

The KJV Controversy and Its Impact on Prophetic Studies

Paul R. Wild, March 10, 2020

Before we launch into a new series on Daniel 7, I feel that some ground rules need to be laid, at least ones that I feel compelled to follow. It is not impossible but is more difficult to explore Bible prophecy and doctrine in general if multiple Bible versions are consulted, because terms may differ between them and, in some cases, later versions do not possess certain verses and passages that the King James Version (KJV) possesses. For this reason and many others, I advocate using only the KJV. Unfortunately, the KJV has been under non-stop assault since 1881. British Anglican theologians by the name of Westcott and Hort - both of them as lost as geese - stated that they only wanted to update the KJV with modern language, but what they actually did was to fool the Anglican church hierarchy and supplanted the Greek text that the KJV is based on with older, corrupt Greek texts that now form the basis of modern Bible versions. At the end of this treatise I will provide a few side by side comparisons of the KJV wording to the wordings of later versions so that readers can see for themselves the degradation of basic doctrines in the later versions.

In recent days, I watched a YouTube video where a scholarly type was asked by the channel host which version of the Bible is the best. Although he was respectful toward the KJV, the scholar inevitably brought up the "older and better Greek texts" argument to support modern versions, such as the Revised Standard Version (RSV), the New American Standard Bible (NASB), the New International Version (NIV), the English Standard Version (ESV), etc. He said that there are now better translations than the KJV, ones which have modern, more relatable English. But the issue is not *translation* but rather *preservation* and *inspiration*. Sure, modern Bible versions may well be great translations, but if they are based on corrupt texts, all you have is a great translation of falsehood. These modern versions are not entirely corrupt, and you can glean some basic Christian doctrines out of them, but like the Apostle Paul said, "A little leaven..." The major problem with the modern versions is that they de-deify Jesus in subtle and sometimes not so subtle ways, lessen the truth of mankind's depraved, sinful nature, and minimize the truth of hell as punishment for the lost. The contrast between Jesus's Godhood and absolute sovereignty versus humanity's utter incapability to save itself is diminished in the modern versions.

As a real-life example of this phenomenon before we met and married, my wife, Christy, had a fellow Sunday school class member who became confused by the Jehovah's Witnesses' (JW) New World Version (NWW) that a JW couple gave him during one of their door-knocking, proselytizing sessions. He got to know the JWs and saw the great marriage they had versus the carnal behavior he saw with Christians in his Sunday school class, thereby concluding the JWs had the truth rather than orthodox Christianity. He began to challenge Christy about the deity of Jesus with the NWW but would recoil when she came back at him with the KJV. You see, the modern versions he had been using before the JWs proselytized him were more like the NWW than the KJV.

Returning to the aforementioned scholar, what he failed to tell his audience is that the modern versions he advocates are based on corrupt Greek texts that were doctored by a

lost, godless heretic, Adamantius Origen, who is often but falsely called an early Church Father by liberal historians. Origen is the father of the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture, a method that disconnects Scripture from its intended meaning and leaves it up to the imagination of the reader as to what it means. He promoted numerous other heresies, such as pre-existence of the soul, purgatory, and the compatibility of Greek Platonic philosophy with Christianity, that time and space don't permit for discussion in this treatise. He traveled extensively around the Mediterranean and altered Greek texts that he encountered, and his emendations were captured in later copies that have made it to our time. We should not be surprised at this, for Paul said in 2 Corinthians 2:17 that people were already corrupting the word of God in his time, so why should we doubt that some lost, godless, deceived soul was doing it a couple hundred years later?

Getting straight to the point, I am saying that God *preserved* His word in the *inspired* Greek text used by the KJV translators, but the new versions are based on Greek texts altered by Origen. Regarding the above-referenced, scholarly type, I got the feeling that below his outward respectfulness was an inner mindset of "There, there, you KJV-only folks; the KJV served its purpose, but move over now and let the adults handle this," and I almost felt like I was being patted on the head as he spoke. Well, even if he didn't have that mindset and I'm just displaying hyper-sensitivity to the issue, I have encountered plenty of Christians, particularly seminarians, who do have that mindset.

I appreciate scholarly, seminary-trained Ph.D.s and Th.D.s who have done the hard work of uncovering truths for the rest of us, laboring in the areas of archaeology, history, Biblical languages, systematic theology, apologetics, hermeneutics, exegesis, Biblical chronology, and so forth. My brother-in-law is a seminarian, and I am tickled that he is, for he provides me a well-trained sounding board to discuss doctrine. Nevertheless, the scholarly types can go off the rails from time to time and lead those without the same knowledge base down the road to a dead end. Case in point, my Yale Divinity School-trained, Ph.D.-level New Testament History and Literature professor during my freshman year of college was an atheist. As a zealous, 17-year-old kid, I found that irritating, so I stayed up all night before the final and wrote him a letter filled with proofs of the existence of God and told him he needed to get saved. I got a C, but I couldn't have cared less if I got an F; deceivers get under my skin.

Why do the scholars attack the KJV and exalt the modern versions? I mentioned up front the "older and better Greek texts" argument. The crux of the issue is that the Greek text for the New Testament that the KJV translators used was based largely on the Textus Receptus (TR), or Received Text, as that being the one received from God the way the original autographs of the apostles were written. The modern, liberalized scholars reject the TR as the inspired, preserved word of God and supplant it with corrupt texts, specifically Sinaiticus Aleph (A) and Vaticanus B (B) under the control of the Roman Catholic Church. The TR was first compiled by Desiderius Erasmus, a Dutch-born, Cambridge professor and Roman Catholic priest of the 1500's who was considered the greatest mind in Europe at the time. Erasmus used the best Greek manuscripts available to him, and he was aware of the existence of corrupt texts that modern scholars now say are "older and better" but

rejected them. The term “Majority Text” (MT) is used to describe the overwhelming majority of ancient Greek texts. There are thousands of them, and all of them are handwritten and copies or copies of copies of the original autographs that are very much in agreement between each other for their Greek wording. The TR correlates very well to the MT, so Erasmus didn’t need to consult dozens of ancient texts to compile his Greek text in order to rebuild the complete canon of the New Testament (NT) in Greek. Prior to Erasmus, the NT was predominantly available only as portions, some very large and some very small, spread among thousands of hand-written documents. Martin Luther, a contemporary and acquaintance of Erasmus, used Erasmus’s text rather than the Roman Catholic’s Latin Vulgate version to develop a German translation that was instrumental in initiating the Protestant Reformation. It’s saying something when the father of the Protestant Reformation used Erasmus’s text rather than the standard text of the Romans.

Now, what about that “older and better” argument? What do the modern scholars say about their preferred texts, A and B, and later texts derived from them? You can see indirect references to these texts in the margin comments of various modern versions, and these comments unveil the disdain the modern translators have for the TR and the KJV. I pulled out the NIV Study Bible and the NASB Study Edition that I had stashed away in boxes to look at some of these margin comments and recorded a few of them herein. Unfortunately, I could not find the RSV that I was given as a reward for completing Presbyterian catechism when I was 12, but it has similar margin comments. Let’s look at some margin comments and verse commentaries from these modern versions, shown in “quotes”:

1. **NIV margin comment and commentary for Mark 16:9-20.** This passage reveals the resurrected Lord and His commandment to go into all the world preaching the gospel: “The earliest manuscripts and some other ancient witnesses do not have Mark 16:9-20” and “Serious doubt exists as to whether these verses belong to the Gospel of Mark. They are absent from important early manuscripts and display certain peculiarities of vocabulary, style and theological content that are unlike the rest of Mark. His Gospel probably ended at 16:8, or its original ending has been lost.”

Read it for yourself and ask yourself if it makes sense to end the gospel at Verse 8, with two women trembling and confused, afraid to tell anyone about the empty tomb, or does it make sense to end the chapter with the exalted Lord commanding His disciples to preach the good news?

2. **NIV margin comment and commentary for 1 John 5:7-8.** These verses boldly teach that God is composed of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit - all distinct from one another, all God, and all unified: “Late manuscripts of the Vulgate *testify in heaven: the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one. And there are three that testify on earth: the* (not found in any Greek manuscript before the sixteenth century)” and “*three*. The OT law required ‘two or three witnesses’ (Dt 17:6; 19:15; see 1 Ti 5:19). At the end of this verse, some older English versions add the

words found in the NIV text note. But the addition is not found in any Greek manuscript or NT translation prior to the 16th century.”

This is the famous Johannine Comma and the strongest verse supporting the doctrine of the Trinity. There is supporting documentation for it in Latin texts and writings of early Church Fathers/clerics/historians. Furthermore, the internal evidence of the Greek indicates that the Comma must be there for the rules of the Greek language to be satisfied, but that’s an entire discussion of its own and too much for this writing to cover. In any case, it has the ring of truth, feels authentic, is consistent with other passages teaching the Trinity, and certainly fits in with the context of 1 John 5.

3. **NASB margin comment for 1 Timothy 3:16. This verse states that God (Jesus) came in the flesh, was vindicated, and was taken up in glory:** “Some later manuscripts read, *God*.”

Yes, later manuscripts like the TR correctly use *God*, whereas the NASB, NIV, RSV, and ESV based on the older, corrupt A and B Greek texts state *He who was revealed in the flesh*, or something similar. This verse, as stated in the KJV, is one of the strongest verses attesting to Jesus as God, whereas the modern versions based on the so-called “oldest and best” manuscripts obliterate that attestation. A *He* could be an angelic being, something which the Mormons might support, but it is not supportable in Christian orthodoxy. Which has the greater ring of truth, *God* or *He*?

The alterations to the *inspired, preserved* text of the TR shown above only scratch the surface of the problem. For anyone caring to see a far more thorough treatment of this issue, I recommend getting copies of [Which Version is the Bible?](#) and [Ripped out of the Bible](#), both by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones. I have read many defenses of the KJV but none better than these. Dr. Jones also wrote [The Chronology of the Old Testament](#), a superb defense of Biblical chronology that exposes the fallacies that liberal scholars propose to attack the historical accuracy of the Bible. I have personally sat under his teaching and found that he is a first-rate scientist and theologian, a combination that most appeals to me. Dr. Jones has a Ph.D. and a Th.D.; majored in geology, chemistry, mathematics, theology, and education from six institutions at the college or university level; has a minor in physics; and is an ordained minister in the Southern Baptist Convention. You can access his writings at the following website:

http://www.floydnojenjones.com/Floyd_Nolen_Jones_2/Home.html

I mentioned up front that I would provide side by side comparisons of the modern versions to the KJV, the proverbial “proof in the pudding.” If you examine them carefully, you will see that many of the modern version verses alter basic Christian doctrine and, in the very least, do not provide as much historical detail as the KJV. Additionally, Dr. Jones compared the TR Greek text to the corrupted Greek text, specifically the one used by the United Bible Society, and found the corrupted text has 2,886 fewer words than the TR. Beloved brethren,

do you know what you're missing if you're reading another version, and can you say without any doubt that whatever you're missing has no effect on your life?

There are many more verses to compare to the KJV than those that are presented herein, but a few are presented in the following, attached table. I pray that you will read them; even if you are not convinced or simply prefer another version over the KJV, I hope you will understand and be OK with why I stick with the KJV. If you want to use the KJV but have a hard time with the older English, you might consider the New KJV that is based on the TR. Although it is superior to the modern versions, it still has some problems when compared to the KJV, so use it with caution.

Verse(s)	KJV	RSV	NASB	NIV	ESV
Colossians 1:14	In whom we have redemption <u>through his blood</u> , even the forgiveness of sins:	in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.	in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.	in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.	in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.
Matthew 9:18	While he spake these things unto them, behold, there came a certain ruler, and <u>worshipped</u> him, saying, My daughter is even now dead: but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live.	While he was thus speaking to them, behold, a ruler came in and knelt before him, saying, "My daughter has just died; but come and lay your hand on her, and she will live."	While He was saying these things to them, a <i>synagogue</i> official came and bowed down before Him, and said, "My daughter has just died; but come and lay Your hand on her, and she will live."	While he was saying this, a synagogue leader came and knelt before him and said, "My daughter has just died. But come and put your hand on her, and she will live."	While he was saying these things to them, behold, a ruler came in and knelt before him, saying, "My daughter has just died, but come and lay your hand on her, and she will live."
Matthew 20:20	Then came to him the mother of Zebedees children with her sons, <u>worshipping</u> him, and desiring a certain thing of him.	Then the mother of the sons of Zeb'edee came up to him, with her sons, and kneeling before him she asked him for something.	Then the mother of the sons of Zebedee came to Jesus with her sons, bowing down and making a request of Him.	Then the mother of Zebedee's sons came to Jesus with her sons and, kneeling down, asked a favor of him.	Then the mother of the sons of Zebedee came up to him with her sons, and kneeling before him she asked him for something.
Mark 9:43-44	And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: <u>Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.</u>	And if your hand causes you to sin, cut it off; it is better for you to enter life maimed than with two hands to go to hell, to the unquenchable fire.	If your hand causes you to stumble, cut it off; it is better for you to enter life crippled, than, having your two hands, to go into hell, into the unquenchable fire, [where THEIR WORM DOES NOT DIE, AND THE FIRE IS NOT QUENCHED.]	If your hand causes you to stumble, cut it off. It is better for you to enter life maimed than with two hands to go into hell, where the fire never goes out.	And if your hand causes you to sin, cut it off. It is better for you to enter life crippled than with two hands to go to hell, to the unquenchable fire.

Verse(s)	KJV	RSV	NASB	NIV	ESV
Mark 10:21	Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, <u>take up the cross,</u> and follow me.	And Jesus looking upon him loved him, and said to him, "You lack one thing; go, sell what you have, and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me."	Looking at him, Jesus felt a love for him and said to him, "One thing you lack: go and sell all you possess and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me."	Jesus looked at him and loved him. "One thing you lack," he said. "Go, sell everything you have and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me."	And Jesus, looking at him, loved him, and said to him, "You lack one thing: go, sell all that you have and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me."
Luke 1:34	Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing <u>I know not a man?</u>	And Mary said to the angel, "How shall this be, since I have no husband?"	Mary said to the angel, "How can this be, since I am a virgin?"	"How will this be," Mary asked the angel, "since I am a virgin?"	And Mary said to the angel, "How will this be, since I am a virgin?"
Luke 9:54-56	And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, <u>even as Elias did?</u> But he turned, and rebuked them, <u>and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save</u>	And when his disciples James and John saw it, they said, "Lord, do you want us to bid fire come down from heaven and consume them?" But he turned and rebuked them. And they went on to another village.	When His disciples James and John saw <i>this</i> , they said, "Lord, do You want us to command fire to come down from heaven and consume them?" But He turned and rebuked them, [and said, "You do not know what kind of spirit you are of; for the Son of Man did not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."] And they went on to another village.	When the disciples James and John saw this, they asked, "Lord, do you want us to call fire down from heaven to destroy them?" But Jesus turned and rebuked them. Then he and his disciples went to another village.	And when his disciples James and John saw it, they said, "Lord, do you want us to tell fire to come down from heaven and consume them?" But he turned and rebuked them. And they went on to another village.

Verse(s)	KJV	RSV	NASB	NIV	ESV
	them. And they went to another village.				
Luke 22:64	And when they had blindfolded him, they struck him on the face, and asked him, saying, Prophecy, who is it that smote thee?	they also blindfolded him and asked him, "Prophecy! Who is it that struck you?"	and they blindfolded Him and were asking Him, saying, "Prophecy, who is the one who hit You?"	They blindfolded him and demanded, "Prophecy! Who hit you?"	They also blindfolded him and kept asking him, "Prophecy! Who is it that struck you?"
Luke 23:38	And a superscription also was written over him in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS.	There was also an inscription over him "This is the King of the Jews."	Now there was also an inscription above Him, "THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS."	There was a written notice above him, which read: THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS.	There was also an inscription over him, ^[a] "This is the King of the Jews."
Acts 8:36-37	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? 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.	And as they went along the road they came to some water, and the eunuch said, "See, here is water! What is to prevent my being baptized?"	As they went along the road they came to some water; and the eunuch said, "Look! Water! What prevents me from being baptized?" [And Philip said, "If you believe with all your heart, you may." And he answered and said, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."]	As they traveled along the road, they came to some water and the eunuch said, "Look, here is water. What can stand in the way of my being baptized?"	And as they were going along the road they came to some water, and the eunuch said, "See, here is water! What prevents me from being baptized?"
Romans 8:1	There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in	There is therefore now no condemnation for	Therefore there is now no condemnation for	Therefore, there is now no condemnation for	There is therefore now no condemnation for

Verse(s)	KJV	RSV	NASB	NIV	ESV
	Christ Jesus, <u>who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.</u>	those who are in Christ Jesus.	those who are in Christ Jesus.	those who are in Christ Jesus,	those who are in Christ Jesus.
Hebrews 1:3	Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had <u>by himself</u> purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high:	He reflects the glory of God and bears the very stamp of his nature, upholding the universe by his word of power. When he had made purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high,	And He is the radiance of His glory and the exact representation of His nature, and ^b upholds all things by the word of His power. When He had made purification of sins, He sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high,	The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word. After he had provided purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven.	He is the radiance of the glory of God and the exact imprint of his nature, and he upholds the universe by the word of his power. After making purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high,