled in the seven languages, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, English and French, that which ever he spake, you would suppose it his native tongue.*" (Ref: E4)

He it was who said to the ignorant clerics of his day that he would '**cause the boy who driveth the plough to know more of the Scriptures than them.**' "*Before Tyndale's day the English versions of the Bible had been translations of a translation, being derived from the Vulgate or older Latin versions. Tyndale, for the first time, went back to the original Hebrew and Greek. And not only did he go back to the original languages seeking for the truth, but he embodied that truth when found in so noble a translation that it has ever since been deemed wise by scholars and revisers to make but a few changes in it; consequently every succeeding version is in reality little more than a revision of Tyndale's. It has been truly said that 'the peculiar genius which breathes through the English Bible, the mingled tenderness and majesty, the Saxon simplicity, the grandeur - unequalled, unapproached in the attempted improvements of modern scholars - all are here, and bear the impress of the mind of one man, and that man is **William Tyndale.**'*" (Ref: E5)

But alas! Tyndale was to suffer the wrath of blind ecclesiastical authority. He was burned at the stake! "*The martyr was first confined in the castle of Filford, about 20 miles from Antwerp. He was taken from prison on Friday, October 6<sup>th</sup> 1536, fastened to the stake, strangled, and his body burned to ashes. The fervent prayer of the martyr Tyndale, when bound to the stake, '**Lord, open the King of England's eyes,**' was about to be answered shortly.*" (Ref:A3)

**David Fuller** writes of Tyndale: "*In the Reformation period the Church of Rome sought to maintain its dominant position by*

*burning not only the copies of the bible, but also those who recognized the supreme authority of God's word. **Tyndale** was burned at the stake at Vilvorde outside Brussels in Belgium on August 6, (October according to some historians) 1536. His great offence was that he had translated the scriptures into English and was making copies available against the wishes of the Roman catholic hierarchy." (Ref:F3)*

**Miles Coverdale's Bible** (1535). This was the first complete Bible in the English language. Coverdale was not the scholar Tyndale was, for his translation relied heavily on Tyndale and Luther's German Bible. It was printed just one year before his friend Tyndale was martyred.

**Matthew's Bible** (1500-1555). This was the first Bible issued with the king's license. It was mostly taken from Tyndale's and Coverdale's work which had gone before. It was printed in Hamburg by the king's printer John Rogers and was dedicated to Henry VIII by Rogers under the name Thomas Matthew, hence its name.

**The Great Bible** (1539). This Bible was printed in large folio (15x9 inches) hence its name. It was printed in Paris and was mostly a revision of Tyndale's and Matthew's work which went before.

**The Geneva Version** (1560). During the reign of the Catholic Queen Mary many Protestant believers from Britain fled to the Continent. The Scot **John Knox** was one. The Geneva Bible is a true '**version**' having been translated from the original Hebrew and Greek throughout. *"A number of these intellectual pilgrims rendezvoused in Geneva (known as the Holy City of the Alps) to form the first committee to attempt a translation of the Bible. Such men as Theodore Beza, **John Knox**, William Whittingham and Miles Coverdale laboured six years to produce the celebrated **Geneva Bible** in 1560. Although this Bible was the first to feature numbered verses and italics, its main achievement was the Hebrew to English rendering of Ezra through Malachi, **thus representing the first English Bible translated entirely out of the original languages.**" (Ref: E6)*

*"The **Geneva Bible** was the first complete translation into English from the originals throughout. It was addressed to 'the brethren of England, **Scotland**, and Ireland,'... There were two Bibles at this time in general use in England. The Geneva Bible was*

*the more popular of the two, and was generally read in the household and in private study of the Word by the people. The Cranmer or Bishops' Bible was the one, however, which obtained most favour amongst the clergy and was read in the churches." (Ref: A4)*

**The Bishops' Bible (1568).** *"Archbishop Parker was the master mind in the preparation of this new edition of the Holy Scriptures, assisted by about 15 scholarly men. He distributed the 'Cranmer Bible' into parts, assigning portions to various learned bishops, the whole being subject to his own personal supervision. The large number of the revisers being from the Episcopal bench gave the name and character to this bible. It was printed in large size, and beautifully executed. It was adorned with numerous cuts; its notes were brief, and, like the 'Geneva Bible,' was divided into verses. It was used in the Churches for about 40 years. Various revised additions of the **Bishops' Bible** were published. Soon after the appearance of the **Authorised Version of 1611**, the Bishops' Bible - the last edition of which was published about five years before its noble successor - fell into general disuse..." (Ref:A5)*

#### References For Above

**A) .. STORY OF OUR ENGLISH BIBLE** by W Scott

A3 ... page 141

A4 ... page 153

A5 ... page 153

**E) .. FINAL AUTHORITY** by William P Grady. Grady

Publications: PO Box 506, Schererville, Indiana 46375. USA

E5 ... pages 161-162

E6 ... pages 139-140

E7 ... page 156

**F) .. WHICH BIBLE** by David Otis Fuller, D.D. published by The

Institute for Biblical Textual Studies. Grand Rapids, Michigan

49503. USA

F3 ... page 3

**The King James Version (1611) is the Real Word of God for our generation of English speaking people.** The Almighty has used it to further His work for almost 400 years.<sup>3</sup>

## **2. Modern Versions**

English Revised Version, New Century Version Bible, Good News Bible, New American Standard Version, American Standard Version, New International Version, New English Bible, Revised Standard Version, The Living Bible, Contemporary English Version and the New King James Version are translated from Critical Text (or Modern Text) based upon the Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament entitled *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. Their sources are derived from the corrupt Vaticanus (“B”) and Sinaiticus (“A”) MSS from Alexandria, Egypt and their some 43 allies. The text is published today in the many varied additions of the Nestles’ Greek New Testament and the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament.

Modern translations, however, mostly use an eclectic text, that conforms more often to codices of the Alexandrian text-type. “Eclectic” means the translators have the liberty to pick and choose from any old manuscript they wish. The Westcott and Hort’s principles often oppose each other and thus the translator must use “conjectural emendation” (that is let their imagination conjure up the true meaning—this is not a joke) and thus choose what best suits their interpretation.

The Old Testament underlying text in these modern versions is changed to the Ben Asher Masoretic/ Leningrad manuscript (1008). This text is published today as the "Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (1966).

## **3. The Majority Text Position**

The Majority Text position is, in my opinion, better named the “New” Majority Text. According to Wikipedia, “The Majority Text’ - has been produced by Zane C. Hodges and Arthur L. Farstad, although this text does not correspond to any one particular manuscript, their position states that the oldest and best attested text of the New Testament Documents would have had time to produce the greatest number of descendants resembling itself.”<sup>4</sup> Z. Hodges, A. Farstad, M. A. Robinson, W. G. Pierpont, Dr. Wilbur Pickering and others hold this view. They reject many of the Alexandrian manuscripts and the Westcott and Hort critical text but believe the Textus Receptus will be improved by the development of a new “Majority Text.” Today the Majority Text is published by The Greek NT according to the Majority Text by Z. Hodges and A. Farstad (1982) and The Greek NT according to Byzantine Text Form By M. A. Robinson & W. G. Pierpont (1991)

The New King James Version uses the “New” Majority Text in many instances. To be a “New” King James Version, the translators should have used the Textus Receptus as their foundation for the NKJV text. However and in addition, the NKJV translators in hundreds of cases used both the Critical Text of Westcott and Hort and the “New” Majority Text. Here are the notes

from the Preface to the New King James Version.

“The textual notes in the present edition of the New Testament make no evaluation of readings, but do clearly indicate the manuscript sources of readings. They objectively present facts without such tendentious remarks as “the best manuscripts omit” or “the most reliable manuscripts read.” Such notes are value judgments that differ according to varying viewpoints on the text. By giving a clearly defined set of variants the New King James Version benefits readers of all textual persuasions.

Where significant variations occur in the New Testament Greek manuscripts, textual notes are classified as follows:

1. NU-Text

These variations from the traditional text generally represent the Alexandrian or Egyptian type of text described previously in “The New Testament Text.” They are found in the Critical Text published in the twenty-seventh edition of the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament (N) and in the United Bible Societies’ fourth edition (U), hence the acronym, “NU-Text.”

2. M-Text

This symbol indicates points of variation in the Majority Text from the traditional text, as also previously discussed in “The New Testament Text.” It should be noted that M stands for whatever reading is printed in the published *Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*, whether supported by overwhelming, strong, or only a divided majority textual tradition.”<sup>5</sup>

Note, the reference note “M” in the New King James Version indicates the usage of the “New” Majority Text as published in The Greek NT according to the Majority Text by Z. Hodges and A. Farstad (1982). The NJKV Majority Text references vary from the KJV Textus Receptus in over 500 places.

David W. Daniels with Chick Publications (a great soul winning organization) and the author of The King James Bible Companion (I carry one in my Bible cover) and Answers to Your Bible Version Questions has done his research and provides us with some excellent insight and information.<sup>6</sup>

The Majority Text, or MT. With a name like **Majority Text** it *should* be a compilation of the **majority** of Greek New Testament manuscripts. **But it is not**. The “Majority Text” is actually a hand-

picked set of manuscripts grouped together (collated) by “pro-Alexandrian” liberal Hermann von Soden.<sup>2</sup> Less than **8%** of the over 5,000 Greek manuscripts were compared to each other by von Soden’s team of collators!

But the NKJV people give the MT great prominence, writing this inaccurate information in the footnotes. So people **think** that the King James is wrong, since it disagrees with "the Majority Text." Who cares? The "Majority Text" is **not** the majority of texts! The "Majority Text" is a **big fake**. Don't believe it. And don't trust any Bible that does.

**If It Looks Like a Duck and Talks Like a Duck...**

There is another side to the New King James that reveals its ugly alliances. Take a look at these examples:

Verse	King James	NKJV	Perversions agreeing with
Acts 3:26	God, having raised up his <b>Son</b>	His <b>Servant</b>	NIV, NASV, ASV, RSV, Roman Catholic New American Bible (NAB), etc.
Acts 17:22	I perceive that in all things ye are <b>too superstitious.</b>	<b>very religious</b>	NIV, NASV, ASV, RSV, Catholic NAB, etc.
Romans 1:25	Who <b>changed</b> the truth of God <b>into</b> a lie	who <b>exchanged</b> the truth of God <b>for</b> the lie	NIV, NASV, ASV, RSV, Catholic NAB, etc.
1 Corinthians 1:18	For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are <b>saved</b> it is the power of God.	who are <b>being saved</b> [This teaches the Roman Catholic lie that salvation is a process.]	NIV, NASV, NASU, RSV, Catholic NAB, etc.

**In most places where the NKJV disagrees with the King James Bible, it agrees with the Alexandrian perversions,** whether Protestant like the NIV, NASV, RSV, ASV, etc., or Roman Catholic like the New American Bible.

The King James Bible is God's preserved words in English. The NKJV is just man's **most subtle perversion** of God's words. Don't be deceived. Insist on the King James Bible, not "New" King James, "Modern" King James, King James "2" or "21" or "Millennium." Even though it is very **similar** to a King James Bible, it is **not** a King James Bible. Insist on the one you can stake your faith on, the genuine King James Bible. And God will bless you.

<sup>2</sup> Von Soden never *claimed* the texts collated by his team were a "majority" of texts. The book *Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text* by Zane Hodges and Arthur Farstad (1982) used mostly von Soden's work and suddenly called it by a new term: "Majority Text." (Note: NKJV publisher Thomas Nelson also published their book.)

David Cloud, by way of e-mail from Kirk DiVietro, Pastor of Grace Baptist Church in Franklin, Massachusetts, documents the intent the New King James Version to become a bridge to the modern versions.<sup>7</sup>

The "New" Majority Text position does not believe that God has preserved His word to all generations as He promised He would do. These men make the same mistakes as the whole host of critical text translators and supporters of the Alexandrian texts. It is strange that several of the "New" Majority Text proponents, after rejecting the corrupt Alexandrian manuscripts, climbed on board with the NKJV editors and produced a Bible that used both the Critical Text from the Alexandrian manuscripts and the "New" Majority Text. These are really "strange bedfellows." A close examination of the NKJV reveals the "New" Majority Text corruption. To cover all the issues would take another book that this writer is not qualified to write. There are a number of sound and qualified men that have weighed in opposition to the NKJV and yes, this writer does hit a couple of low points of the NKJV in upcoming chapters. This NKJV "bridge" version is very confusing. Again, the NKJV only partially uses the KJV Textus Receptus as its underlying Greek and thus using "King James" in their name is a lie. We repeat, the NKJV contains many of the same foul readings as the other modern versions because the NKJV uses the same rotten Critical Text in many places. Warning! Stay away from the NKJV "bridge" and the Majority Text position and their future versions. The true Majority Text is the Textus Receptus

which produced the KJV which in turn, has had over 800,000,000 copies published to date.

#### **4. Concluding Remarks—KJV advocate camps**

There are several camps that support the KJV as the best English version. All of these camps believe in the verbal plenary inspiration of scripture. However, the amount of disagreement between these camps is unbelievable. In my mind these camps can be broken down in the following manner.

- ◆ Those who believe the KJV is the preserved, infallible, and inerrant word of God and nothing needs to be added or subtracted and thus we hold the inspired word of God in the KJV. In addition, those in this camp believe the KJV Bible to be the totally authoritative. This camp sees no reason for any improvement to the KJV because the KJV is perfect now. Any and all so called “corrections” and re-writings move in the wrong direction. **This writer agrees with this position.**
- ◆ Those who believe the KJV was re-inspired by God using the KJV translators and thus the KJV is preserved, infallible, inerrant word of God and nothing needs to be added or subtracted. This camp sees no reason for any improvement to the KJV.
- ◆ Those who believe the KJV is the preserved word of God and is the best, but they believe there are minor errors contained therein. However, the KJV is the book that God blesses and is the closest thing we have. In their view, any errors are so minor as not worth correcting.
- ◆ Those who believe the KJV is the preserved word of God and is the best. However, they believe there are minor errors contained therein. They also believe these errors can be corrected with the development of the “New” Majority Text.

Writer’s final note for this chapter: **The KJV is all you need.**

## **Chapter 28: Q And A—Answers To The Perverted Translations, Their Positions and KJV Critics—Questions 1 to 8**

This chapter anticipates some questions that should be asked or could be asked by anyone who wishes to know the truth about these new versions. These questions have been answered as briefly as possible without any (well, maybe some) fanfare. They cut to the heart of the matter. Also, these as a general rule, point to material already covered and the points established herein. Many of these questions have been developed to be just plain combative to these new translations.

However, there are a few new concepts here. These are inserted to whet your mind and to provoke you to continue to study this very important subject. The battle for the true Bible is, again, the most important issue facing our country in this generation and the church today.

**Question 1:** Is there any chance you could be wrong about your view?

**Answer:** None. We have weighed the evidence. We show perversions and subversions in the following areas:

- ◆ The corruption of the translation of the very words of God
- ◆ The internal doctrinal perversion caused by mistranslation can be found without exception in every modern version
- ◆ The perversion of the simple message of salvation

**Question 2:** What about the discord that those who advocate for the KJV have sown in literally hundreds of churches where this controversy has caused problems?

**Answer:** This is funny! It is like the old saying, “The pot calling the kettle black.” Or it is like old Ahab saying to Elijah, “Art thou he that troubleth Israel?” These new version promoters expect good Christian folk to roll over, play dead, and not object when these modernized saints and apostates bring these perverted and subverted versions with their damnable heresies into our homes and churches and try to cram them down our throats in the name of Christian unity. If you are to compromise on this point, you can be assured that you will make God mad, because He has already declared and written His curse on those who add or remove even one word from His book! Our God is God and He changes not!

**Question 3:** How do you justify staying with the KJV when it has all of those archaic words and is so very difficult to read?

**Answer:** I imagine you are talking about the simple singular words--“thee, thou, and thine” and the plural word “ye” which are replaced by the simple “you” in the new modern translations. These old words are, yes, somewhat

archaic. However, the use of "thee, thou, thine and ye" was not found in the course of normal language during 1611 either. In the original introduction of the 1611 King James Bible, you will not find the use of "thee, thou, thine, and ye". A little homework will verify this if you will do the work.

Notice also that "thou" takes various forms depending on its grammatical usage:

- ◆ **Thou-** as sentence subject: "**Thou** art the man."
- ◆ **Thee-** as sentence object: "He shall give his angels charge concerning **thee**: and in *their* hands they shall bear **thee** up."
- ◆ **Thy-** possessive form (as an adjective): "After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be **thy** name."
- ◆ **Thine-** possessive form (as object or recipient of the possession): "**Thine** is the glory."

The 1611 King James Bible translators translated the Bible "literally" and thus used the "formal equivalence" method of translation. We have already defined this method of translation as an "attempt to translate by keeping as close as possible to the exact words and phrasing in the original language..." or, insomuch as possible, hold to an accurate, word-for-word translation of the Hebrew and Greek texts.

In our time and at the time of the writing of the KJV, the one-word "you" is used for both the singular and plural. The Greek and Hebrew languages contain a different word for the second person singular and the second person plural pronouns. Words that begin with "t" (thou, thy, thine) are singular, and words that begin with "y" (you and ye) are plural. Note the following verse:

 **John 3:7 (KJV)** <sup>7</sup>Marvel not that I said unto **thee**, **Ye** must be born again.

Jesus is talking to old Nicodemus above. The statement is directed specifically to Nicodemus where Jesus said, "I said unto **thee**," (**singular**). However, the statement applies to all in, "**Ye** must be born again" (**plural**). The exact accuracy and the divine doctrinal perfection of the KJV Bible are found in this little verse that is written to the entire world.

Verb forms & endings in the Greek and Hebrew will vary depending on usage. Thus, in the KJV, we have the exact and precise biblical endings not found in the modern versions. Note the following examples of verb inflection. These verb inflections such as "est" and "eth" make a difference in the following manner:

- ◆ **The first person—the one who speaks**
- ◆ **The second person—the one spoken too**
- ◆ **The third person—the one spoken about**

**Example: the first person—*John 9:38 (KJV)*** <sup>38</sup>And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him.

**Example: the second person—*John 1:50 (KJV)*** <sup>50</sup>Jesus answered and said unto him, Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig tree, **believest thou?** thou shalt see greater things than these. thou shalt see greater things than these.

**Example: the third person—*John 3:36 (KJV)*** <sup>36</sup>**He that believeth** on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

In addition *The Dean Burgon Society* makes the following excellent observation that fits here. “We could attempt to replace the "eth" verb endings in the AV with a present tense or perhaps a past, but would find that the "eth" (historical present) is not adequately translated by either.”<sup>1</sup>

The Hebrew and the Greek languages make the distinction between these seemingly minor nuances of the above pronouns and in a host verb inflections. There should be no doubt in your mind. **All of these little nuances have super significant doctrinal implications. Minor variations destroy the word of God and it then becomes the word of some man’s interpretation.**

In every argument put forth by the advocates of these new versions, they claim an easier to read version. It is a misnomer and an lie that these new versions are easier to read.

In the excellent book "New Age Bible Versions", on page 196, G.A. Riplinger gives us the Flesch-Kincaid readability results of various 'Bibles'. In her first analysis, she compares the average grade level required to read the first chapter of the first and last books of both the Old and New Testaments. G.A. Riplinger on her website states, “Modern testing using the Flesch-Kincaid research company's computerized 'Grade Level Indicator' verifies that only the KJV Bible progressively builds in understanding from Genesis to Revelation, and maintains the easiest reading level.”

Some churches use the KJV in their adult classes and these “simpler” versions for their children's and youth classes. The KJV as stated by Riplinger above, **“progressively builds in understanding from Genesis to Revelation, and maintains the easiest reading level.” Riplinger in the book *In Awe of Thy Word* documents the KJV building blocks to understanding.** For children or adults, the KJV stands alone as the best tool to impart learning, knowledge and understanding. Get Riplinger’s book *In Awe of Thy Word*.<sup>2</sup>

See the following table from New Age Bible Versions:

Book of the Bible	KJV Grade Level	NIV Grade Level	NASB Grade Level	TEV Grade Level	NKJV Grade Level
Gen. 1	4.4	5.1	4.7	5.1	5.2
Mal. 1	4.6	4.8	5.1	5.4	4.6
Matt. 1	6.7	16.4	6.8	11.8	10.3
Rev. 1	7.5	7.1	7.7	6.4	7.7
Grade Level Average	5.8	8.4	6.1	7.2	6.9

Think of this. The headline advertisements of these new versions always promote their ease of reading as their main selling point. Riplinger has now completely destroyed the reason for their existence. Yet, many churches continue to use them. Copyright laws require substantial changes to get a new copyright. The easy words were used first in the KJV and with each new version the readability will be more difficult. Look at the popular NIV reading levels above and compare those to the KJV above.

**Question 4:** Why do all other versions compare themselves to the KJV?

**Answer:** The KJV is accurate, God honored, and time tested. It has been, without any doubt, used of God more than any Bible since New Testament times and in the history of Christianity. It is also the most published book in the history of mankind. It is still the most read, most studied, most memorized, and most quoted book used today. It is the standard and the other books are out to say they have met the standard and improved. It is not so.

In addition, the KJV is the only Authorized Version and the only version in wide use that does not submit to copyright laws. Some KJV Bibles with notes have been copyrighted and fall under the scrutiny of copyright laws. However, the copyright applies to the notes and not to the Bible text.

God in His divine providence has not allowed His Word to be bound. Look at what Paul writes to Timothy.

 **2 Timothy 2:9 (KJV)** <sup>9</sup>Wherein I suffer trouble, as an evil doer, *even* unto bonds; but the word of God is not bound.

Copyrights bind the Word of God. If there were no other reason for believing the KJV is the real Bible for English speaking people, the non-

binding effect of no copyrights on the KJV is enough for any man to believe that the KJV is the very word of God. God is not and can not be bound. Would we expect any less of His true word? Again, God is not and can not be bound; neither would the true word of God. The KJV is truly the Book of public domain.

**Question 5:** The new versions claim they are doctrinally correct. Is that true?

**Answer:** No. We have set forth the doctrinal problems in these new versions in 14 critical issues in their dealings with the verse John 3:16. See **Section II, Chapters 9 to 22** for a more complete analysis. In addition, this poor feeble writer could write a book on each of the following topics:

- ◆ **New Bible Versions and their Perverted Attack on the Deity of Christ**
- ◆ **New Bible Versions and their Perverted Attack on the Doctrine of Salvation**
- ◆ **New Bible Versions and their Perverted Attack on the Godly Living**
- ◆ **New Bible Versions and their Perverted Promotion of Catholic Dogma**
- ◆ **New Bible Versions and their Perverted Attack on the Incarnation of Christ—no never mind— that is covered herein.**

Let me recommend *One Book Stands Alone* by Dr. Douglas D. Stauffer published by McCowen Mills Publishers, Millbrook, Alabama. Dr. Stauffer compares the KJV to other versions (mostly the NIV) and briefly explains the doctrinal errors of these new perverted translations. Dr. Stauffer brought home to me the reality that “every change in these new translations is wrong and leads the reader in the wrong direction and away from the truth.” The quotes are mine and not those of Dr. Stauffer.

**Question 6:** What versions do most commentators and writers quote?

**Answer:** That is a good question. Reader, you have been set up by the writer. It is the KJV, of course. However, here are a couple of points that need to be made.

First, some contemporary writers are so schizophrenic that they cannot quote from a single version. They quote from multiple versions that fit their taste for any specific passage. How confusing that would be to a lost person. If salvation comes through the word of God, (and we have already given the verses that clearly declare salvation does come through the word of God), then how many versions would the lost person have to read and understand before they could come to know the Lord? This makes absolutely no spiritual sense. The KJV made the difference in my life and millions before. The KJV is the Bible of the age of revivals. It has worked in the past.

It works today. And it will work in the future.

Second, the Bible version controversy (caused by the KJV translators, no doubt) has become so heated that many of these so called scholars and book writers do not even quote any version in their books. They will give the referenced passage and make their points without ever referring to any exact wording from the blessed word of God. This is a shame and a sham. These authors demonstrate what they will not admit. They, by their actions, of not quoting the true word of God, elevate themselves to individual interpreters of the word of God and thus make their words equal with Gods' words. Think about it!

The Word of God is alive! The Word of God itself says in *Hebrews 4:12 (KJV)* **“<sup>12</sup>For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.”** There is nothing that this book can say that will have any everlasting effect unless it points you to the Bible in its proper context. The verses quoted herein are what counts and not the pitiful words and efforts of this writer.

**Question 7:** Are the new versions, that quote John 3:16 and “only begotten” correctly, true to the word of God?

**Answer:** Another good test verse (however, just one of many) is Colossians 1:14. Look at he KJV and compare them to the ASV and NASB. The ASV and NASB correctly translate John 3:16. Note below, where the ASV and NASB leave out **“through his blood.”** This is the same type of heresy that is found in John 3:16 and thus these versions are no better than these other versions which corrupt John 3:16.

📖 *Colossians 1:14 (KJV)* <sup>14</sup>In whom we have redemption **through his blood**, *even* the forgiveness of sins:

📖 *Col 1:14 (ASV)* in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins:

📖 *Col 1:14 (NASB)* in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins.

Down at my house on a bookshelf in a little office in the basement, there is an old *Black Heritage Edition* of a KJV Bible. Isaiah 1:18 is illustrated in fine fashion. *Isaiah 1:18 (KJV)* says **“<sup>18</sup>Come now, and let us reason together, saith the LORD: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.”**

There is a page on the left side of the Bible written in red. It is

covered multiple times with the word “sin.” Isaiah 1:18 is written in light gray and intermingled with the word “sin” and the verse is unrecognizable. On the right side, the next sheet of the Bible is a red tinted transparent cellophane or plastic sheet. When you cover the “sin” page with the red cellophane and look through the red cellophane, the “sin” turns white as snow. Isaiah 1:18 is then readily recognizable and plain to read.

Yes, the blood of Jesus will turn our sins as white as snow. And yes, the old song says, “nothing but the blood.” You may want a Bible that removes the blood of Jesus, but I do not.

Again, as you are aware or should be aware, removing the little phrase **“through his blood”** is every bit as critical to the word of God as “only begotten.” And it would be very easy to write a sister book to this one with the same Biblical arguments in an almost duplicate point-by-point format of the doctrinal problems of the leaving out the phrase, **“through his blood”**.

Let me make it plain. In spite all of the denials of all of these new versions and their translators, they make their changes based on the corrupt Westcott and Hort Greek texts or one of their derivatives. These new versions are apostate and reprobate. The well is bad. And as my former Pastor, Roy Yelton used to say, “what is in the well will come up in the bucket.” The very water of life had been poisoned in these new wells and is unfit to drink.

**Question 8:** What about the NKJV? The critical texts you have mentioned seem to be correct in the NKJV. Is it all right?

**Answer:** It is no better than the other new versions and we will rely on James L. Melton for our answer. He very aptly puts the NKJV on the trash heap with the rest of these new versions.

**James L. Melton is the pastor of Bible Baptist Church at 315 S. Lindell Street in Martin, Tennessee. Bro. Melton had been saved since May 3, 1979, had been actively teaching and preaching since the late 1980's. He began writing gospel tracts in the early 1990's. Pastor Melton has authored a treasure house of tracts, books, and sermons covering a wide array of Christian issues. You can glean a wealth of excellent information at Pastor Melton's *Bible Baptist Publications* website.**

### **The NKJV: A Deadly Translation By James L. Melton<sup>3</sup>**

We will now give some special attention to one of the deadliest translations on the market--the *New King James Version*, first published in 1979. It is a deadly version because its editors have succeeded in deceiving the body of Christ on two main points: (1) That it's a King James Bible (which is a lie), and (2) that it's based on the Textus Receptus (which is only a partial truth). The following

---

information should be helpful when dealing with Christians who have been swindled by the Laodicean lovers of filthy lucre:

1. The text of the NKJV is copyrighted by Thomas Nelson Publishers, while there is no copyright today on the text of the KJV. If your KJV has maps or notes, then it may have a copyright, but the text itself does not.
2. There's nothing "new" about the NKJV logo. It is a "666" symbol of the *pagan* trinity which was used in the ancient Egyptian mysteries. It was also used by satanist Aleister Crowley around the turn of this century. The symbol can be seen on the New King James Bible, on certain rock albums (like Led Zeppelin's), or you can see it on the cover of such New Age books as *The Aquarian Conspiracy*. (See Riplinger's tract on the NKJV.)
3. It is estimated that the NKJV makes over 100,000 translation changes, which comes to *over eighty changes per page and about three changes per verse!* A great number of these changes bring the NKJV in line with the readings of such Alexandrian perversions as the NIV and the RSV. Where changes are not made in the text, subtle footnotes often give credence to the Westcott and Hort Greek Text.
4. While passing off as being true to the Textus Receptus, the NKJV IGNORES the Receptus over 1,200 times.
5. In the NKJV, there are 22 omissions of "hell", 23 omissions of "blood", 44 omissions of "repent", 50 omissions of "heaven", 51 omissions of "God", and 66 omissions of "Lord". The terms "devils", "damnation", "JEHOVAH", and "new testament" are completely omitted.
6. The NKJV demotes the Lord Jesus Christ. In John 1:3, the KJV says that all things were made "by" Jesus Christ, but in the NKJV, all things were just made "through" Him. The word "Servant" replaces "Son" in Acts 3:13 and 3:26. "Servant" replaces "child" in Acts 4:27 and 4:30. The word "Jesus" is omitted from Mark 2:15, Hebrews 4:8, and Acts 7:45.
7. The NKJV confuses people about salvation. In Hebrews 10:14 it replaces "are sanctified" with "are being sanctified", and it replaces "are saved" with "are being saved" in I Corinthians 1:18 and II

Corinthians 2:15. The words "may believe" have been replaced with "may continue to believe" in I John 5:13. The old straight and "narrow" way of Matthew 7:14 has become the "difficult" way in the NKJV.

8. In II Corinthians 10:5 the KJV reads "casting down imaginations", but the NKJV reads "casting down arguments". The word "thought", which occurs later in the verse, matches "imaginations", not "arguments". This change weakens the verse.

9. The KJV tells us to reject a "heretick" after the second admonition in Titus 3:10. The NKJV tells us to reject a "divisive man". *How nice! Now the Alexandrians and Ecumenicals have justification for rejecting anyone they wish to label as "divisive men".*

10. According to the NKJV, no one would stoop so low as to "corrupt" God's word. No, they just "peddle" it (II Cor. 2:17). The reading matches the Alexandrian versions.

11. Since the NKJV has "changed the truth of God into a lie", it has also changed Romans 1:25 to read "exchanged the truth of God for the lie". This reading matches the readings of the new perversions, so *how say ye it's a King James Bible?*

12. The NKJV gives us no command to "study" God's word in II Timothy 2:15.

13. The word "science" is replaced with "knowledge" in I Timothy 6:20, although "science" has occurred in every edition of the KJV since 1611! *How say ye it's a King James Bible?*

14. The Jews "require" a sign, according to I Corinthians 1:22 (and according to Jesus Christ - John 4:48), but the NKJV says they only "request" a sign. *They didn't "request" one when signs first appeared in Exodus 4*, and there are numerous places throughout the Bible where God gives Israel signs when they haven't requested anything (Exo. 4, Exo. 31:13, Num. 26:10, I Sam. 2:34, Isa. 7:10-14, Luke 2:12, etc). They "require" a sign, because signs are a part of their national heritage.

15. The King James reading in II Corinthians 5:17 says that if any man is in Christ he is a new "creature", which matches the words of

Christ in Mark 16:15. The cross reference is destroyed in the NKJV, which uses the word "creation."

16. As a final note, we'd like to point out how the NKJV is very inconsistent in it's attempt to update the language of the KJV. The preface to the NKJV states that previous "revisions" of the KJV have "sought to keep abreast of changes in English speech", and also that they too are taking a "further step toward this objective". However, when taking a closer look at the language of the NKJV, we find that oftentimes they are stepping BACKWARDS! Please note a few examples of how well the NKJV has "kept abreast of the changes in the English language": See Chart. (used by permission)

SCRIPTURE	KJV	NKJV
<b>Ezra 31:4</b>	little rivers	rivulets
<b>Psalms 43:1</b>	Judge	Vindicate
<b>Psalms 139:23</b>	thoughts	anxieties
<b>Isaiah 28:1</b>	fat	verdant
<b>Amos 5:21</b>	smell	savor
<b>Matthew 26:7</b>	box	flask
<b>Luke 8:31</b>	the deep	the abyss
<b>John 10:41</b>	did	performed
<b>Luke 19:11-27</b>	pounds	minas
<b>John 19:9</b>	judgement hall	Praetorium
<b>Acts 1:18</b>	bowels	entrails
<b>Acts 18:12</b>	deputy	proconsul
<b>Acts 21:38</b>	uproar	insurrection
<b>Acts 27:30</b>	boat	skiff
<b>Hebrews 12:8</b>	bastard	illegitimate

## Chapter 29: Q And A— Answers To The Perverted Translations, Their Positions and KJV Critics—Questions 9 to 17

This chapter anticipates more questions that should be asked or could be asked by anyone who wishes to know the truth about these new versions.

**Question 9:** The KJV advocates are accused of continually charting the KJV in side-by-side formats against these other versions? What is the point?

**Answer:** You will note that there is limited use of side-by-side charts in this book because they did not fit our format and writing style. However, side-by-sides are an excellent tool for quick reference study. Many of these charts deal devastating back-to-back blows in a straight forward punching format that quickly floors these new translations.

To the casual reader and even many well-schooled Bible students, a small subtle change, in a few places, in a single reading, may not seem to be that bad. And of course, the devil or one of his little imps looking across your shoulder is telling you that you are too ignorant to read and understand the KJV. The side-by-side charts can show patterns of variations and deviations that lead to the same damnable doctrinal heresies this writer has been dealing with. Also, the devil and his advocates for these corrupt Bibles hate it when you use a Bible method (“comparing spiritual things with spiritual” as previously discussed) for your Bible study. Those who use charts in refuting these new versions will be rewarded by the Lord Himself for their labors. You and I need to commend them.

 **1 Corinthians 2:13 (KJV)** <sup>13</sup>Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; **comparing** spiritual things with spiritual.

These new version advocates hate for you to compare. It does not take long in these side-by-side formats for anyone and everyone to know the true colors of these new perversions of versions.

**Question 10:** Are there really some words missing from some Bibles?

**Answer:** *The Dean Burgon Society* gives us the following statistics. These have been reformatted for ease of reference.

The New Testament contains 27 Books, 260 Chapters, 7,957 Verses and 180,751 Words. The Old Testament contains 39 Books, 929 Chapters, 23,144 Verses and 610,577 Words. The entire Bible contains 66 Books, 1,189 Chapters, 31,101 Verses and 791,328 Words.

Also, the *Hope of Israel Baptist Mission* gives us some valuable help here. The following information and chart was copied from their website at:

[http://www.hopeofisrael.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=25&Itemid=35](http://www.hopeofisrael.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=25&Itemid=35).

Evangelist Bro. K. Daniel Fried is a converted Jew from an orthodox family and directs the ministries of *Hope of Israel Baptist Mission*. They stand firmly and correctly as a "King James Bible Believing, Pre-Millennial, and Separated ministry." *Hope of Israel Baptist Mission* seeks to evangelize the "apple of God's eye," reaching out to over 14 million Jews worldwide. They are a local-church minded ministry seeking to establish solid local churches in Jewish populated areas. (used by permission.)

### Verses Deleted In Modern Bible Versions

Most people believe the new versions are just "harmless" updating of words and made easier to understand. Nothing could be further from the Truth! Jesus Christ, in Luke 8:11-12, tells the parable of the sower and the seed: "Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God. . . then cometh the devil, and TAKETH AWAY the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved." Luke 8:11-12

The new versions "take away" complete verses from the words of God. And as with Eve (see Genesis 3:1), it is all done very subtly. The average reader would never know it happened! See the Chart for these deletions. The *New King James Version* (NKJV) referenced is the #401, *Thomas Nelson Publishers*, 1979, 1980, 1982, with footnotes.<sup>4</sup>

The NIV deletes over 64,000 words including words like mercyseat, Jehovah, and Godhead, Calvary, Lucifer, new testament, regeneration, etc. In I John 5:7, the NIV deletes "For there are three that testify:" and reads almost exactly like the Jehovah's Witness rendering that says "For there are three witness bearers,". The KJV states "For there are three that bear record in heaven, **the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.**"

This is one of the greatest verses testifying of the trinity. The Jehovah's Witnesses believe that Jesus is "a god" and thus despise the doctrine of the Trinity. And yes, you can find plenty of books that have been written on the manuscript evidence that supports inclusion of 1 John 5:7. 1 John 5:7 is commonly called the "Johnnine Comma" in the Bible. Reader, do you believe in the trinity of God? If so, then this deletion should offend you. These subversive translators are playing around with the Bible and it is sick.

Verses "Taken Away" in the New Testament

T = Taken Away				F = Taken Away in Footnote			
VERSE	NIV	NASV	NKJV	RSV	NRSV	NCV	LIV
<b>Matt 12:47</b>	F			T	F		
<b>Matt 17:21</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	F
<b>Matt 18:11</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	F
<b>Matt 21:44</b>	F			T	F	F	
<b>Matt 23:14</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	
<b>Mark 7:16</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	T
<b>Mark 9:44</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	T
<b>Mark 9:46</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	T
<b>Mark 11:26</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	T
<b>Mark 15:28</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	F
<b>Mark 16:9-20</b>	F	F	F	T	F	F	F
<b>Luke 17:36</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	
<b>Luke 22:43</b>	F	F	F	T	F		
<b>Luke 22:44</b>	F	F	F	T	F		
<b>Luke 23:17</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	T
<b>Luke 24:12</b>		F		T	F		
<b>Luke 24:40</b>		T		T	F		
<b>John 5:4</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	F
<b>John 7:53 -</b>	F	F		T	F	F	F
<b>Acts 8:37</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	F
<b>Acts 15:34</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	T
<b>Acts 24:7</b>	T	T		T	T	T	
<b>Acts 28:29</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	T
<b>Rom. 16:24</b>	T	T	F	T	T	T	
<b>2 Cor. 13:14</b>					T		
<b>James 1:8</b>				T	T		

**Question 11:** What about the errors in the KJV?

**Answer:** There are none. There are, however, to the unsaved novice, many seemingly apparent errors and seemingly apparent contradictions in the Bible. Dr. Peter S. Ruckman (in an old fashioned fire and brimstone style) buries the KJV critics in his very fine book *The Errors In The King James Bible*. The book, in the very aggressive and adversarial tone that is certainly needed, deals with over 400 hundred of these so-called errors and gives Biblical solutions. It is no wonder Dr. Ruckman gives so many people indigestion when they have to swallow their own words, and many times swallow the very words of God.

When you do not believe the Bible, then you are blinded and cannot discern the truth. A man that is at odds with the written word of God is at odds with the Living Word of God—the Lord Jesus Christ. When you stand opposed to the word of God, you are the one in error.

**Question 12:** Why do we have all of these new versions?

**Answer:** The Bible market is big business and there are a host of moneychangers in the temple and the marketplace. Every time a new version makes a hit, it is a multi-million dollar business. This should be obvious. Many of the people who own these publishers are as corrupt as the moneychangers in the temple. And yes, the Lord Jesus will overturn their tables in His due time.

As more versions come out, the quality in each perversion has to decrease. Each new copyrighted version has to make substantial changes to justify the new copyright. This requires more words and more synonyms for each version. The good words are used up. You now have, in many new versions, a substantial number of words that no one is familiar with. Thus, the reading becomes more difficult. This is the exact opposite of these new versions “easy-to-read” advertisements.

**Question 13:** What about versions in other languages?

**Answer:** G.A. Riplinger and many others call the real Bibles “pure Bibles.” And yes, God has preserved his word through the Masoretic text (Old Testament) and the Textus Receptus (New Testament). And yes, God in His divine providence has provided for pure translations in various languages throughout the world.

 **Romans 10:13 through Romans 10:18 (KJV)** <sup>13</sup>For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. <sup>14</sup>How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? <sup>15</sup>And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is

written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things! <sup>16</sup>But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? <sup>17</sup>So then faith *cometh* by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. <sup>18</sup>But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth, **and their words unto the ends of the world.**

 **Romans 16:25 through Romans 16:27 (KJV)** <sup>25</sup>Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, <sup>26</sup>**But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith:** <sup>27</sup>To God only wise, *be* glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen.

 **Acts 13:45 through Acts 13:47 (KJV)** <sup>45</sup>But when the Jews saw the multitudes, they were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming. <sup>46</sup>Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary that the **word of God** should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. <sup>47</sup>For so hath the Lord commanded us, *saying*, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou **shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth.**

**Question 14:** Could there be a new pure version?

**Answer:** *The Sword of the Lord*, an evangelistic organization and publishing agency, says in their doctrinal statement—“**WE BELIEVE** the Bible, the Scriptures of the Old Testament and the New Testament, preserved for us in the Masoretic text (Old Testament) and Textus Receptus (New Testament) and in the King James Bible, is verbally and plenary inspired of God. It is the inspired, inerrant, infallible, and altogether authentic, accurate and authoritative Word of God, therefore the supreme and final authority in all things.” That is exactly right.

The original texts mentioned above could be used to develop a more modern up to date Bible. However, in order to retain the divine accuracy, then we would be right back to the "thee, thou, thine, and ye," pronouns and the "eth and "est" endings. See the answer to Question 3 in the previous chapter. Dr. Ruckman says there is only one archaic word for 7,800 words in common usage in the Bible. A new version would require so very little change, that there would be no point.

The publishers want something new and would corrupt any revision process. In addition, where are the scholars that are comparable to the KJV

translators? And where can we find, in this day, men that would dedicate the time who do not have their own religious ax to grind? Then, the publishers would want to bind their new Bible with their copyright. And then, we would lose the great tradition and heritage that abounds with the KJV. Why would we want to even consider such a thing? The KJV has been a solidifying force holding our culture and language together. In my opinion, the KJV will stand as the God ordained and authorized version for the English speaking people until the Lord returns.

**Question 15:** Why did you write this book and what qualifications do you have?

**Answer:** Mark 12:37 (KJV) “<sup>37</sup>David therefore himself calleth him Lord; and whence is he *then* his son? And the common people heard him gladly.” My only hope of eternal life is what the Lord Jesus Christ did for me on Calvary. My trust lies in His work on the cross, His shed blood, and His righteousness as imputed to all who believe as stated in His Holy Word. I am one of the very common people. However, I believe the Bible and am thoroughly persuaded that the KJV is right. The battle of the Bible versions is the battle of our time for the true Christian. After thought and prayer, I felt that the Lord Himself would be pleased if I weighed in on this battle. And yes, God has always used the common man and certainly there is certainly none more common than myself. And if only a few copies are self-published, my family has been left a testimony, a warning and an admonition concerning the most important topic and Christian battle of this age.

The stakes are too high. The souls of men are perishing and the word of God is their hope. These perverted and subverted versions are not the word of God. May each of us pick up the Sword of the Lord and march into battle.

**Question 16:** Could you not use lexicons to do your own check to the original languages?

**Answer:** You need to know that almost every one of these Greek and Hebrew dictionaries are tainted. G.A. Riplinger in a pure Q and A advertisement at **A.V. Publications Corp** on line says this,

How often have you heard a Bible teacher say, "The word here actually means," only to have him unknowingly parrot new version readings — all because he is unfamiliar with the corruption which has affected his Greek and Hebrew reference books (Strongs, Vines, Thayer, Gesenius, Brown, Driver, Briggs, Liddell and Scott, etc.)?"

**And now for her answer:** “**Language and Lexicons**—G.A. Riplinger (Audio tape 2 hours)—Covers the 'Roots of the language of the new versions and the corruption of current texts, lexicons and

grammers.' This tape answers those who protest, "... but the Greek and Hebrew say..."

Also in chapter 42 of *New Age Bible Versions*, G.A. Riplinger dedicates that chapter to "Lucifer's Lexicons." It is down right scary. All of the above mentioned and well-worshipped references are corrupted according to G.A. Riplinger. And, yes, *New Age Bible Versions* provides us with the evidence. **God gave His Word and it is the only uncorrupted thing this side of eternity.**

In addition, I followed the lead of G.A. Riplinger and looked at my computer program featuring **THAYER'S GREEK DEFINITIONS** "PARSONS TECHNOLOGY, INC. Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Copyrights--*Brown-Driver-Briggs' Hebrew Definitions*--Electronic Edition STEP Files Copyright © 1999, Findex.com, Inc. All rights reserved."

Under # 3 in the section "Plan for the Book" we read, "Next follows the Thayer's Definitions given in English as edited by the Online Bible of Winterbourne, Ontario. The nature of the edits is two-fold. First, they simplify the content by removing the etymology, cross-references, and Greek phrases. The result allows for easier reading of the English definitions. **Secondly, they correct some of Thayer's Unitarian doctrinal positions concerning the work and person of Christ so that they will be more widely accepted within the Christian community.**" The emphasis is mine. If they correct "some," then how much is uncorrected and how are you supposed to know which is corrected and which is not? You may not want to know. But as for me, I want to know. And we know that you and I will be judged by God's word. And no, you will not be permitted to judge God's word! Oh! Oh! Did you get the statement, "**so that they will be more widely accepted within the Christian community.**" Does that not say they were so stinking bad that they were unacceptable? And just how much unacceptable is left?

The KJV is right! The lexicons, the references, the dictionaries are all corrupted in some critical areas. They can be used as reference material, but in the same manner you would use any other commentary. These dictionaries and lexicons are not the word of God.

**Question 17:** G.A. Riplinger was asked the following question in the <http://www.ekkcom.com/gail24tx.htm> website. This is critical in the fact the latest scholarship shows that Wescott and Hort's arguments of the "oldest and best" is just a plain hoax.

**A listener from Concord, California confesses that the NASB lines up better with the Nestles Greek text than the King James**

---

**Version. Would you care to comment on this question?****Answer:**

The reason the King James Version does not seem to be an accurate translation of the NASB/Nestle interlinear is because, as the preface to the Nestles Greek text admits: “*This is **not** the traditional Greek text*” (emphasis mine). The KJV is a very precise translation of the traditional Greek text. Most book stores do not carry Berry’s Greek Textus Receptus interlinear. If you compare the NASB to this Greek text you would find the NASB in error thousands of places. Dr. Wilbur Pickering, in his thesis work at Dallas Theological Seminary, said:

*“New versions differ from the originals in some six thousand places. They are several times further removed from the originals than the King James Version.”*

He is saying this because the recent collation of the earliest papyri has now proven that King James readings are early, not late, as was previously supposed.

Embarrassed scholars have now thrown out that Nestle’s twenty-first edition interlinear mentioned by the listener and produced a Nestle twenty-sixth edition with five hundred changes back to the King James readings. Many pastors do not know this. An example would be 1 Peter 1:22. The King James has always said “*pure heart*”; the new versions merely have “*heart.*” The Nestle’s twenty-sixth Greek edition had to go back to the reading, “*pure heart,*” because it was discovered in the papyri.

We have five thousand or so Greek New Testament manuscripts extant today. Ninety- nine and 44/100 percent of these agree with each other; this is the text underlying the King James Version. The director of the British Museum, Dr. Kenyon, said, “*This is the text found in the great majority of manuscripts.*” The King James comes from “*the great majority of manuscripts.*” Kenyon says further, “*Until 1881 it held the field as the text in practically universal use.*” What happened in 1881? Two spiritualists, Wescott and Hort, changed this traditional Greek text in eight thousand, four hundred, and thirteen places using the corrupt Vaticanus manuscript. The following scenario puts an impossible strain on the imagination:

1. God left his church without the word from A.D. 330 (Vaticanus) to 1881; the church did not have the true word of God for fifteen hundred years.
2. It was *restored* in 1881 by spiritualists and heretics, like Wescott

and Hort (Wescott and Hort called themselves heretics), using the Vaticanus manuscript, a by-product of Origen, who himself was declared a heretic by regional synods in Alexandria, Cyprus, Jerusalem, and a general council in Constantinople in A.D. 553.

3. It was *refined* recently by five liberal scholars, one of which was Roman Catholic Cardinal Carlo Martini of the Pontifical Biblical Institute. This institute announced in April of 1994 that fundamentalist Christians were “*dangerous.*” Martini is said to be one of two men most likely to be selected as the next pope.

4. This text-type, never used by the body of Christ in the nineteen hundred-year history of the church, is accepted by the “*blind,*” “*lukewarm*” Laodicean church. (This church is not commended for keeping the word, like the preceding Philadelphia church period. His word has been ousted from the pulpit; that puts him outside saying, “*Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice...*” (Rev. 3:20).

This “new” Wescott and Hort Greek text was cloned for the following generation by Eberhard Nestle. In 1927 his son Erwin became its warden. He confesses: “*My father knew quite well that a certain one-sidedness adhered to his text.*” This one-sidedness is evidenced by the critical apparatus which appears at the bottom of each page. It purports to list which ancient authorities support the new changes and *which* do not. Pastors and seminary students are unaware of the distorted nature of the evidence. The late Dr. Ernest Colwell, past president of the University of Chicago and North America’s preeminent textual scholar, said of the apparatus, when he was working with the International Greek New Testament Committee: “*They fail to cite witnesses accurately or completely.*” These admissions of “one-sidedness” and inaccuracy stem from the following facts: Only seven percent of the cursives are listed; .02 percent of the lectionaries are listed; twenty-four percent of the citations by church fathers are listed; thirty-three percent of the ancient versions are listed. We are not getting an accurate picture of the manuscript evidence in either the United Bible Societies or the Nestle/Aland Greek New Testaments.

The critical apparatus accompanying the New King James Version is equally misleading. It uses the letter “M” to indicate that a reading is supported by the Hodges-Farstad *Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*. Readers naturally assume that the term “Majority Text” and the letter “M” represents a numerical majority of a full collation of the five thousand-plus Greek New

Testament documents. Nothing could be further from the truth. Von Soden collated *only* four hundred and fourteen of the five thousand-plus documents. Even these four hundred and fourteen were not *fully* collated. Few read the preface and introduction which concedes:

*“A large percentage of the material has never been fully collated... We were forced to rely on von Soden’s work.... ”* (p. vi)

*“As all who are familiar with von Soden’s material will know, his presentation of the data leaves much to be desired. ”* (p. xxii)

*“The present edition does not cite the testimony of the ancient versions or church fathers ”* (p. xviii)

*“What is urgently needed is a new apparatus for the gospels, Acts, and epistles covering the entire manuscript tradition. It should include complete collation of a very high percentage of the surviving Majority Text manuscripts. ”* (p. xxiii)

*“There is still much work to do in New Testament textual criticism. ”* (p. vi)

The book of Revelation in Hodges-Farstad’s so-called “Majority Text” relied, for the most part, on H.C. Hoskier’s collation of the book of Revelation. In spite of the fact that the eighty or so Andreas MSS are older and stylistically superior, Hodge-Farstad relied on an equal number of MS in the 046 line. To excuse this prejudicial move, they list only one-third of the Andreas line. This distortion allows the omission of vital texts such as Revelation 1:11, *“I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last. ”*

Dr. Jack Moorman of Great Britain did a very recent collation of the old uncials. He made some amazing discoveries most seminary students have missed. He collated the old uncial manuscripts A, C, and D, and showed that they agreed with the King James readings two to one and three to two. He collated the alphabet uncials and found that they agreed four to one. They have now discovered that many of the fifteen thousand corrections on the fourth century Sinaiticus manuscripts were made *before* it left the scriptorium, This vindicates scores and scores of King James readings.

When Dr. Moorman looked at the ancient versions of the New Testament, he found that the fifty or sixty old Latin manuscripts agreed with the King James Version two to one. The three hundred Peshitta manuscripts agreed three to one; the Gothic manuscripts agreed three to one; the Armenian manuscripts agreed three to two. The British Museum’s collection of eighty-seven thousand citations by church fathers agrees with the King James Version two to one. The antiquity of the KJV text-type is evidenced in Joseph Bosworth’s *Parallel Gospels*. It includes the Gothic version dated

---

about 360, the Anglo-Saxon version dated between 600 and 900, the Wycliffe translation dated 1381, and the Tyndale dated 1526. Comparing them with the King James Version and the new versions quickly shows that the King James is *the* text that has been used historically by the church as far back as the Gothic period, dated 360.

**Acts 2:6 says, “Every man heard them speak in his own language.” God has spoken to men around the world through a text like the KJV in the German Tepl Bible, the Italian Diodati, the French Olivetan Bible, the Hungarian Erdosi Bible, the Spanish Valera Bible, the Polish Visoly Bible, the De Grave Bible in Holland, the Russian Holy Synodal Bible, the German Luther Bible, and the Gottshcalkson Bible of Iceland. These all agree with the readings of the King James Version. The King James Bible Society (527 Benjulyn Rd., Cantonment, FL) keeps an updated list of current foreign bibles and missionaries in agreement with the KJV. People looking around at their church think *everyone* uses an NIV or another *new* version. That may be true within the context of their limited vision, but when looking back at the history of the church around the world, you will see that those sixty-four thousand missing words in the NIV have *not* been missing through the history of the church.<sup>2</sup>**

## Chapter 30: Q And A—Answers To The Perverted Translations, Their Positions and KJV Critics—Questions 18 to 21

This is our final Q and A chapter.

**Question 18:** These new versions claim they use the “oldest and best manuscripts.” This would appear, to me, to be exactly what we need in a Bible translation. This should produce the best version. Why should these new versions not use the oldest and the best manuscripts?

**Answer:** The “oldest and best manuscripts” is a Westcott and Hort perpetuated hoax. Westcott and Hort used the extant Alexandrian Texts from Alexandria, Egypt. These are often referred to as the “Minority Texts”. These texts represent only about 5% of existing manuscripts. Westcott and Hort revised the New Testament by rejecting the Received Text or **Textus Receptus** and by promoting Vaticanus and Sinaiticus—the two exalted Minority Texts and used these almost exclusively as the basis for these new perversions.

For the remainder of the answer the following article is from David B. Loughran and his internet publication *Bible Versions, Which is the real Word of God*. This excellent and to the point article can be found at the Stewarton Bible School Web Page. The Stewarton Bible School is located in Stewarton, Scotland and the website address is as follows: <http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/sbs777/vital/kjv/index.html>, July 1999. The footnotes at the end of the question belong to the internet article.

Another 5% are Neutral Texts: sometimes agreeing with the majority and at others with the minority. The 'Minority Texts' are also known as the. The Minority Texts were rejected by the early Christians and also by all the Protestant Reformers of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. The Reformers, who were well aware of the existence of the Minority Texts, considered them unfit for translation purposes. These are very important points to bear in mind. Why did the early Christians and the Protestant Reformers reject the Minority Texts?

The answer is:

- ◆ The **Minority Texts** were the work of unbelieving Egyptian scribes who did not accept the Bible as the **Word of God** or **JESUS as the SON of GOD!**
- ◆ The **Minority Texts** have less than 50 manuscripts compared to thousands of manuscripts, versions and writings of church fathers representing the **Textus Receptus**;
- ◆ The **Minority Texts** abound with alterations, often a single

manuscript being amended by several different scribes over a period of many years; something the Aaronic priests and Masorites would never have tolerated when making copies of the Scriptures.

- ◆ The **Minority Texts** omit approximately **200 verses** from the Scriptures. This is equivalent to 1st and 2nd Peter. Pause and consider that stunning fact!
- ◆ The **Minority Texts** contradict themselves in hundreds of places.
- ◆ The **Minority Texts** are doctrinally weak and often dangerously incorrect.
- ◆ Virtually every modern English Bible relies on the Minority Text as its underlying New Testament text in preference to Textus Receptus!<sup>writer's footnote 1</sup>

A **'manuscript'** is a **hand-written document, not one that is typed or printed.** The word **'manuscript'** is often abbreviated as MS or ms (singular) and MSS or mss (plural). Currently there are between **5250** and **5309** extant (existing) manuscripts of the Scriptures or parts of it. Manuscripts fall into two categories:

- ◆ **Masters:** These were the original autographs. *There are currently no original autographs or masters in existence.* They have all long since been replaced by copies.
- ◆ **Copies:** These are hand-written copies of the masters or hand-written copies of earlier copies. Some 5000+ hand-written copies of the whole or parts of Scripture are still in existence.
- ◆ Manuscripts produced by the early Christians fall into three categories:
  1. **Copies** of masters or copies of earlier copies.
  2. **Versions** : These are translations of Scripture made directly from the original languages. For example from Hebrew or Greek into Syriac, Latin, German, English or French. A **translation** from Latin into English, or from English into Chinese, cannot strictly be called a **'version.'** It is simply a translation of a translation: whereas a **'version'** must be a translation from the original. Bear this important fact in mind.
  3. **Church Fathers:** *"Our third group is the early church fathers. These are the men who led the Christians in the first few centuries after the New Testament was completed. We have record of their early sermons, books and commentaries. They will be able to provide us with*

*much information on disputed passages. Many may have seen the original autographs." Ref: B1)*

As regards the **format** of ancient manuscripts, they are often described as:

- ◆ **Uncial or Majuscules:** written in capital letters with no spaces: e.g. NOMANHATHSEENGD.
- ◆ **Cursives or Miniscules:** written in small letters and later with spaces: e.g. No-man-hath-seen-gd. writer's footnote 2

Bear in mind that a **version** is a translation made directly from the original Hebrew or Greek: i.e. from Hebrew or Greek into Syriac, Latin or English; whereas a translation of a version into yet another language is simply called a **translation**. Bible versions were made in several languages within a few years of the New Testament's creation. This was a rarity in the ancient world for any book.

Josh McDowell writes on pages 16-17 of his book **Answers to Tough Questions**. *"...Translation of a document into another language was rare in the ancient world, so this is an added plus for the New Testament. The number of copies of the versions is in excess of 18,000, with possibly as many as 25,000. This is further evidence that helps us establish the New Testament text. Even if we did not possess the 5,500 Greek manuscripts or the 18,000 copies of the versions, the text of the New Testament could still be reproduced within 250 years from its composition. How? By the writing of the early Christians. In commentaries, letters, etc., these ancient writers quote biblical text, thus giving us another witness to the text of the New Testament.*

**John Burgon** has catalogued more than **86,000** citations of the New Testament in the writings of the early church fathers who lived before A.D.325. Thus we observe that there is so much more evidence for the reliability of the New Testament text than any other comparable writings in the ancient world." (Ref: M1)

In his book **Final Authority**, William P Grady quotes John Burgon on pages 33-34 concerning the reliability of a version over any single manuscript. *"I suppose it may be laid down that an ancient Version outweighs any single Codex, ancient or modern, which can be named: the reason being, that it is scarcely credible that a Version - the Peshitto, for example, an Egyptian or the Gothic - can have been executed from a single exemplar (copy).*

*A second reason for the value of ancient versions is in their ability to exhibit a text which antedates the oldest Greek manuscripts. Readings which are challenged in the Authorized Version for their non-existence in the 'two most ancient authorities' (Codex Sinaiticus or A; and Codex Vaticanus, or B, fourth century) are frequently discovered in the Syrian and Latin translations of the second century."*

In the course of time many versions (translations from the original language) of Scripture were made. Let us now consider a few.

**The Peshitta Version** (AD 150)—The Peshitta was the first Syrian translation from the original languages. Even to this day there are around **350 copies** of the Peshitta (or Peshitto) version in existence. In his book **Which Bible?** David O Fuller writes this of the Peshitto: *"It was at Antioch, capital of Syria, that the believers were first called Christians. And as time rolled on, the Syrian-speaking Christians could be numbered by the thousands. It is generally admitted that the Bible was translated from the original languages into Syrian about 150 AD. This version is known as the Peshitto (the correct or simple). This Bible even today generally follows the Received Text. One authority tells us this - 'The Peshitto in our days is found in use amongst the Nestorians, who have always kept it, by the Monophysites on the plains of Syria, the Christians of St. Thomas in Malabar, and by the Maronites on the mountain terraces of Lebanon.'"* (Ref: F8)

**The Old Latin Vulgate** (AD157)—The word '*vulgate*' is Latin for *vulgar* or *common*. The Old Latin Vulgate is a version. It was used by early believers in Europe when Latin was in popular use. It was sometimes referred to as the **Itala** version. **The Old Latin Vulgate** must not be confused with Jerome's Vulgate, which was produced over 220 years later in AD 380. Jerome's Vulgate (also written in Latin for the Roman Church) was rejected by the early Christians for almost a millennium. The **Waldenses, Gauls, Celts, Albigenses** and other groups throughout Europe used the **Old Latin Vulgate** and rejected Jerome's Vulgate.

In his book **An Understandable History of the Bible** Rev. Samuel Gipp Th.D confirms this fact. He writes: *"The Old Latin Vulgate was used by the Christians in the churches of the Waldenses, Gauls, Celts, Albigenses and other fundamental groups throughout Europe. This Latin version became so used and beloved*

by orthodox Christians and was in such common use by the common people that it assumed the term '**Vulgate**' as a name. Vulgate comes from 'vulgar' which is the Latin word for 'common' **It was so esteemed for its faithfulness to the deity of Christ and its accurate reproductions of the originals, that these early Christians let Jerome's Roman Catholic translation 'sit on the shelf.'** Jerome's translation was not used by the true Biblical Christians for almost a millennium after it was translated from corrupted manuscripts by Jerome in **380 A.D.** Even then it only came into usage due to the death of Latin as a common language, and the violent, wicked persecutions waged against true believers by Pope Gregory IX during his reign from 1227 to 1242 A.D." (Ref:B2)

David Fuller confirms this fact: "*It is clearly evident that the Latin Bible of early British Christianity was **not** the Latin Bible (Vulgate) of the Papacy.*" (Ref:F9)

**The Italic Bible** (AD157) "*Italy, France and Great Britain were once provinces of the old Roman Empire. Latin was then the language of the common people. So the first translations of the Bible in these countries were made from the Greek Vulgate into Latin. One of the first of these Latin Bibles was for the **Waldenses** in northern Italy, translated not later than 157 AD and was known as the **Italic Version**. The renowned scholar Beza states that the Italic Church dates from 120 AD. Allix, an outstanding scholar, testifies that enemies had corrupted many manuscripts, while the Italic Church handed them down in their apostolic purity.*" (Ref:D2)

**The Waldensian** (AD 120 & onwards)—"*The Waldenses were among the first of the peoples of Europe to obtain a translation of the Holy Scriptures. Hundreds of years before the Reformation, they possessed a Bible in manuscript in their native tongue. They had the truth unadulterated, and this rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution ...Here for a thousand years, witnesses for the truth maintained the ancient faith...In a most wonderful manner it (the **Word of Truth**) was **preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness.***" (Ref:F7)

**The Gallic Bible** (Southern France) (AD177)

**The Gothic Bible** (AD 330-350)

**The Old Syriac Bible** (AD 400)

**The Armenian Bible** (AD 400) There are **1244 copies** of this version still in existence.

**The Palestinian Syriac** (AD 450)

**The French Bible** of Oliveton (AD 1535)

**The Czech Bible** (AD 1602)

**The Italian Bible** of Diodati (AD 1606)

**The Greek Orthodox Bible:** Used from Apostolic times to the present day by the Greek Orthodox Church.

All the above mentioned Bibles and the vast majority (about 99%) of the **5200 extant New Testament MSS** are in agreement with the text now known as **Textus Receptus**; the Text which underlies the **Authorized King James Bible**.<sup>writer's footnote 3</sup>

### References for Above Answer:

- B1—**AN UNDERSTANDABLE HISTORY OF THE BIBLE** by Rev. Samuel C Gipp. Bible Believers Baptist Bookstore: 1252 East Aurora Road, Macedonia, Ohio 44056 USA, Page 63.
- M1— **Answers to Tough Questions** by Josh McDowell and Don Stuart. Scripture Press, Amersham-on-the-Hill, Bucks HP6 6JQ, England. (ISBN 0-946515-51-4), Pages 16-17.
- F8— **WHICH BIBLE** by David Otis Fuller, D.D. published by The Institute for Biblical Textual Studies. Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503. USA, Pages 197-198.
- B2— **AN UNDERSTANDABLE HISTORY OF THE BIBLE** by Rev. Samuel C Gipp. Bible Believers Baptist Bookstore: 1252 East Aurora Road, Macedonia, Ohio 44056 USA, page 67-68.
- F9— **WHICH BIBLE** by David Otis Fuller, D.D. published by The Institute for Biblical Textual Studies. Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503. USA, Page 201.
- D2— **GOD WROTE ONLY ONE BIBLE** by Jasper J Ray, Eye Opener Publications: PO Box 7944, Eugene, Oregon, 974 01 USA, Page 98.

### **Question 19:** What is the **Textus Receptus**?

**Answer:** The **Textus Receptus** is the underlying Greek text of the **King James Version**. The **Textus Receptus** is also called the **Traditional Received Text**, the **Byzantine Text** or the **Majority Text** because it is based on the vast majority of manuscripts still in existence.

Again, the balance of the answer is the following article from David B. Loughran and his internet publication *Bible Versions, Which is the real Word of God*. This excellent and to the point article can be found at the Stewarton Bible School Web Page. The Stewarton Bible School is located in Stewarton, Scotland and the website address is as follows: <http://www.stewartonbibleschool.com>

[atschool.eduweb.co.uk/sbs777/vital/kjv/index.html](http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/sbs777/vital/kjv/index.html), July 1999. The footnotes at the end of the question belong to the internet article.

“These extant manuscripts (MSS) were brought together by various editors such as **Lucian** (AD 250-312), **Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza** and the **Elzevir brothers** to form the text known as **Textus Receptus**, the name given to the Majority Text in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The most notable editor of all was **Desiderius Erasmus** (1466-1536) one of the greatest scholars the world has ever known. When the early Protestant Reformers of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries decided to translate the scriptures directly from Greek into the languages of Europe, they selected **Textus Receptus** as their foundation Greek document. It is vitally important to understand why they did so.

**Wilkinson** writes in his book **Truth Triumphant**: *"The Protestant denominations are built upon that manuscript of the Greek New Testament sometimes called **Textus Receptus**, or the **Received Text**. It is that **Greek New Testament** from which the writings of the apostles in Greek have been translated into English, German, Dutch and other languages. During the dark ages the **Received Text** was practically unknown outside the Greek Church. It was restored to Christendom by the labours of that great scholar **Erasmus**. It is altogether too little known that the real editor of the **Received Text** was **Lucian**. None of Lucian's enemies fails to credit him with this work. Neither Lucian nor Erasmus, but rather the apostles, wrote the Greek New Testament. However, Lucian's day was an age of apostasy when a flood of deprivations was systematically attempting to devastate both the Bible manuscripts and Bible theology. **Origen**, of the Alexandrian college, made his editions and commentaries of the Bible a secure retreat for all errors, and deformed them with philosophical speculations introducing casuistry and lying. **Lucian's** unrivalled success in verifying, safeguarding, and transmitting those divine writings left a heritage for which all generations should be thankful."* (Ref: J2)

The **King James Bible Old Testament** was translated from the **Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text**; named after Jacob ben Chayyim, under whose editorship it was printed in in 1524-5.

In his book **Which Bible?** David Otis Fuller says this about **Textus Receptus**. Carefully note Fuller's first point that all churches (we could now add all Bible students) fall into one of two basic study categories:

- ◆ *“Those who use a variety of Bibles influenced by the **Minority Text** (the Nestle/Aland Text). For 45 years I was in this camp; but I thank God for opening my eyes.”*
- ◆ *“Those who only study Bibles based on the **Majority Text**, from which came the Received Text - **Textus Receptus**. I have now joined this camp.”*

**Fuller continues:** *“First of all, the **Textus Receptus** was the Bible of early Eastern Christianity. Later it was adopted as the official text of the **Greek Catholic Church**. There were local reasons which contributed to this result. But, probably, far greater reasons will be found in the fact that the Received Text had authority enough to become, either in itself or by its translation, the Bible of the great **Syrian Church**; of the **Waldensian Church** of northern Italy; of the **Gallic Church** in southern France; and of the **Celtic Church** in Scotland and Ireland; as well as the official Bible of the **Greek Catholic Church**.*

*All these churches, some earlier, some later, were in opposition to the Church of Rome and at a time when the Received Text and these Bibles of the Constantine type were rivals. They, as represented in their descendants, are rivals to this day. **The Church of Rome built on the Eusebio-Origen type of Bible; these others built on the Received Text.** Therefore, because they themselves believed that the Received Text was the true apostolic Bible, and further, because the Church of Rome arrogated to itself the power to choose a Bible which bore the 283marks of systematic depravation, we have the testimony of these five churches to the authenticity and the apostolicity of the Received Text.” ( Ref: F1)*

Why did the early churches of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries and all the Protestant Reformers of the 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries choose Textus Receptus in preference to the Minority Text?

The answer is because:

- ◆ **Textus Receptus** is based on the vast majority (90%) of the 5000+ Greek manuscripts in existence. That is why it is also called the **Majority Text**.
- ◆ **Textus Receptus** is not mutilated with deletions, additions and amendments, as is the Minority Text.
- ◆ **Textus Receptus** agrees with the earliest versions of the Bible: **Peshitta** (AD150) **Old Latin Vulgate** (AD157), the **Italic Bible** (AD157) etc. These Bibles were produced some 200 years before the minority Egyptian codices favoured by the Roman Church.

Remember this vital point.

- ◆ **Textus Receptus** agrees with the vast majority of the 86,000+ citations from scripture by the early church fathers.
- ◆ **Textus Receptus** is untainted with Egyptian philosophy and unbelief.
- ◆ **Textus Receptus** strongly upholds the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith: the creation account in Genesis, the divinity of Jesus Christ, the virgin birth, the Saviour's miracles, his bodily resurrection, his literal return and the cleansing power of his blood!
- ◆ **Textus Receptus** was - and still is - the enemy of the Roman Church. This is an important fact to bear in mind.

Reverend Gipp comments further: "*The Majority Text has been known throughout history by several names. It has been known as the Byzantine text, the Imperial Text, the Traditional Text and the Reformation Text as well as the Majority Text. This text culminates in the TEXTUS RECEPTUS or Received Text which is the basis for the King James Bible, which we know also as the Authorized Version.... We describe this text with the term "Universal," because it represents the majority of extant MSS which represent the original autographs. Professor Hodges of Dallas Theological Seminary explains, "The manuscript of an ancient book will, under any but the most exceptional conditions, multiply in a reasonable regular fashion with the result that the copies nearest the autograph will normally have the largest number of descendants."* (Ref:B3)

**Continuing from page 66 in Gipp's book:** "*Professor Hodges concludes, 'Thus the Majority text, upon which the King James Version is based, has in reality the strongest claim possible to be regarded as an authentic representation of the original text. This claim is quite independent of any shifting consensus of scholarly judgment about its readings and is based on the objective reality of its dominance in the transmissional history of the New Testament text.'*" (Ref:B4)

In his book **God Wrote Only One Bible**, Jasper J Ray pens the following testimony about **Textus Receptus**: "*Wonder of wonders, in the midst of all the present confusion regarding manuscripts, we still have a Bible we can trust. The writing of the Word of God by inspiration is no greater miracle than the miracle of its preservation in the Textus Receptus. All criticism of this text from which was translated the King James Bible, is based upon an unproved hypothesis: i.e. that there are older and more dependable*

*copies of the original Bible manuscripts. No one in nineteen hundred years, has been able to prove that one jot or tittle has been inserted or taken out." (Ref:D3)*

In his book **Final Authority**, William P Grady provides further interesting details about **Textus Receptus**, the Received Text: *"For instance, over 5,000 Greek manuscripts of the New Testament exist today ranging from small fragments containing two or three verses to nearly entire Bibles. Their ages vary from the second to the sixteenth century; the manuscripts are ending with the arrival of printing. By comparison, there exist only ten quality manuscripts of Caesar's Gallic War composed between 58-50BC... "Once again, the outstanding features of the **Received Text** is its high percentage of agreement among so many thousands of independent witnesses. This agreement is often placed at about 90 percent; **in other words, 90 percent of all existing manuscripts agree with one another so miraculously that they are able to form their own unique text...***

*If the critic of your King James Bible is correct in his rejection of the underlying **Textus Receptus**, then he is also under the greatest pressure to account for its existence. To complain of fabrication is one thing, but to account for its **universal prevalence** is quite another. Whenever a large body of ancient documents are seen to be in agreement, this inexplicable harmony becomes their greatest evidence for legitimacy. Simple arithmetic confirms that the nearer a particular reading is to the original, the longer the time span will be for descendants to follow. The longer the family is, the older the original source must be."(Ref: E1)*

*"For instance, over 5,000 Greek manuscripts of the New Testament exist today ranging from small fragments containing two or three verses to nearly entire Bibles. Their ages vary from the second to the sixteenth century; the manuscripts are ending with the arrival of printing. By comparison, there exist only ten quality manuscripts of Caesar's Gallic War composed between 58-50BC... "Once again, the outstanding features of the **Received Text** is its high percentage of agreement among so many thousands of independent witnesses. This agreement is often placed at about 90 percent; **in other words, 90 percent of all existing manuscripts agree with one another so miraculously that they are able to form their own unique text...**" (Ref: E1)<sup>writer's footnote 4</sup>*

**References for Above Answer:**

- J2— **TRUTH TRIUMPHANT** by Benjamin. G. Wilkinson, published by Teach Services, Route 1 Box 182, Brushton, USA, Page 50.

- F1— **WHICH BIBLE** by David Otis Fuller, D.D. published by The Institute for Biblical Textual Studies. Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503, USA, Pages 196-197.
- B3— **AN UNDERSTANDABLE HISTORY OF THE BIBLE** by Rev. Samuel C Gipp. Bible Believers Baptist Bookstore: 1252 East Aurora Road, Macedonia, Ohio 44056, USA, Page 65-66.
- B4— **AN UNDERSTANDABLE HISTORY OF THE BIBLE** by Rev. Samuel C Gipp. Bible Believers Baptist Bookstore: 1252 East Aurora Road, Macedonia, Ohio 44056, USA, Page 66.
- D3— **GOD WROTE ONLY ONE BIBLE** by Jasper J Ray, Eye Opener Publications: PO Box 7944, Eugene, Oregon, 97401, USA, Page 104.
- E1— **FINAL AUTHORITY** by William P Grady. Grady Publications: PO Box 506, Schererville, Indiana 46375, USA, Pages 26-27.

**Question 20:** Where can I obtain a copy of the **Textus Receptus**?

**Answer:** A paperback (800 pages) entitled *The Interlinear Greek-English N.T.* by Berry is obtainable from: *Eye Opener Publications* P.O. Box 7944, Eugene, Oregon 97401 U.S.A. This is the Textus Receptus from which the KJV was translated in 1611. Literal modern English words appear between the Greek lines and under each word, making it possible for anyone to make an accurate check of all Bible versions. The KJV appears in the margins. Notice in how many ways modern translations vary from the Greek text.

**Question 21:** Can you summarize the fruit or results of these new versions?

**Answer:** The same ancient perversions are now the modern perversions. These perversions brought the gross and perverted Catholic doctrines that include the immaculate conception of Mary, the perpetual virginity of Mary, the worship of Mary called “Mariolatry”, an unbiblical priesthood, confession of sins to man, an unbiblical view of Peter, idol worship, self flagellation, and others to the Catholic realm. *The Trail of Blood* by J. M. Carroll and *Foxes Book of Martyrs* document the millions of deaths and atrocities resulting from by the use of these ancient perversions. There is a cause and effect relationship here. Yes God has warned us, **“Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.”**

**The same mindset that corrupted the word of God in ancient times is the same mindset that brings us the continual onslaught of these new versions today.** We have direct historical linkages of corrupted manuscripts to:

1. Roman Catholicism as listed above
2. The dark ages—search your history
3. The rise of the modern Nazism that produced World War II. Look at the article online entitled **“The NIV Nazi Connection”** at <http://www.jesus-is>

---

[-savior.com/Bible/NIV/niv-nazi.htm](http://-savior.com/Bible/NIV/niv-nazi.htm). This will give you a good start. Google “Nazi connection to Bible versions” for more information.

You can be assured that the same types of atrocities, perversion, depression, and misery brought on by the aforementioned connections above, will be generated by these new versions. If we allow these new versions to destroy the KJV, we are one generation from total apostasy.

## Chapter 31: The King of the King James Version

**Author's Note:** The King of the King James Version has been blasphemed throughout history. King James, however, has left a Christian legacy with a glowing testimony as a defender of the faith and a lover of the book of the ages. God honored this King who honored Him. This article is from Jesus-is-Savior website, *HIS MAJESTIE, King James VI & I Page, King James I, BIOGRAPHY*, [http://www.jesus-is-savior.com/Bible/king\\_james-his\\_majesty.htm](http://www.jesus-is-savior.com/Bible/king_james-his_majesty.htm) as linked to <http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/kingbio.htm>.

**HIS MAJESTIE, King James VI & I Page  
King James I, BIOGRAPHY  
Keyword: King James I**

### AN INFANT KING.

James Charles Stuart was born on June 19, 1566 at Edinburg Castle in Scotland. His father, Lord Darnley, was murdered in early 1567 before young James was 1 year old. His mother, Mary Queen of Scots, subsequently ascended to the Scottish throne. Her reign, however was short lived and she was forced to abdicate in favor of her son on July 24, 1567. Little James was crowned King James VI of Scotland five days later at the tender age of 13 months. Reformation leader John Knox preached the sermon at his coronation.

James' mother, Mary, was imprisoned in England by her cousin Queen Elizabeth and 19 years later, in February of 1587, was executed for her part in the conspiracy to assassinate Queen Elizabeth. King James never knew his mother.

And so, like many monarchs of the time, King James was reared by neither father nor mother but rather by tutors. Of his four tutors, perhaps one of the most influential was George Buchanan, a staunch Calvinist. It was under Mr. Buchanan's strict teaching methods that King James became one of the most learned and intellectually curious men to ever sit on any throne. Mr. Buchanan was 64 years old when he began tutoring the young king.

It was Greek before breakfast then Latin and history, composition, arithmetic cosmography, dialectics, rhetoric and of course, theology. King James spoke fluent Greek, Latin, French, English, and Scots and was schooled in Italian and Spanish. The King once remarked, that he could speak Latin before he could speak his native Scots. Because of his linguistic capabilities, King James typically did not need a translator when conducting business with other heads of state.

The stiff intellectual diet from George Buchanan was absorbed by a young boy who may have had a certain measure of dislike for his strict tutor.

Nevertheless, King James learned well and grew into a powerful man with a powerful pen. The Cambridge University press notes that the King's writings were among the most important and influential British writings of their period.

### **KING JAMES BEGINS TO REIGN IN SCOTLAND.**

King James began to rule his native Scotland when he was 19 years old. A few years later, he took Anne of Denmark to be his queen. King James loved his wife and wrote beautiful poetry for her. Together they had nine children. Once, when the King and Queen were out hunting, Queen Anne accidentally killed the King's favorite hunting dog, Jewell. The Queen felt badly about this and the King bought her a gift to ease her mind of this incident.

King James believed in the Divine Right of Kings and the monarch's duty to reign according to God's law and the public good. In order to pass on his kingly instruction to his eldest son, Prince Henry, King James wrote *Basilicon Doron* which means, "the Kingly Gift". *Basilicon Doron* was not meant for general publication, but for the instruction of the young prince in the likely event that his father would not survive to instruct him--King James was sickly and survived a number of assassination attempts. The King bound his printer Robert Waldegrave to secrecy and ordered an edition of only seven copies. Somehow, however, intelligence of the book and its contents got abroad.

Subsequently, there was so much demand for *Basilicon Doron* that forged, corrupted copies were being distributed. With these pressures, the King then had it published for the general public and it became a bestseller. It was published in English, Welsh, Latin, French, Swedish and German for a period of over 50 years.

*Basilicon Doron* is a short treatise, only 153 pages long. It consists of three short volumes, the first of which is "A King's Christian Duetie Towards God." James D'Israeli said, "James had formed the most elevated conception of the virtues and duties of a monarch."

In *Basilicon Doron*, King James' understanding of Christian discipleship, style and prose are at their best. He skillfully intertwines sacred scripture with godly and Christian advice. The King offers his son this important advice on knowing God:

"Diligently read his word, & earnestly...pray for the right understanding thereof. Search the scriptures saith Christ for they will bear testimony of me. The whole Scriptures saith Paul are profitable to teach, to improve, to correct, and to instruct in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect unto all good works.

"The whole Scripture containeth but two things: a command and a prohibition. Obey in both... The worship of God is wholly grounded

---

upon the Scripture, quickened by faith." Basilicon Doron by King James

### **THE KING UNITES SCOTLAND AND ENGLAND.**

King James' great aspiration to be the first King of both Scotland and England was realized in 1603 upon the death of Queen Elizabeth. When he ascended to the English throne that year he had already been king of Scotland for 36 years. He was now known as King James VI of Scotland & I of England.

The king played a masterly political game and kept his kingdom out of war. For the first time a Scottish monarch wielded effective authority over the more far-flung areas of the realm. He supported literature both through his own writing and his patronage. There was peace during his reign--both with his subjects and foreign powers.

### **THE KING HAD MANY ENEMIES.**

As a Scotsman ruling over the English, the King endured much racism and slander--especially from the once powerful English Lords and Ladies who he replaced with his Scottish countrymen. Unfortunately, many of today's historians look to the writings of hostile sources such as Sir Anthony Weldon and Francis Osborne as accurate descriptions of this great king.

One of the king's detractors, Sir Anthony Weldon, was knighted by King James but was subsequently dismissed after King James found racist writings by Weldon about the King's native Scotland. Many historians today quote Weldon as if he were a reliable historical source. Examples of Weldon's racism are found in his treatise entitled, "*A Perfect Description of the People and Country of Scotland*" where he says that the Scots are a "stinking people" who hold "fornication...but a pastime". He also said, "...their flesh naturally abhors cleanness. Their breath commonly stinks of pottage...to be chained in marriage with one of them, were to be tied to a dead carcass, and cast into a stinking ditch....I do wonder that...King James should be born in so stinking a town as Edinburgh in lousy Scotland."

Despite this obvious bias, historians continue to consult the writings of Anthony Weldon who intimated that King James had inordinate affections towards other men--but he did not do this until 25 years after King James was dead and could not defend himself. Today's sodomite/homosexual community is touting the King as one of their own, which he was not. These misinformed sources, virtually without exception, fail to mention that King James and his Queen had nine children together. You can read about the rumors in this article or check out an excellently researched book on the subject by Stephen Coston, Sr. entitled, *King James: Unjustly Accused?*. Almost prophetically, the king wrote of his enemies:

"They quarrel me (not for any evil or vice in me) but because I was a king, which they thought the highest evil, and because they were ashamed to profess this quarrel they were busy to look narrowly in all my actions, and I warrant you a moat in my eye, yes a false report was matter enough for them to work upon." --James I, Basilicon Doron

The Catholic religion was also an enemy of King James. Papists (as King James called them) attempted to assassinate him a number of times. Most notably, in 1605 Roman Catholic Guy Fawkes attempted to blow up Parliament when the king was to have been present. The conspiracy was discovered and all co-conspirators were executed. This failed attempt is celebrated on November 5 in England each year and is known as Guy Fawkes Night.

King James was an evangelist of the true gospel, which automatically made him an enemy of Rome. King James strongly delineated the errors of Roman superstition and spurned them yet he treated Romanist subjects fairly. Catholic ambassador Nicolo Molin said this of King James:

"He is a Protestant...the King tries to extend his Protestant religion to the whole island. The King is a bitter enemy of our religion. He frequently speaks of it in terms of contempt. He is all the harsher because of this last conspiracy against his life...He understood that the Jesuits had a hand in it."

### **SUCCESS IN KINGSHIP.**

Despite his detractors, King James the VI of Scotland and I of England was a highly successful King.

As a lover of the theatre, King James became patron to the troop of one of his most famous subjects--William Shakespeare, the playwright. Shakespeare's troop came to be known as the King's Men. Shakespeare and the King held a special relationship as they both loved literature. Shakespeare even wrote his famous play, "Macbeth" specifically for King James.

Another little recognized fact is that King James the VI and I is the founding monarch of the United States. Under his reign, we have the first successful colonies planted on the American mainland--Virginia, Massachusetts, and Nova Scotia (Latin for New Scotland) in SE Canada. The King himself ordered, wrote and authorized the Evangelistic Grant Charter to settle the Colony of Virginia:

*"To make habitation...and to deduce a colony of sundry of our people into that part of America, commonly called Virginia...in propagating of Christian religion to such people as yet live in*

---

*darkness...to bring a settled and quiet government."*

### **CROWNING ACHIEVEMENT.**

Not only was King James the first monarch to unite Scotland, England and Ireland into Great Britain (as he liked to call it), but he commissioned what many consider to be the greatest piece of religious and literary work in the world--the Authorized King James Version of the Bible, aka the Authorized Version. King James gave his subjects the greatest gift he could--the Holy Bible so that they could be saved and fed from the Word of God.

In January of 1604, the King called the Hampton Court Conference in order to hear of things "pretended to be amiss" in the church. At this conference, Dr. John Reynolds, a Puritan, requested of the King a new translation of the Bible because those that were allowed during the reigns of Henry the VIII and Edward the VI were corrupt.

The King loved the idea and by July of 1604 the King had appointed 54 men to the translation committee. These men were not only the best linguists and scholars in the kingdom but in the world. Much of their work on the King James Bible formed the basis for our linguistic studies of today.

The translators were organized into six groups and met respectively at Westminster, Cambridge, and Oxford. This group of great scholars had qualifications such as have not been rivaled before or after them. They spent most of their lifetimes in the pursuit of God and knowledge. One translator, Dr. Lancelot Andrews, mastered at least 15 languages and by the time he was 6 years old, he had read the entire Bible in Hebrew. Others on the translation committee were just as qualified. Some wrote foreign language dictionaries and lexicons, they commonly debated in Greek, they translated and edited great works and wrote their own. These are but a few of their fantastic accomplishments. They not only knew the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek biblical languages but also the related languages that shed light on them such as Arabic, Persian, Coptic, Syriac, Latin, Chaldee, Spanish, French, Italian, and Dutch.

These men were not only world class scholars, they were Christians who lived holy lives as Deans and Presidents of major universities such as Oxford, Cambridge, and Westminster. Some prayed 5 hours a day.

Their translation work did not go without opposition. According to the translator's notes in the preface of the King James Bible, the Catholic religion was dead set against translating the Bible into the common tongue. Popery proved to be the translator's chief enemy. The translators wrote of the Catholic religion:

"So much are they afraid of the light of the scripture, that they will not trust the people with it...Sure we are that not he that hath the good gold, that is

afraid to bring it to the touchstone, but he that hath the counterfeit."

Despite the opposition of the Catholic religion, the work continued and the end product was nothing short of miraculous. Many consider the commissioning of the Authorized King James Version of the Bible the crowning achievement of King James the VI and & I.

Upon its publication, the King James or Authorized Version eclipsed all previous and subsequent versions. It is the best-selling book of all time.

Today there are a plethora of Bible versions available--yet for many Christians the King James Bible of 1611 is the absolute and final word of God. We will use a quote from the Merit Student's Encyclopedia:

"The greatest English Bible is the Authorized, or King James Version...The King James Bible became the traditional Bible of English-speaking Protestants. Its dignified and beautiful style strongly influenced the development of literature in the English language. The influence can be seen in the works of John Bunyan, John Milton, Herman Melville and many other writers."

Actor Charlton Heston had this to say about the King James Bible in his autobiography:

"...the King James translation has been described as the only great work of art ever created by a committee...The authors of several boring translations that have followed over the last fifty years mumble that the KJV is "difficult" filled with long words...Over the past several centuries it's been the single book in most households an enormous force in shaping the development of the English language. Carried around the world by missionaries...Exploring it...was one of the most rewarding creative experiences of my life."

The Authorized King James Version of the Bible has been cherished and read by Christians the world over since 1611 when it was published. Sir Winston Churchill said,

"The scholars who produced this masterpiece are mostly unknown and unremembered. But they forged an enduring link, literary and religious, between the English-speaking people of the world."

The Authorized King James Bible is not only heralded by Christians for its doctrinal accuracy, but it has been recognized by the secular as the "Monument of English Prose" for it is most beautiful in style and prose. In fact, the King James Bible has been listed in Norton Anthologies "The World's Best Literature" for decades.

### THE KING'S WRITINGS.

King James wrote extensively on a variety of subjects. Fortunately, in 1616, the bishop of his chapel compiled many of the king's writings in one volume entitled, "The Workes of the Most High and Mightie Prince, James, by the Grace of God, King of Great Britaine, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c." (in Jacobean typography, the letter "I" can represent "I" or "J". James = James)

In reading *The Workes*, we find that although King James was a highly learned scholar and statesman, his writings are forthright, cogent, pungent, lively, interesting, unpretentious, and easy to read. In *The Workes*, one finds that King James was a contender for the faith of Jesus Christ and cared about the spiritual well-being of his kingdom. He even wrote Christian meditations for his people and his court. His writings are still relevant today and are important sources for understanding the nature of law and government.

### PHYSICAL AILMENTS.

Though King James had a life filled with accomplishments, he was a man acquainted with grief. He was a sickly man who had physical handicaps in his legs and a tongue that was too large for his mouth. As a result of his unsteady gait, the king had numerous falls, accidents and injuries. He suffered from crippling arthritis, abdominal colic, gout, inability to sleep, weak/spasmodic limbs, nausea, frequent diarrhea, and kidney pain. Some believe that he may have had congenital diseases of the nervous system. Sometimes the pain was so great that the king became delirious.

To add to his ill-health, the king suffered from depression from the loss of his beloved wife Queen Anne in 1619. She was preceded in death by their eldest son, Prince Henry in 1612. The King was no stranger to pain and sorrow. The sun set on King James the great monarch on March 27, 1625 at Theobolds Park in Herts, England. He was 59 years old when he died and was buried at Westminster Abbey. Unlike many Scottish monarchs, King James died in his bed at peace with his subjects and foreign countries. He also passed Royal power on, intact, to an adult son which was also quite unusual.

Though he died almost 400 years long ago, the King's legacy, the King James Bible continues to flourish and to bring men, women, boys and girls to a life-saving knowledge of Jesus Christ.<sup>1</sup>

## **Chapter 32: Concluding Thoughts: Perverted Bibles & A Perverted Salvation**

### **Questions You Should Ask To the Advocates of These New Versions**

These are some questions you should consider and you may want to ask the advocates of these new versions? Although the answers are not given here, they are given in this book. The correct answer, in every case, reinforces our case for the KJV.

1. Which version is the easiest to read?
2. Which version is time honored and proven to yield the best results?
3. Which version is the most quoted today?
4. Which version is the most memorized today?
5. Who benefits when new versions are published?
6. How many archaic words are there in the KJV?
7. Which “thee” or “thou” do you not understand?
8. Can you name a KJV word that you do not understand?
9. Can you name and explain a passage that was made clearer to you by reading one of the newer versions?
10. Did God promise to preserve His word?
11. How did God preserve His word?
12. Which version is the true word of God?
13. Which version is the most accurate? Why?
14. How many more new versions do we need?
15. How has true worship, Bible reading, prayer, and true Christian spirituality increased since the advent of these new versions?
16. What do you think about the continual doctrinal bias and weakening of critical doctrines in these new versions?
17. Have you ever compared one of these new versions side by side with the KJV? What were the results?
18. How many mistakes are you aware of in the KJV? Where are they?

### **Can These New Corrupted Versions Of The Bible Bring Salvation To A Lost World?**

**First, how do these new versions view salvation?** Someone may read this and think, “I do not care about this issue. What it is all about is bringing the lost to Christ.” Sounds spiritual. In the end that is exactly the point. This poor writer was a mean hell deserving sinner—just like all men

everywhere. This idea of “good” sinners and “bad sinners” is a lie. For years, I realized the state of my lost condition. My hope was that I would have time for a death bed confession. In my mind, a person was lost and then must receive Christ to be saved. Then, after salvation, a man had to keep himself saved. Listen to the King James Version of the Bible.

- 📖 **1 Corinthians 1:18 (KJV)** <sup>18</sup>For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which **are saved** it is the power of God.
- 📖 **2 Corinthians 2:15 (KJV)** <sup>15</sup>For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that **are saved**, and in them that perish:
- 📖 **Hebrews 10:14 (KJV)** <sup>14</sup>For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that **are sanctified**.
- 📖 **Ephesians 2:8 - 9 (KJV)** <sup>8</sup>**For by grace are ye saved** through faith; and that not of yourselves: *it is* the gift of God: <sup>9</sup>Not of works, lest any man should boast.

According to the above, Christians “**are saved**”, “**are saved**”, “**are sanctified**”, and “**For by grace are ye saved**.” In my testimony, I have related how the Holy Spirit used a combination of John 3:16 and Ephesians 2:8-9 to draw me to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ. May I say, “Amazing grace how sweet the sound that saved a wretch like me,...it was grace that taught my heart to fear and grace my fears relieved” Oh! There is no need to fear. Those who believe “**are saved**.” Oh! You can be saved today, and know it. There is no need to wait for a deathbed confession or the last rites of the Catholic Church.

Now, let us look at the New King James Version and compare its readings with the same verses above. It is by far the best of the new versions on the market. This writer thought of calling the NKJV the best new perversion on the market. However, the term “best perversion” did not seem to make sense so we will not use it here.

- 📖 **1 Corinthians 1:18 (NKJV)** <sup>18</sup>For the message of the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who **are being saved** it is the power of God.
- 📖 **2 Corinthians 2:15 (NKJV)** <sup>15</sup>For we are to God the fragrance of Christ among those who **are being saved** and among those who are perishing.
- 📖 **Hebrews 10:14 (NKJV)** <sup>14</sup>For by one offering He has perfected forever those **who are being sanctified**.
- 📖 **Ephesians 2:8 - 9 (NKJV)** <sup>8</sup>**For by grace you have been saved** through faith, and that not of yourselves; *it is* the gift of God, <sup>9</sup>not of works, lest anyone should boast.

Now here, in the NKJV we have Christians as those who: “**are being saved**”, “**are being saved**” and “**are being sanctified.**” The NKJV changed the verb tenses dealing with salvation! Salvation in the NKJV becomes a process of “being saved” and “being sanctified.” This is old Catholic dogma. The Catholic needs to depend on himself, his good works, the church, the priest, last rites, and then his family, and the church to pay and pray him out of purgatory. Salvation is offered freely and instantaneously (“that moment” as the song says) to all who believe and place their trust in Christ. Not one time—no not any—will you find the phrase “**are being saved**” in the King James Bible. It is a totally false concept. The thief on the cross needed the assurance of our Lord when the Lord said, “Today shalt thou be with me in paradise.”

Now, note in Ephesians 2:8 in the NKJV, we “**have been saved.**” To the New King James translators my question is, “When do we get saved, how do we stay saved, and do we have a “right now” salvation?” You and I need a “right now” and “know so” salvation. “Know so” salvation was a term used frequently by John R. Rice. Ah! Listen to the KJV.

📖 **1 John 5:12 - 13 (KJV)** <sup>12</sup>He that hath the Son hath life; *and* he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. <sup>13</sup>These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God.

These new versions pervert the doctrine of salvation. Also, do your research, and note that the NIV, with the bulk of these other versions follow the “are being” saved text lines.

And yes, these are a few of many, many heresies that relate to salvation in these new versions. Let us look at the story of Philip and the eunuch in the KJV. Note verse 37 in the following passage.

📖 **Acts 8:34 - 40 (KJV)** <sup>34</sup>And the eunuch answered Philip, and said, I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man? <sup>35</sup>Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus. <sup>36</sup>And as they went on *their* way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, *here is* water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? <sup>37</sup>**And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.** And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. <sup>38</sup>And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. <sup>39</sup>And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more:

and he went on his way rejoicing.<sup>40</sup> But Philip was found at Azotus: and passing through he preached in all the cities, till he came to Caesarea.

Here, we have the strongest (certainly not the only) and clearest passage in the entire Bible teaching the Biblical doctrine of “believer’s baptism.” Now, let us look at the NIV rendering.

 **Acts 8:34 - 40 (NIV)** <sup>34</sup>The eunuch asked Philip, “Tell me, please, who is the prophet talking about, himself or someone else?” <sup>35</sup>Then Philip began with that very passage of Scripture and told him the good news about Jesus. <sup>36</sup>As they traveled along the road, they came to some water and the eunuch said, “Look, here is water. Why shouldn’t I be baptized?”<sup>37</sup> <sup>38</sup>And he gave orders to stop the chariot. Then both Philip and the eunuch went down into the water and Philip baptized him. <sup>39</sup>When they came up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord suddenly took Philip away, and the eunuch did not see him again, but went on his way rejoicing. <sup>40</sup>Philip, however, appeared at Azotus and traveled about, preaching the gospel in all the towns until he reached Caesarea.

Look at verse 37. No! There is no verse 37. How can any Baptist carry this damnable NIV into the pulpit? How could any Baptist even quote or reference the NIV? It is beyond my understanding. Have Baptists forgotten how millions of Baptists were hated, persecuted, and martyred by the Catholics for holding to the doctrine of believer's baptism. Read *The Trail of Blood—Following the Christians Down Through the Centuries or The History of Baptist Churches From the Time of Christ, Their Founder, to the Present Day* by J. M. Carroll for an excellent but brief documentation of Baptist history. It is online. May God deliver us from these new versions!

The NIV hides and perverts the doctrine of “believer’s baptism.” Look back at the NIV rendering for more heresy. By removing verse 37, the doctrine of believer’s baptism is cleverly removed and replaced with a passage that teaches “baptismal regeneration.”

And yes, there is much more. We have set forth the doctrinal problems in these new versions. In 14 instances, we have documented the doctrinal superiority of John 3:16. See Section II and Chapters 9 to 22 for a more complete analysis of the John 3:16 doctrinal perversions. In addition, this poor feeble writer could write a book on each of the following topics:

- ◆ **New Bible Versions and their Perverted Attack on the Deity of Christ**
- ◆ **New Bible Versions and their Perverted Attack on the Doctrine of Salvation**
- ◆ **New Bible Versions and their Perverted Attack on the Godly Living**
- ◆ **New Bible Versions and their Perverted Promotion of Catholic**

**Dogma.** These doctrines include the immaculate conception of Mary, the perpetual virginity of Mary, the worship of Mary called “Mariolatry”, an unbiblical priesthood and confession of sins to man, and unbiblical view of Peter, idol worship, self flagellation and yes, there is so much more.

◆ **New Bible Versions and their Perverted Attack on the Incarnation of Christ—no never mind—that is covered herein.**

Let me recommend *One Book Stands Alone* by Dr. Douglas D. Stauffer published by McCowen Mills Publishers, Millbrook, Alabama. Dr. Stauffer compares the KJV to other versions and briefly explains the doctrinal errors of these new perverted translations. The chapter on “*The Road to Rome*” reveals the teaching of the Catholic dogma referenced above. Dr. Stauffer brought home to me the reality that: “Every change in these new translations is wrong and leads the reader in the wrong direction and away from the truth.” The quotes are mine.

The King James Version is God’s perfect, preserved words. You can not improve on perfection. In order to be effective in winning the lost, we must use the KJV. These other versions leave a muffled and unclear sound.

Encourage your friends, your co-workers, your pastor and your Sunday school teacher to use the KJV. Press the point and make sure those that you love and can influence will take the time to study and understand the issue.

English is the dominant language in the world. In 2010, according to the You Tube website, more people in China spoke English than in the United States. In 2013, there will be more English speaking people in India than in the United States. Over 80 percent of the websites are in English. The hope of the world is a pure Bible—the King James Version.

**Second, What about professing Christians?** Certainly, there is no doubt that many saved, born again, blood washed Christians are carrying these Bibles that pervert John 3:16. However, we should point out, that not every person that carries the KJV is saved. And not everyone that carries one of these new versions is saved. The true Christian weighs the evidence, and in my personal opinion, will not be deceived by these new versions when exposed to the light of the absolutely irrefutable evidence found herein. The information found herein is readily available in hundreds of other books for all who will research the issue. It is the unbeliever that rebels against God.

The Bible has warned us, time and time again, but many will still follow the wolves in sheep’s clothing.

📖 **Matthew 7:15 (KJV)** <sup>15</sup>Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.

📖 **2 Corinthians 4:4 (KJV)** <sup>4</sup>In whom the god of this world hath blinded

the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.

 **2 Corinthians 11:12 through 2 Corinthians 11:15 (KJV)** <sup>12</sup>But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion; that wherein they glory, they may be found even as we. <sup>13</sup>**For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ.** <sup>14</sup>**And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light.** <sup>15</sup>Therefore *it is* no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works.

This writer took almost seven years to write this book. As this writer begin to relate the problems with these new versions to other Christians and churches, a long time friend and Christian lady related on more than one occasion her concern for her daughter. Her daughter left a traditional Baptist church and begin attending a liberal church which used the NIV. After she begin attending the liberal church, the daughter relayed to her mother (a Bible believing saint who knows and studies the Bible) that it was useless for her to study the Bible because only an educated person could understand the Bible.

In other words, you had to know “Greek” to be able to understand the Bible. Then you have to search through all these new versions to get a true understanding. Oh! Listen carefully. The problem today is not the people, but the pastors who promote these new versions. These pastors go to liberal seminaries and are taught that the Bible was divinely inspired, infallible, inerrant word of God in the “original” manuscripts. However, as we have seen and as these modern pastors point out, the originals do not exist. These pastors were taught in their seminary that the Bible was not preserved in the KJV and its underlying manuscripts. Thus the word of God could only be found in the various “oldest and best” manuscripts previously discussed.

The modern version pastors are taught that today, the true word of God can be found by searching through these modern versions. Of course, these versions do not read the same and thus the modern day pastor must judge which is right and which best fits into his sermon for the next Sunday. Think of it, the modern version pastor gets to pick and choose what he thinks is right! The modern day pastor has now become his own judge and now presides over the word of God! What power this pastor now has! And yes, what arrogance!

This modern version pastor has more knowledge than his laity and is able to judge God’s word. Also, he is able to tell a pulpit committee that he is a King James man but reads and uses these other versions for study. When hired by a King James church, he starts with the KJV. But after time he starts quoting from these new versions which have “better readings” than the KJV.

This new version pastor **will never correct one of the modern versions** but **will have to correct the KJV** as the occasion warrants. Then for a Wednesday night study, a new version is used. Many applaud the new and up to date language of the new versions. Finally, the new version pastor moves to preaching full time from his favorite new version. The new version is now labeled by the new version pastor as “my” whatever version. When he is questioned, he reasons that he has an ignorant trouble maker in “his” congregation. The pastor now has converted several (maybe most) in his congregation to his view of these new versions. For the good of the church and in the name of “church growth”, the church now needs a “back door” revival. Some members will be politely ignored until these members feel insulted enough to leave.

Any opposition to the modern version pastor is viewed as “persecution.” He, after all, knows what is right. The education of the new version pastor, rather than the KJV, is the standard for what is right. He now has every right to do what is right for the ignorant people. He now has set himself up as the great high priest for his congregation. This is the same kind of popery that was despised by the protestant saints of the reformation. Have we forgotten the lessons of yesteryear?

It does not matter how much you love your pastor, nor how much he is dedicated to the church, nor how good his sermons are, nor how good he relates to the people, there is a spiritual problem when he uses any version except the KJV. That pastor is deceived. However, when exposed to the material herein, he must either get right with God or rebel against God. He must make a choice. Does a pastor love his education and his own way more than God? If so, he must now convert to his own brand of religion, which is for all essential purposes “Catholicism.” And my friend, it is your obligation to show others the truth. Just get your new version pastor a copy of this book or one of the host of others in the “Recommended Reading” section of this book and leave the rest to the Lord.

Back to the daughter of the Christian lady above. She has moved to a more liberal church outside the Baptist denomination that preaches the “love of God.” Her new church does not condemn sin because God loves people and wants them to happy. Oh! The shame of it.

Through this study, this writer has witnessed several pastors and teachers on various programs that once used the KJV. Now, they have departed to other versions. These preachers and teachers read these new versions for their text but when they quote scripture, they revert to the KJV. These are men that cut their teeth on the KJV. They are sound doctrinally. These men still preach well grounded sermons. It is as though these men are completely blinded to the corruption in these new versions. We are one generation from total apostasy. The first step of compromise is a small one.

The next step leads too a deep abyss. The next generation in these liberal seminaries have no hope. Years of benefit reaped from the KJV will be lost overnight. The fight is on.

The writer wishes to recommend **Which Bible?** by David Otis Fuller, D.D. This book was first published in 1970 and is not directly quoted herein. Dr. Fuller does three excellent things in his book. Dr. Fuller:

1. **Documents the history of the ancient manuscripts and proves the Textus Receptus is a product of the “oldest and best” manuscripts.**
2. **Proves there are only two lines or streams of manuscripts—the dirty corrupt stream of manuscripts that produced the Bibles of Catholicism and the pure stream of manuscripts that produced the KJV Bible.**
3. **Demonstrates that there is a divide in the lives of the people who follow these various streams. Search the history of corruption and defilement of the Catholic Faith and see what they produced. Then you can make a comparison to that of the lives of true Christians and their churches.**

**Can these John 3:16 perversions who say that God gave His “one and only” son be used to see anyone saved?** There are certainly those who come to the Lord through these new versions. The majority of soul winning pastors who use these new versions are still doctrinally sound because of the influence of KJV and the overwhelming majority of excellent Biblical commentaries based on the KJV. But consider what the pure word of God has done, and what it can do. The KJV has brought millions to Christ and will be used of God to bring millions more. Why should anyone compromise on this issue? The next generation will reap the results of the leaven introduced by our generation.

Let me quote some verses that should terrify every believer who wants to be loyal to Jesus Christ and His Word and to win others to Christ.

 ***John 3:14 through John 3:18 (KJV)*** <sup>14</sup>And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: <sup>15</sup>That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. <sup>16</sup>For God so loved the world, that **he gave his only begotten Son**, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. <sup>17</sup>For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. <sup>18</sup>He that believeth on him is not condemned: **but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.**

Here the Bible clearly says a lost person is condemned **because “he**

**hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.”** We have already proved and established that “one and only” is not a dynamic equivalent to “only begotten” and thus we open the doors to despicable and damnable heresy. Can God save someone who believes in just anything? The certain answer is, “No.” God puts total store in salvation in His Name.

 **Acts 4:12 (KJV)** <sup>12</sup>Neither is there salvation in any other: for **there is none other name** under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.

We, as Christians, may be fickle at times. And yes, we are fickle, but God abides true.

 **1 John 5:20 (KJV)** <sup>20</sup>And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and **we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.**

 **Romans 3:4 (KJV)** <sup>4</sup>God forbid: yea, **let God be true, but every man a liar**; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.

 **1 Corinthians 1:9 (KJV)** <sup>9</sup>**God is faithful**, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

God is absolutely true to His word and His name. Professions of faith can occur without a possession of faith. The reverse is never true.

 **Matthew 7:21 through Matthew 7:23 (KJV)** <sup>21</sup>**Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven;** but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. <sup>22</sup>Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? <sup>23</sup>And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

Now, the purposes of our study are to:

1. Declare the true Gospel and thus see people saved.
2. Have professing Christians check and verify their own salvation and if unsaved, trust the “only begotten” Son of God. If you are saved, you need assurance of your salvation. These new versions are ambiguous about the security of the believer. You can depend on the promises of God that are clearly stated in the pure and true KJV Bible.

3. Give a clear exposition of John 3:16.
4. Declare the heresy of these new versions which pervert John 3:16 and bring Christians to true repentance concerning this matter.

**The heresies concerning the true Gospel are numerous. Pseudo-Christians cults believe in baptismal regeneration, saving grace in sacraments and works, etc. Salvation is not of works.**

 *Ephesians 2:8 through Ephesians 2:9 (KJV)* <sup>8</sup>For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: *it is* the gift of God: <sup>9</sup>Not of works, lest any man should boast.

Salvation is not based upon our works before we are saved, nor our works after we are saved, nor our promise or commitment to do something at the point of salvation.

Salvation is based upon repentance toward God, and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ. Prior to the salvation of a sinner, the works and commitment of that lost person is not a factor. A sinner has nothing to commit and no ability to keep the commitment. An honest sinner knows that.

The order is salvation and then service. Christian, you need to be committed, but your commitment only comes through faith in Christ and not through your self-efforts. Ah! I have departed from the subject and need to return.

The person who trusts Christ and believes in the “only begotten” Son of God is the one who is saved. Christ finished our salvation on the cross. He did the work. He died for me. He died for you and He arose from the dead proving God is perfectly satisfied with His redeeming work on the cross. All my works are as filthy rags. If God is satisfied with the work of Christ on my behalf, Yes! I am satisfied too.

My friend Bill said on occasion, “I looked at the cross and I had nothing to offer.” Look at one of the classic gospel songs of yesteryear.

Rock of Ages, cleft for me,  
 Let me hide myself in Thee;  
 Let the water and the blood,  
 From Thy wounded side which flowed,  
 Be of sin the double cure;  
 Save from wrath and make me pure.  
 Not the labor of my hands  
 Can fulfill Thy law's demands;  
 Could my zeal no respite know,  
 Could my tears forever flow,  
 All for sin could not atone;  
 Thou must save, and Thou alone.

Nothing in my hand I bring,  
 Simply to the cross I cling;  
 Naked, come to Thee for dress;  
 Helpless look to Thee for grace;  
 Foul, I to the fountain fly;  
 Wash me, Savior, or I die.  
 While I draw this fleeting breath,  
 When mine eyes shall close in death,  
 [*originally* When my eye-strings break in death]  
 When I soar to worlds unknown,  
 See Thee on Thy judgment throne,  
 Rock of Ages, cleft for me,  
 Let me hide myself in Thee.

By Augustus M. Toplady

The believer according to the blessed word of God is saved. The unbeliever is not. Salvation is not works. The believer is changed by the new birth and will have works but these works do not merit any part of salvation.

 **Galatians 2:16 (KJV)** <sup>16</sup>Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

 **Romans 3:23 through Romans 3:30 (KJV)** <sup>23</sup>For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; <sup>24</sup>Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: <sup>25</sup>Whom God hath set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; <sup>26</sup>To declare, *I say*, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. <sup>27</sup>Where *is* boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. <sup>28</sup>Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. <sup>29</sup>*Is he* the God of the Jews only? *is he* not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: <sup>30</sup>Seeing *it is* one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.

Some (many) say they believe salvation is by faith, but then you must work to secure heaven. No! It is one or the other and the following is one additional proof text to support the prior texts.

 **Romans 11:6 (KJV)** <sup>6</sup>And if by grace, then *is it* no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if *it be* of works, then is it no more

grace: otherwise work is no more work.

Surely, every true born again Christian understands that salvation is based solely on the grace of God, and faith in Jesus Christ—His Son, and His finished work through His death, burial, and resurrection.

 **Ephesians 2:8 through Ephesians 2:9 (KJV)** <sup>8</sup>For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: *it is* the gift of God: <sup>9</sup>Not of works, lest any man should boast.

 **Romans 10:9 through Romans 10:10 (KJV)** <sup>9</sup>That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. <sup>10</sup>For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.

Here is a simple question. Does a sinner have to believe all of John 3:16 to be saved? Or, if a person does not believe in John 3:16 in its entirety, is that person saved?

What about the hyper-Calvinist, who says, “I believe John 3:16 and the Father sent the Son to the world because He loved it—but the world really means God’s chosen and the objects of His special grace and all others are left to themselves to get what they deserve.” These pseudo-intellectual and perhaps pseudo-Christians over interpret, over analyze, and wrongly divide the word of God to rob the Bible and John 3:16 of the very simple message of hope and salvation directed to the entire world.

Are these saved? Read the “Institutes” by John Calvin. There are a few truths in the writings of John Calvin. There are also volumes of conjecture, opinion, half-truths, and heretical doctrines based upon Calvin’s own hyper-dissection, miss-interpretation, and pseudo-explanations of the word of God. Further, Calvin is exalted above the apostle Paul and even the Lord Jesus Christ in certain deeper life Christian thought circles, seminaries, and Christian schools. Herein, this book has issued severe condemnations of Calvin, Wescott and Hort. Their writings fill books that are held in the highest esteem in our seminaries. Search the writings of these men and see if you find a “new birth” testimony.

God is concerned about saving sinners—and yes, saving all sinners.

 **2 Peter 3:9 (KJV)** <sup>9</sup>The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, **but that all should come to repentance.**

God is concerned about every believer knowing that without a shadow

of doubt that they are saved and secure in the promises of God. Both salvation and security are found in John 3:16. Again the hyper-Calvinist with his “limited atonement” doctrine emasculates the Bible of its message and purpose. Some hyper-Calvinists feel they cannot offer salvation to others because of their perverted doctrine of “predestination” or “double predestination” or “election” or whatever they call it. Their damnable doctrines offer them a grand scheme to deny the simple Gospel to all. Note again, some of these hyper-Calvinist even make it a sin, in their perverted minds, to offer salvation to all.

Neither, can they offer the security to anyone because they do not know who the “elect” are. The true gospel offers salvation and security to all.

The point here is clear. To pervert the words and to pervert the message of John 3:16 is wicked, sinful, and disgraceful in the sight of God. Again, I do not presume to speak for God. The Bible is clear. God hates the liar and the man who perverts the word of God. God warns us to watch for “wolves in sheep’s clothing.” My hope is that you will be true to the word of God and John 3:16 and its message. These versions that pervert John 3:16 cannot be trusted in any other doctrinal area.

If you are not saved, believe John 3:16. Believe it now. When you trust in the “only begotten” Son of God, and God the Son, who loved you, and died for you—then, and only then can you have eternal life. And yes, you can know you are saved. Again, listen to the song, “To God be the Glory.”

To God be the glory, great things He has done;  
 So loved He the world that He gave us His Son,  
 Who yielded His life an atonement for sin,  
 And opened the life gate that all may go in.

*Refrain*

*Praise the Lord, praise the Lord,*

*Let the earth hear His voice!*

*Praise the Lord, praise the Lord,*

*Let the people rejoice!*

*O come to the Father, through Jesus the Son,  
 And give Him the glory, great things He has done.*

O perfect redemption, the purchase of blood,

To every believer the promise of God;

The vilest offender who truly believes,

That moment from Jesus a pardon receives.

The “moment” you believe in Jesus, that “moment” you get eternal, everlasting, and never-ending life and you are safe and secure in the Father’s hand.

📖 **John 10:27 through John 10:29 (KJV)** <sup>27</sup>My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: <sup>28</sup>And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any *man* pluck them out of my hand. <sup>29</sup>My Father, which gave *them* me, is greater than all; and no *man* is able to pluck *them* out of my Father's hand.

Now, let us, who name the name of Christ, be loyal to God the Father and his only begotten Son. Let us denounce the subversions and perversions of the word of God. And last but certainly not least, let us proclaim the word of God and the message of John 3:16. The word of God is the divine seed that produces salvation in the heart of the repentant sinner.

📖 **1 Peter 1:23 (KJV)** <sup>23</sup>Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.

📖 **James 1:21 (KJV)** <sup>21</sup>Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls.

📖 **John 5:24 (KJV)** <sup>24</sup>Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.

In Baptist churches, most services conclude with an invitation. **First**, you are responsible. **James 4:17 KJV** <sup>17</sup>Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.

**Second**, it is now decision time for you. This writer had to make a choice in this matter, and so must you. Pay close attention to the following verses.

📖 **Ezekiel 22:25 - 26 (KJV)** <sup>25</sup>*There is a conspiracy of her prophets* in the midst thereof, like a roaring lion ravening the prey; **they have devoured souls**; they have taken the treasure and precious things; they have made her many widows in the midst thereof. <sup>26</sup>**Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and I am profaned among them.**

Surely you can see the application. The time for the decision is now. God requires it. Look at a few sample verses from God's word that illustrate the necessity for a decision to be made.

📖 **Exodus 32:26 (KJV)** <sup>26</sup>... Who *is* on the LORD'S side?...

- 📖 ***Joshua 24:15 (KJV)*** <sup>15</sup>And if it seem evil unto you to serve the LORD, choose you this day whom ye will serve;...
- 📖 ***Matthew 12:30 (KJV)*** <sup>30</sup>He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.

Stand by the KJV. Get in a soul-winning KJV church.

**Third**, bring the matter to your friends, pastor, teacher and others with whom you come in contact. Pray that the Holy Spirit will guide them. Pastors and teachers, you must warn others and you must do more than just say that you are a proponent of the KJV. You must show to those in whom you have the oversight, the reasons you **believe that the KJV is the preserved word of God in English**. This requires more than just a statement of faith in the KJV. It requires some teaching. People must understand the following:

- ◆ **The doctrinal perversions induced by these new versions**
- ◆ **The doctrine of the preservation of the scriptures**
- ◆ **The history of these perverted translations**

Last, but not least, get your families out of these new version churches. The same ancient perversions are now the modern perversions. These perversions generated the gross and perverted Catholic doctrines—the immaculate conception of Mary, the perpetual virginity of Mary, the worship of Mary called “Mariolatry”, an unbiblical priesthood and confession of sins to man, an unbiblical view of Peter, idol worship, self flagellation and many others. *The Trail of Blood* by J. M. Carroll and *Foxes Book of Martyrs* document the millions of deaths and atrocities resulting from the old heresies that are now given a new venue in these new versions. There is a cause and effect relationship here. Yes God has warned us, **“Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.”** If we allow these new versions to destroy the KJV, we are one generation from total apostasy. The souls of men and your family are at stake. Start with your family and get them into a KJV church.

The tenets in this book can be summarized in three one hour sessions and you can put together the outlines and information from this book. Copyright permission will be given. In the event you would like, this writer is available to do the teaching. Stand by the KJV and diligently teach others about this fight for the heart and soul of Christianity. We also fight for the souls of men.

May God bless you, and may you be a vessel of honor and carry the word of God and the Spirit of God to a lost and dying world. You may contact me at...

**David Shanks, Publisher, 167 Leonard Road, Telford, Tennessee 37690**

**Email: [davidshanks@isp.com](mailto:davidshanks@isp.com), Phone: 423-257-5515 or 423-741-0443**

**Website: [www.john316truth.com](http://www.john316truth.com)**

## The Perversion And Subversion Of John 3:16 footnotes

### Chapter 1

<sup>1</sup> Ray Thomas, "The Bible Versions-Weighed in the Balance: Lesson #10" (sermon presented at Faith Baptist Church, Waterford, MI, May 16, 2004).

<sup>2</sup> J. Vernon McGee, "Psalm 22:16," in *Thru the Bible commentary* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997, c1981,) (electronic ed.).

<sup>3</sup> J. Vernon McGee, "Zechariah 13:6," in *Thru the Bible commentary* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997, c1981,) (electronic ed.).

### Chapter 2

<sup>1</sup> *Strong's Hebrew and Greek Dictionaries*, Electronic Edition STEP Files, by James Strong (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Parsons Technology, Inc., 1998), s.v. "G3439," "G3441," and "G1096."

<sup>2</sup> Rick Myers, *e-Sword Version 7.1.0* (Franklin, TN: Equipping Ministries Foundation), GNT-TR+—1894 Strong's numbers, KJV+—King James Version w/ Strong's numbers.

<sup>3</sup> *Encarta Encyclopedia*, Version 13.0.0.0531, s.v. "Latin." contributed by George E. Duckworth, (Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation, 1993-2003) (CD-ROM).

<sup>4</sup> *Encarta Encyclopedia*, Version 13.0.0.0531, s.v. "English." contributed by Mario Pei, (Redmond, WA: 1993-2003 Microsoft Corporation) (CD-ROM).

<sup>5</sup> *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., s.v. "mono."

<sup>6</sup> *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., s.v. "generate."

<sup>7</sup> *Webster's 1828 Dictionary-American Student Package* (Independence, MO: 1995 Christian Technologies, Inc.) (CD-ROM), s.v. "generate," "generated," "generating," "generation," "generative," "generator," "generic or generical," "generically," "generosity," and "generous."

<sup>8</sup> Henry Morris, Ph.D., "God's Only Begotten Son," Institute for Creation Research in Back to Genesis, <http://www.icr.org/article/gods-only-begotten-son/>. (Accessed November 30, 2010.) Web note: Morris, H. 2007. Jesus: God's Only Begotten Son. *Acts & Facts*. 36 (12): 4.

### Chapter 3

<sup>1</sup> John Gill, *Exposition of the Entire Bible* (Franklin, TN: Equipping Ministries Foundation, 2000-2004) (electronic edition found in *e-Sword*).

<sup>2</sup> Edwin H. Palmer, *The Five Points of Calvinism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1972), 44-45.

<sup>3</sup> Edwin H. Palmer, *The Five Points of Calvinism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1972), 45.

### Chapter 4

<sup>1</sup> Dr. W.A. Criswell, "Christ, The Word of God" *Criswell Sermon Library* (W.A. Criswell Foundation, 2002) <http://www.wacriswell.com/index.cfm/FuseAction/Search.Transcripts/sermon/311.cfm>. (Used by permission)

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Thomas Holland, *Crowned With Glory* (Lincoln, NE: Writers Club Press, 2000), 179-180.

### Chapter 5

<sup>1</sup> Tim Warner, "The Gnostic & Arian Corruption of John 1:18" *Study to Answer. Net*

in The Bible Versions Issue (2001) <http://studytoanswer.net/bibleversions/john1n18.html>.

<sup>2</sup> Mark Oaks, "Our Beliefs" *The Bible Church, Home of Expository Bible Studies* (1998-2007) <http://www.bibleword.org/beliefs.shtml#CR>.

### **Chapter 6**

<sup>1</sup> John McTernan, "Defending The Holy Bible: The Only Begotten Son of God" *Branch of David* (Branch of David Publications, 2003) <http://www.branchofdavid.org/defending%20holy%20bible.htm#begotten>.

<sup>2</sup> John Holman, "Defending the Holy Bible: Historical Facts Concerning The Holy Bible" *Branch of David* (Branch of David Publications, 2003) <http://www.branchofdavid.org/defending%20holy%20bible.htm#begotten>.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Peter S. Ruckman, *The Bible "Babel"* (Pensacola, FL: Bible Believers Press, 1964), 44.

### **Chapter 7**

<sup>1</sup> G.A. Riplinger, *In Awe of thy Word* (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 2003), 1048.

<sup>2</sup> G.A. Riplinger, *In Awe of thy Word* (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 2003), 1064-1066.

<sup>3</sup> G.A. Riplinger, *In Awe of thy Word* (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 2003), 1066.

<sup>4</sup> G.A. Riplinger, *In Awe of thy Word* (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 2003), 715.

<sup>5</sup> G.A. Riplinger, *In Awe of thy Word* (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 2003), 716.

<sup>6</sup> *Thayer's Greek Definitions*, Electronic Edition STEP Files (El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research, 1999) (Quickverse CD-ROM), s.v. "G3439."

<sup>7</sup> "Dictionary and Word Search for *monogenēs* (Strong's 3439)" *Blue Letter Bible* (Blue Letter Bible 1996-2007) (19 Jul 2007) <http://cf.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strong=G3439&Version=kjv>

### **Chapter 8**

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth L. Barker, Editor, *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation* (Grand Rapids, MI: The Zondervan Corporation, 1986) 118.

<sup>2</sup> Kenneth L. Barker, Editor, *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation* (Grand Rapids, MI: The Zondervan Corporation, 1986) 124.

<sup>3</sup> Kenneth L. Barker, Editor, *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation* (Grand Rapids, MI: The Zondervan Corporation, 1986) 124.

<sup>4</sup> G.A. Riplinger, *Blind Guides* (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications), 37-38.

<sup>5</sup> YouTube website, "Gail Riplinger verses James White, 1993, KRDS Radio Part III," [www.youtube.com/watch?v=MUEm62KSRxg](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MUEm62KSRxg)

<sup>6</sup> *QuickVerse* Version 2006 (10.01), Electronic Edition STEP Files, (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Parsons Technology, Inc., 1998), s.w. G1085 in KJV & NIV

<sup>7</sup> Kypros.org website, *Greek-English Dictionary*, <http://www.kypros.org/cgi-bin/lexicon>, s.w. μονογενής

<sup>8</sup> Charlton T. Lewis, *Charles Short, A Latin Dictionary*, Founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin dictionary. revised by. Charlton T. Lewis, Ph.D. and. Charles Short, LL.D. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1879, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text.jsp>

doc=Perseus:text:1999.04.0059:entry=mo^no^ge^ne\_s&highlight=monogenes, s.w. [mōnōgēnēs](#)

<sup>9</sup> G. M. Edwards, *Edwards, An English-Greek Lexicon* (second edition, 1914; reprinted 1930). Scanned by the Tim Spalding for AncientLibrary.com, <http://www.ancientlibrary.com/eng-grk/0197.html>, s.w. only begotten

<sup>10</sup> S. C. Woodhouse, M.A., *The University of Chicago Library English-Greek Dictionary A Vocabulary of the Attic Language by George Routledge & Sons, Limited*, (Broadway House, Ludgate Hill, E.C. 1910) [http://colet.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/chuck/woodhouse\\_pages.pl?page\\_num=574](http://colet.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/chuck/woodhouse_pages.pl?page_num=574), s.w. only begotten

<sup>11</sup> Gregory R Lane, Editor-in-Chief, Tufts University, *Perseus (on-line) Digital Library*, Gregory R Lane, Editor-in-Chief, Tufts University, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>

<sup>12</sup> “Liddell and Scott’s lexicon,” Wikipedia.org website, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A\\_Greek-English\\_Lexicon](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Greek-English_Lexicon)

<sup>13</sup> Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon* (1889), (Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1889) *Perseus (on-line) Digital Library*, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0058%3Aentry%3D%2321505>, s.w. monogenes

<sup>14</sup> Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, *An Greek-English Lexicon* (1940), revised and augmented throughout by. Sir Henry Stuart Jones. with the assistance of. Roderick McKenzie (Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1940) *Perseus (on-line) Digital Library*, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3D%2368502>, s.w. monogenes

<sup>15</sup> *Strong’s Hebrew and Greek Dictionaries*, Electronic Edition STEP Files, by James Strong (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Parsons Technology, Inc., 1998), s.v. “G1085, G1080, G1075, G1075, G1077, G1078, G1079, G1081, G1083, G1084” and “G1096.”

<sup>16</sup> Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon* (1889), (Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1889) *Perseus (on-line) Digital Library*, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/enggreek?.submit=Redo%3A&options=Sort+Results+Alphabetically&lang=greek&lookup=begotten&type=beg in>, s.w. begotten

<sup>17</sup> The Unbound Bible website, *Bible Language Tools/ Greek Lexical Parser*, <http://unbound.biola.edu/index.cfm?method=greekSearch.showWordList&detached=1>, s.w. γινωμαί = begotten

<sup>18</sup> Rick Myers, *e-Sword Version 7.1.0* (Franklin, TN: Equipping Ministries Foundation, *Robinson’s Morphological Analysis Codes*, s.w. μονογενους<sup>3439 A-GSM</sup>

<sup>19</sup> *Babel Fish website*, [http://babelfish.yahoo.com/translate\\_txt](http://babelfish.yahoo.com/translate_txt), s.w. only begotten

<sup>20</sup> *Babel Fish website*, [http://babelfish.yahoo.com/translate\\_txt](http://babelfish.yahoo.com/translate_txt), s.w. μοναδικός

<sup>21</sup> Charlton T. Lewis, *Charles Short, A Latin Dictionary*, Founded on Andrews’ edition of Freund’s Latin dictionary. revised by. Charlton T. Lewis, Ph.D. and. Charles Short, LL.D. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1879, *Perseus (on-line) Digital Library*, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0059%3Aentry%3D%2349835>

<sup>22</sup> Gregory R Lane, Editor-in-Chief, Tufts University, *Perseus (on-line) Digital Library*, Gregory R Lane, Editor-in-Chief, Tufts University, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0059%3Aentry%3D%2349840>

<sup>23</sup> *Thayer's Greek Definitions*, Electronic Edition STEP Files (El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research, 1999) (Quickverse CD-ROM), s.v. "G3439."

### **Chapter 9**

### **Chapter 10**

### **Chapter 11**

<sup>1</sup> *Strong's Hebrew and Greek Dictionaries*, Electronic Edition STEP Files, by James Strong (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Parsons Technology, Inc., 1998), s.v. "G2059."

<sup>2</sup> G.A. Riplinger, *The Language of the King James Bible* (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 1998), 117-119.

### **Chapter 12**

<sup>1</sup> The Dean Burgeon Society Web Site, "No. 75 Official News Organ Of The Dean Burgeon Society", [http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/News/no\\_75.htm](http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/News/no_75.htm) (November, 2005 - March, 2006).

<sup>2</sup> Edward F. Hills, *The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscripts* (Des Moines, Iowa: The Christian Research Press, 1956) 218.

<sup>3</sup> G.A. Riplinger, *In Awe of thy Word* (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 2003), 331.

<sup>4</sup> Dr. Ian Richard Kyle Paisley, "Introduction", *My Plea for the Old Sword*, (European Institute of Protestant Studies website, 1999) <http://www.ianpaisley.org/article.asp?ArtKey=plea0>.

<sup>5</sup> Adam Clarke, "Introduction", *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the New Testament* (1810)

<sup>6</sup> Winston Churchill as quoted by G. S. Paine, *The Men Behind the King James Version*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich.; 1959, 1977ed., p. 182.

<sup>7</sup> Ronald Reagan, "The King James Bible," *Newsweek*, Dec. 27, 1982 p.46 and found on the *Dial-the-Truth Ministries website*, <http://www.av1611.org/kjv/reagan.html>.

<sup>8</sup> Benjamin Keach, "Contents" *Preaching from the Types and Metaphors of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1978) vii.

### **Chapter 13**

<sup>1</sup> G.A. Riplinger, *In Awe of thy Word* (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 2003), 49.

### **Chapter 14**

### **Chapter 15**

<sup>1</sup> *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance*, Electronic Edition STEP Files, by James Strong (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Parsons Technology, Inc., 1998), s.v. "G3439."

<sup>2</sup> *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance*, Electronic Edition STEP Files, by James Strong (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Parsons Technology, Inc., 1998), s.v. "Matthew 1:20 (KJV)."

<sup>3</sup> *Strong's Hebrew and Greek Dictionaries*, Electronic Edition STEP Files, by James Strong (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Parsons Technology, Inc., 1998), s.v. "G1080."

<sup>4</sup> *Strong's Hebrew and Greek Dictionaries*, Electronic Edition STEP Files, by James Strong (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Parsons Technology, Inc., 1998), s.v. "G1096," "G1085," and "G1080."

<sup>5</sup> W. E. Vine, Merrill F. Unger, and William White, Jr., *Vines Complete Expository of the Old and New Testament Words* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1996) (eBible CD-ROM), Vol. 2, 244.

- <sup>6</sup> William MacDonald and Arthur Farstad, *Believer's Bible Commentary: Old and New Testaments* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1995) (eBible CD-ROM), PAGE##.
- <sup>7</sup> Earl D. Ramacher, Ronald B. Allen, and Wayne H. House, *Nelson's New Illustrated Bible Commentary* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999) (eBible CD-ROM), PAGE##.
- <sup>8</sup> J. Vernon McGee, "John 1:1-2," in *Thru the Bible commentary* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997, c1981,) (electronic ed.).
- <sup>9</sup> John R. Rice, D.D., Litt.D., *The Son of God* (Murfreesboro, Tennessee: Sword of the Lord Publishers (1976), 29.
- <sup>10</sup> Charles H. Spurgeon, *12 Christmas Sermons* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1976), 97.
- <sup>11</sup> Dr. Harold L. Willmington, *Willmington's Guide to the Bible*, (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, 1981), 284.
- <sup>12</sup> J. Sidlow Baxter, *Explore the Book*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House)307.
- <sup>13</sup> G.A. Riplinger, *NewAgeVersions* (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 1993), 337.
- <sup>14</sup> Adam Clarke, *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the New Testament*, (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Electronic STEP Files Copyright © 1999, Parsons Technology, Inc.) s.v. John 1:14.
- <sup>15</sup> Dr. W.A. Criswell, "The Christ of Christmas" *Criswell Sermon Library* (W.A. Criswell Foundation, 2002) <http://www.wacriswell.com/index.cfm/FuseAction/Search.Transcripts/sermon/1141.cfm>. (Used by permission)
- <sup>16</sup> Dr. Ian Richard Kyle Paisley, Christian Foundations, Chapter: "Seven Reasons Why I Believe IN THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST," *What Saith the Scripture.com*, <http://whatsaiththescripture.com/The.Holy.Bible/Reasons7.Virg.Birth.Christ.html>.
- <sup>17</sup> Dr. Hank Lindstrom, "Only Begotten Son" *Biblelineministries Web Page*, <http://www.biblelineministries.org/articles/basearchphp3action=full&mainkey=ONLY+BEGOTTEN+SON&typed=only+begotten+son>
- <sup>18</sup> Official Website of Southern Baptist Convention, *Statement of Faith—Topic: God*. <http://www.sbc.net/bfm/bfm2000.asp#ii>.
- <sup>19</sup> The United Methodist Church Website, *The Confession of Faith of The Evangelical United Brethren Church I-V*. (Home > Our Faith > Beliefs > The Confession of Faith of The Evangelical United Brethren Church I-V ) <http://archives.umc.org/interior.asp?ptid=1&mid=1654>.
- <sup>20</sup> The Website of the Evangelical Presbyterian Church, *Beliefs and Distinctives—Essentials of Our Faith*. <http://www.epc.org/about-epc/beliefs/essentials.html>.
- <sup>21</sup> The Website of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, USA, *Confession of Faith*. <http://www.ub.org/about/cof.html>.

## **Chapter 16**

- <sup>1</sup> Charles Ryrie, *Basic Theology*, (Wheaton, Illinois: Victor Books, 1986) 238.
- <sup>2</sup> Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology—Second Edition*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1998) pp 770.
- <sup>3</sup> Dr. Harold L. Willmington, *Willmington's Guide to the Bible*, (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, 1981), 609.
- <sup>4</sup> Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids, 1949, pp. 93-94 as quoted by *Bible Research* website, <http://www.bible-researcher.com/eternal-generation.html>

<sup>5</sup> Jasper James Ray, *God Wrote Only One Bible*, (Eugene, Oregon, USA 97401: The Eye Opener Publications, 1955) 103.

<sup>6</sup> Rick Myers, *e-Sword Version 7.1.0* (Franklin, TN: Equipping Ministries Foundation), GNT-TR+—1894 Scrivener Textus Receptus w/ Strong's numbers, GNT-WH+—Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament w/ Strong's numbers, KJV+—King James Version w/ Strong's numbers.

<sup>7</sup> *Strong's Hebrew and Greek Dictionaries*, Electronic Edition STEP Files, by James Strong (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Parsons Technology, Inc., 1998), s.v. "G1080."

<sup>8</sup> *Strong's Hebrew and Greek Dictionaries*, Electronic Edition STEP Files, by James Strong (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Parsons Technology, Inc., 1998), s.v. "G4416."

### **Chapter 17**

<sup>1</sup>D.A. Carson, *The King James Version Debate—A Plea for Realism*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1979) 92-93.

<sup>2</sup>D.A. Carson, *The King James Version Debate—A Plea for Realism*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1979) 92-93.

### **Chapter 18**

<sup>1</sup> *Thayer's Greek Definitions*, Electronic Edition STEP Files (El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research, 1999) (Quickverse CD-ROM), s.v. "G3439."

<sup>2</sup> G.A. Riplinger, *NewAgeVersions* (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 1993), 601.

<sup>3</sup> *Thayer's Greek Definitions*, Electronic Edition STEP Files (El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research, 1999) (Quickverse CD-ROM), Section 3—Plan of the Book.

<sup>4</sup> Blue Letter Bible. "Dictionary and Word Search for *monogenēs* (*Strong's 3439*)".

Blue Letter Bible. 1996 2007. 4 Sep 2007. <[http:// cf.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongsg3439&Version=kjv](http://cf.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongsg3439&Version=kjv)>.

Note: from Thayer's Lexicon (*Help*)

<sup>5</sup> Kenneth L Barker, *The Making of the NIV, Chapter 8—“The One and Only Son”* by Richard N. Longenecker, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1991) 118.

<sup>6</sup> Kenneth L Barker, *The Making of the NIV, Chapter 8—“The One and Only Son”* by Richard N. Longenecker, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1991) 124.

<sup>7</sup> Kenneth L Barker, *The Making of the NIV, Chapter 8—“The One and Only Son”* by Richard N. Longenecker, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1991) 121.

### **Chapter 19**

<sup>1</sup> Dr. W.A. Criswell, "How Could God Become Man?" *Criswell Sermon Library* (W.A. Criswell Foundation, 2002) <http://www.wacriswell.com/index.cfm/FuseAction/Search.Transcripts/sermon/391.cfm>. (Used by permission)

### **Chapter 20**

<sup>1</sup> Christian Apologetics & Research Ministry, "Gnosticism", <http://www.carm.org/heresy/gnosticism.htm>.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Ken Matto, "The New American Standard Version--Another Gnostic Version", (Scion of Zion Internet Ministry) [http://www.scionofzion.com/nasv\\_agnostic.htm](http://www.scionofzion.com/nasv_agnostic.htm).

<sup>3</sup> Christian Apologetics & Research Ministry, "Arianism", <http://www.carm.org/heresy/arianism.htm>.

<sup>4</sup> Christian Apologetics & Research Ministry, "Adpotionism", <http://www.carm.org/>

[heresy/adoptionism.htm](#).

<sup>5</sup> Pastor Jack Moorman, *Modern Bibles the Dark Secret*,” [http://www.feasite.org/Tracts/fbcdarks.htm#Names\\_Of\\_Christ\\_Missing](http://www.feasite.org/Tracts/fbcdarks.htm#Names_Of_Christ_Missing).

### **Chapter 21**

<sup>1</sup> John Gill, *Exposition of the Entire Bible* (Franklin, TN: Equipping Ministries Foundation, 2000-2004)(electronic edition found in *e-Sword*).

<sup>2</sup> Edwin H. Palmer, *The Five Points of Calvinism*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1972) 44-45.

<sup>3</sup> Edwin H. Palmer, *The Five Points of Calvinism*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1972) 44.

### **Chapter 22**

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Robert Barnett, *Which Bible Will You Trust? The Dean Burgon Society's 1992 Annual Meeting*, “*New Age Bible Versions*, <http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/KJBible/barnett92.htm#THE%20NEW>.

<sup>2</sup> The Dean Burgon Society Web Page, <http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/>.

### **Chapter 23**

<sup>1</sup> Timothy Binion, “*The Study Of Bible Translation*,” [http://www.pastortim.org/study\\_of\\_bible\\_translation.htm](http://www.pastortim.org/study_of_bible_translation.htm).

<sup>2</sup> Jesus -is-lord.com Web Page, “*Report of the Committee on Versions, made to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society, and adopted May 1st, 1851*” <http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/transrul.htm>.

### **Chapter 24**

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Thomas Holland, *Manuscript Evidence* (“*Lesson 4: Early Heresies and the Western and Alexandrian Line*”), <http://www.purewords.org/kjb1611/html/lesson04.htm>.

<sup>2</sup> David Otis Fuller, D.D., *True Or False? The Westcott-Hort Textual Theory Examined Edited by David Otis Fuller, D.D.* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1973) as copied to <http://www.wayoflife.org/articles/truefalse/index.html>.

### **Chapter 25**

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Thomas Holland, *Manuscript Evidence* (“*Lesson 5: The Traditional Text Line*”), <http://www.purewords.org/kjb1611/html/lesson05.htm>

### **Chapter 26**

<sup>1</sup> Pastor Jack Moorman, *Modern Bibles the Dark Secret—Part 2*” <http://www.feasite.org/Tracts/fbcdark2.htm>.

### **Chapter 27**

<sup>1</sup> David B. Loughran, *Bible Versions Part One...Files 2 and3 of 7*, Stewarton Bible School webpage, Stewarton, Scotland, <http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/sbs777/vital/kjv/index.html>, July 1999

<sup>2</sup> David B. Loughran, *Bible Versions Part One...File 2 of 7*, Stewarton Bible School

webpage, Stewarton, Scotland, <http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/sbs777/vital/kjv/index.html>, July 1999

<sup>3</sup> David B. Loughran, *Bible Versions Part One...File 2 of 7*, Stewarton Bible School webpage, Stewarton, Scotland, <http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/sbs777/vital/kjv/index.html>, July 1999

<sup>4</sup> Wikipedia, “Byzantine text-type” [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Majority\\_Text](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Majority_Text).

<sup>5</sup> *The New King James Version*. Nashville : Thomas Nelson, 1996, c1982.

<sup>6</sup> David W. Daniels, *Answers to Your Bible Version Questions*, (Ontario: Chick Publications, 2003, 2010), pp.181-182..

<sup>7</sup> David Cloud, “*What About the New King James Version*”, <http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/whatabout-nkjv.html>.

### **Chapter 28**

<sup>1</sup> The Dean Burgeon Society Web Site, “*No. 75 Official News Organ Of The Dean Burgeon Society*”, [http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/News/no\\_75.htm](http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/News/no_75.htm) (November, 2005 - March, 2006).

<sup>2</sup> G.A. Riplinger, *In Awe of thy Word* (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 2003), 196.

<sup>3</sup> James L. Melton, “*The NKJV: A Deadly Translation*”, <http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/nkjvdead.htm>.

### **Chapter 29**

<sup>1</sup> Hope of Israel Baptist Web Page, Copyright © 1998-2011 “*Bible Versions-Verses Deleted in Modern Bibles*,” [http://www.hopeofisrael.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=25&Itemid=35](http://www.hopeofisrael.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=25&Itemid=35)

<sup>2</sup> G.A. Riplinger, “Question about NASB,” ekkcom.com website, <http://www.ekkcom.com/gail24tx.htm>.

### **Chapter 30**

<sup>1</sup> David B. Loughran, *Bible Versions Part One...File 4 of 7*, Stewarton Bible School webpage, Stewarton, Scotland, <http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/sbs777/vital/kjv/index.html>, July 1999

<sup>2</sup> David B. Loughran, *Bible Versions Part One...File 1 of 7*, Stewarton Bible School webpage, Stewarton, Scotland, <http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/sbs777/vital/kjv/index.html>, July 1999

<sup>3</sup> David B. Loughran, *Bible Versions Part One...File 2 of 7*, Stewarton Bible School webpage, Stewarton, Scotland, <http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/sbs777/vital/kjv/index.html>, July 1999

<sup>4</sup> David B. Loughran, *Bible Versions Part One...File 3 of 7*, Stewarton Bible School webpage, Stewarton, Scotland, <http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/sbs777/vital/kjv/index.html>, July 1999

### **Chapter 31**

<sup>1</sup> Jesus-is-Savior website, *HIS MAJESTIE, King James VI & I Page, King James I, BIOGRAPHY*, [http://www.jesus-is-savior.com/Bible/king\\_james-his\\_majesty.htm](http://www.jesus-is-savior.com/Bible/king_james-his_majesty.htm) and linked to <http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/kingbio.htm>

### **Chapter 32**

## Recommended Reading

- G.A. Riplinger, **In AwE of thy Word** (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 2003).
- G.A. Riplinger, **Blind Guides** (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications).
- G.A. Riplinger, **NewAgeVersions** (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 1993).
- G.A. Riplinger, **The Language of the King James Bible** (Ararat, Virginia: A.V. Publications, 1998).

G.A. Riplinger in the excellent book **In AwE of Thy Word** correctly describes the word of God as “The Breath and Heartbeat of God.” Riplinger states, **“The KJV progressively builds in understanding from Genesis to Revelation, and maintains the easiest reading level.” Riplinger in the book In AwE of Thy Word documents the KJV building blocks to understanding.** For children or adults, the KJV stands alone as the best tool to impart knowledge learning, knowledge and understanding. Get Riplinger’s book **In AwE of Thy Word**.

- Dr. Thomas Holland, **Crowned With Glory** (Lincoln, NE: Writers Club Press, 2000). **Dr. Holland is an excellent defender of the KJV and *Crowned With Glory* brings some an excellent work to the table.**
- **One Book Stands Alone** by Dr. Douglas D. Stauffer published by McCowen Mills Publishers, Millbrook, Alabama. Dr. Stauffer compares the KJV to other versions and briefly explains the doctrinal errors of these new perverted translations. The chapter on *The Road to Rome* reveals the teaching of the Catholic dogma referenced above. Dr. Stauffer brought home to me the reality that: “Every change in these new translations is wrong and leads the reader in the wrong direction and away from the truth.” The quotes are mine.
- **Which Bible?** by David Otis Fuller, D.D. 1970 and is not directly quoted herein. Dr. Fuller does three excellent things in his book. Dr. Fuller:
  1. **Documents the history of the ancient manuscripts and proves the Textus Receptus is a product of the “oldest and best” manuscripts.**
  2. **Proves there are only two lines or streams of manuscripts—the dirty corrupt stream of manuscripts that produced the Bibles of Catholicism and the pure stream of manuscripts that produced the KJV Bible.**
  3. **Demonstrates that there is a divide in the lives of the people who follow these various streams. Search the history of corruption and defilement the Catholics and see what they produced and then compare that to the lives of true Christians and their churches.**
- Dr. Peter S. Ruckman, **The Bible “Babel”** (Pensacola, FL: Bible Believers Press, 1964), 44.
- Edward F. Hills, **The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscripts** (Des Moines, Iowa: The Christian Research Press, 1956) 218-219.
- Jasper James Ray, **God Wrote Only One Bible**, (Eugene, Oregon, USA 97401: The Eye Opener Publications, 1955) 103.
- **An Understandable History Of The Bible** by Rev. Samuel C Gipp. Bible Believers Baptist Bookstore: 1252 East Aurora Road, Macedonia, Ohio 44056, USA

- **Final Authority** by William P Grady. Grady Publications: PO Box 506, Schererville, Indiana 46375, USA
- **Answers to Tough Questions** by Josh McDowell and Don Stuart. Scripture Press, Amersham-on-the-Hill, Bucks HP6 6JQ, England. (ISBN 0-946515-51-4)
- **Truth Triumphant** by Benjamin. G. Wilkinson, published by Teach Services, Route 1 Box 182, Brushton, USA
- **Final Authority** by William P Grady. Grady Publications: PO Box 506, Schererville, Indiana 46375, USA,

#### Excellent Web stuff

- Henry Morris, Ph.D., “**God’s Only Begotten Son,**” Institute for Creation Research in Back to Genesis, <http://www.icr.org/article/830/>.
- Tim Warner, “**The Gnostic & Arian Corruption of John 1:18**” *Study to Answer. Net* in The Bible Versions Issue (2001) <http://studytoanswer.net/bibleversions/john1n18.html>.
- Mark Oaks, “**Our Beliefs**” *The Bible Church, Home of Expository Bible Studies* (1998-2007) <http://www.bibleword.org/beliefs.shtml#CR>.
- John McTernan, **Defend and Proclaim the Faith Ministries,** <http://www.defendproclaimthefaith.org/>
- **Hope of Israel Baptist Mission website,** Evangelist Bro. K. Daniel Fried, <http://www.site.hopeofisrael.org/Home.php>
- **Dr. Robert Barnett, Which Bible Will You Trust? The Dean Burgon Society's 1992 Annual Meeting, “New Age Bible Versions,”** <http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/KJBible/barnett92.htm#THE%20NEW>.
- David B. Loughran, “**Bible Versions Part One...File 4 of 7**” , Stewarton Bible School webpage, Stewarton, Scotland, <http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/sbs777/vital/kjv/index.html>. July 1999--excellent and to the point articles can be found at the Stewarton Bible School Web Page.
- Jesus is Lord website, **HIS MAJESTIE, King James VI & I Page, King James I, BIOGRAPHY,** <http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/kingbio.htm>
- Dr. Hank Lindstrom, “**Only Begotten Son**” *Biblelineministries Web Page,* <http://www.biblelineministries.org/articles/basearchphp3action=full&mainkey=ONLY+BEGOTTEN+SON&typed=only+begotten+son>
- Dr. W.A. Criswell, “**Christ, The Word of God**” *Criswell Sermon Library* (W.A. Criswell Foundation, 2002) <http://www.wacriswell.com/index.cfm/FuseAction/Search.Transcripts/sermon/311.cfm>.
- Dr. Ken Matto, “**The New American Standard Version--Another Gnostic Version**”, (Scion of Zion Internet Ministry) [http://www.scionofzion.com/nasv\\_agnostic.htm](http://www.scionofzion.com/nasv_agnostic.htm).
- Pastor Jack Moorman, **Modern Bibles the Dark Secret,** [http://www.feasite.org/Tracts/fbcdarks.htm#Names\\_of\\_Christ\\_Missing](http://www.feasite.org/Tracts/fbcdarks.htm#Names_of_Christ_Missing).
- Timothy Binion, “**The Study Of Bible Translation,**” [http://www.pastortim.org/study\\_of\\_bible\\_translation.htm](http://www.pastortim.org/study_of_bible_translation.htm).

- Jesus -is-lord.com Web Page, “**Report of the Committee on Versions, made to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society, and adopted May 1st, 1851**” <http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/transrul.htm>.
- **The Dean Burgon Society Web Page**, <http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/>.
- David W. Daniels, **Bible Versions, Your Questions Answered**, <http://www.chick.com/ask/articles/nkjvtext.asp>, (2000).
- David Cloud, “**What About the New King James Version**”, <http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/whatabout-nkjv.html>.
- Dr. W.A. Criswell, “**Christ, The Word of God**” *Criswell Sermon Library* (W.A. Criswell Foundation, 2002) <http://www.wacriswell.com/index.cfm/FuseAction/Search.Transcripts/sermon/311.cfm>.
- James L. Melton, “**The NKJV: A Deadly Translation**”, <http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/nkjvdead.htm>. Also see **Bible Baptist Publications** website.

The following is a very limited list of books and articles that have been published in an effort to get pastors and the general Christian public to accept the perverted NIV version.

- Richard Barnard, **God's Word in Our Language: The Story of the New International Version**. Colorado Springs: International Bible Society, 1989.
- Kenneth L. Barker, ed., **The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation**. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- Kenneth L. Barker, **Accuracy defined and illustrated: An NIV translator answers your questions**. Colorado Springs: International Bible Society, 1995.
- Kenneth L. Barker, **The Accuracy of the NIV. Grand Rapids: Baker**, 1996.
- Kenneth L. Barker, **The Balance of the NIV: What Makes a Good Translation**. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.
- Burton L. Goddard, **The NIV Story: The Inside Story of the New International Version**. New York: Vantage Press, 1989.
- Richard J. Goodrich and Albert L. Lukaszewski, eds., **A Reader's Greek New Testament**. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004. ISBN: 0310248884. Purports to give the readings adopted by the NIV translation committee, with notes showing variations from the third edition of the UBS Greek New Testament.
- Stephen W. Paine, "Twentieth-Century Evangelicals Look at Bible Translation," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 4/1 (Spring, 1969)
- John H. Skilton, review of the NIV New Testament in *Westminster Theological Journal* 37/2 (Winter 1975)
- Bruce K. Waltke, "The New International Version and Its Textual Principles in the Book of Psalms," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 32/1 (March 1989)
- Carolyn Johnson Youngblood, "The New International Version Translation Project: Its Conception And Implementation," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 21/3 (September 1978)
- D.A. Carson, **The King James Version Debate—A Plea for Realism**, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1979)