

Review: Dr. Donald A. Waite, *Defending the King James Bible: A fourfold superiority: Text, Translators, Technique, Theology. God's Word Kept Intact in English*, The Bible for Today Press, Collingswood, New Jersey (NJ), 1992 (2006 edn.)

Pages: 327

Excellent Polemic On The King James Bible

An information mine and detailed defense of the King James Bible resting on four foundations. These build a strong bulwark against a range of strategies used by enemies to unseat it.

For the Old Testament the 'oldest and best' Hebrew text as found in the 1008AD Leningrad Codex used in the modern versions (MVs) is not the Ben Chayyim text. It contains up to 30,000 footnotes suggesting changes (the *legendum*) which can be used at will.

The Ben Chayyim text is also supposedly correctable using a hodge podge of sources: the LXX; Latin Vulgate; Dead Sea Scrolls; Josephus' writings; Aramaic Targums; Jerome's Psalms; Greek translations of Origen's Hexapla (Theodotion and Symmachus' works).

For the New Testament the critical Greek-type text (WH/NA/NU) first created by Westcott and Hort is exposed. The argument no traditional reading can be found prior to 400AD (the time of the beloved 'old' uncial MSS) is false: pre-400AD papyri and language versions (e.g. Syrian and Latin) contain the traditional text (TR). Further, Church Father quotations, other MSS, cursive mss, and 100% of lectionaries favour the TR.

Hort's solution to this problem was to simply invent an imaginary early recension at Antioch. By force of tradition this became the standard text and so all evidence for the TR could be dealt with by weight rather than count. Of course the text type Hort preferred was given more weight than the overwhelming bundle of TR witnesses.

Even Greeks today have no faith in WH-from a Greek Orthodox priest in Jerusalem: “We use the Received Text; we have no confidence at all in the Westcott and Hort text.”

That WH and TR texts agree is statistically a lie; WH changes the TR in 5,604 places involving 9,970 Greek words, or 7% of the total.

On translators, the AV scholars are unequalled post 1604-11, notwithstanding the knowledge increase in modern times. Examples are final revision committee member John Bois who could read the Hebrew Bible at age five, and Lancelot Andrewes who could have served as 'interpreter-general' at Babel.

On technique, six companies across three groups plus a final committee resulted in at least seven individual translations of each book, then seven revisions to finalise the work. This was a unique and innovative process.

Dynamic equivalence (the philosophy used in MVs and championed last century by unbeliever Eugene Nida) was rightly rejected by the translators in favour of word and grammatical form.

On theology the lie 'no doctrine is affected' in WH and the MVs is drilled. Eschatology, Soteriology and Christology are all debased in pernicious ways. Stand outs are Mark 16.9-20, John 7.53-8.11, John 5.7, Colossians 1.14, Acts 8.37 and John 1.18. Given the frantic attempt by MV evangelists to pave over this issue, the author devotes forty-seven pages proving his case.

While thorough and perhaps useful for referencing, the alpha-numeric labelling and paragraph formatting results in a somewhat disjointed reading experience.

251 revision and study questions are included which prove to be an excellent way for the reader to cement learnings.

Three appendices deal with what scripture says about the words of God, a list of 135 complete English Bibles since Wycliffe's in 1388 (most claiming to 'update' the English), and common questions.

Introduction (pp. 1-5)

The KJB is posited as being God's words kept *in-tact*¹. This Latin word means 'not touched'¹ so a perfect translation from Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek is implied. Dynamic equivalence is charged with mixing up man's words with God's.

The KJB contains 791,328 words in total, of which 618 may cause some difficulty with regard to meaning for the modern reader.

The lie of 40-50 thousand changes between the 1611 and today's King James is exposed-the author found only 421 changes audible to the ear, of which 285 were a change of *form* and 136 of *substance*.

God's Words Kept Intact is Bible Preservation (pp. 6-19)

The KJB is posited as being God's words kept intact. This Latin word means 'not touched' so a perfect translation is implied possible.

Biblical evidence is given to suggest word preservation:

*Ps 12.6-7 whose exegesis includes preservation being from the Psalmist's generation. This raises an interesting question for the KJBB as the Hebrew Psalms must be preserved, not necessarily in Hebrew (Ben Chayyim text) but Hebrew preservation is strongly suggestive.

*Ps 78.1-7 offers promises that the 'generation to come' might know them (i.e. the words).

*Ps 105.8 is even stronger where preservation of His word is commanded to a thousand generations.

*Ps 119.89 is important to memorise as it shows the eternal and settled nature of God's word.

*Pr 22.20-21 clarifies preservation method will be in writing. Mt 4.4 reinforces this with Jesus' words Himself. Perfect preservation of the

Hebrew text in Hebrew is strongly suggested therefore to at least Jesus' day (from Moses c1500 years prior). The word *written* in Mt 4.4 in Greek is γεγραπται which comes from the verb γραπφο (to write). The tense of *written* is past perfect which signifies an action begun in the past that will continue indefinitely. The other two past tenses are best given by example: past imperfect (e.g. was writing) and past spot or point action (the 'aorist') (e.g. wrote).

*Mt 5.17-18 has Christ's well known promise of preservation of every 'jot' and 'tittle'. The jot is equated with the Hebrew letter *yodh* (י) which looks like an apostrophe, and the tittle is thought to be either the smallest Hebrew vowel point which is a dot, or the difference between the letters *beth* (ב) and *chaph* (כ) the latter being more rounded than the former. Similarly for *daleth* (ד) and *resh* (ר). These two examples present the definition of a tittle as the smallest discernible difference between two Hebrew letters.

*Mt 24.35 is at least the NT/Greek word equivalent of Mt 4.4.

*Jn 14.26 et al are given as evidences of the method of inspiration (in terms of autographa) and preservation (in terms of Christ's original spoken words until the time of writing).

If preservation by God is allowed, his integrity is amply witnessed by scripture so this would usually be a non-issue with sceptics.

Church 'tradition' also records a belief in plenary preservation²:

*London Baptist Confession, 1677 and 1689.

*Philadelphia Baptist Confession, 1743.

*Presbyterian Westminster Confession of Faith, 1646.

*Savoy Confession, 1652.

The Westminster Confession also advocates translation of these original languages³ into 'every vulgar tongue'.

KJB belief is explicitly disavowed by stating preservation of words into English is strictly limited to a translation of the preserved words as found in the MT and TR. This preservation hinges on four premises:

*Superior texts of the MT and TR above the Ben Asher and WH-line specifically.

*Superior translators that carried out the work.

*Superior translation technique involving multiple reviews, checks and balances.

*Superior theology of the KJB specifically regarding Eschatology, Soteriology and Christology.

I Cr 3.9-11 is taken as a fair analogy of the above doctrine-the texts (foundation) must be sure, the translators (builders) must be qualified, the technique (act of building) excellent, and theology (building materials used) of high quality.

The stress of preservation is made by choosing to use the word *words*, rather than *word* (singular).

¹Also part of the etymology of *tactile*.

²The Westminster Confession holds clearly to an MT/TR preservation position: "The Old Testament in Hebrew...and the New Testament in Greek...being immediately inspired by God and...kept pure in all ages...the Church is finally to appeal unto them. This position would necessitate availability of a perfect MT and TR from Malachi c400AD, then Revelation c90AD. This position does not allow for preservation in a third language, e.g. Latin or English (early, middle or modern).

³'Languages' is used as the writers were intelligent and honest enough to know they don't have any original *texts*. While this may open up the door of lower textual criticism to WH, by languages they are clearly referring to the MT and TR. This is to counter the attempt by modern Bible agnostics who claim word preservation yet ultimately believe in concept or idea preservation rather than actual words.

The King James Bible Is God's Words Kept Intact In English Because Of Its Superior Original Language Texts (pp. 20-61)

The Hebrew text or Bible is first dealt with. Etymology, *Masoretic* is from

masor, which means tradition in Hebrew. The NASV (1960), NIV (1969) and NKJV (1979) all use a different Hebrew text, the Biblia Hebraica Kittel⁴ [BHK] (1937) and Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia [BHS] (1967/77).

The BHK is different as despite the text being Ben Chayyim's 1524-25 edition of Daniel Bomberg's 1516-17 Hebrew Bible, each of the 1,424 pages has up to twenty suggested changes making a total up to 30,000 footnotes that can be adopted into the text. This falls far short of Jesus promise in Mt 5.18.

The new versions also use additional 'light' that can be found in learnings of 'cognate languages', lexicography and the Dead Sea Scrolls (for the NASV). The NIV expands on this significantly with usage of: the Latin Vulgate; Samaritan Pentateuch; ancient scribal traditions; the LXX; Symmachus and Theodotion's translation of the Hebrew OT into Greek; the Syriac Peshitta; Aramaic Targums and Jerome's Juxta Hebraica for the Psalms; simply adopting different diacritical marks (vowel points) to change the reading.

The NKJV uses the BHS which uses the Ben Asher text, which in turn is the Leningrad Codex (B19a or L) dated 1008AD and found in Leningrad⁵. The claim is this is not the traditional MT used since Tyndale's day (which would make it a counterfeit). The LXX, Latin Vulgate, ancient translations of Hebrew and manuscripts from the Dead Sea caves were also used.⁶

Romans 3.1-2 is a proof text as to how materials containing the OT text should be weighed as to preservation. 'Oracles' brings to mind the Oracle of Delphi who was a direct conduit between men and the gods, giving them precisely what they said (this goes to the doctrine of inspiration).

The bottom line is non-Hebrew sources should never take priority over the Masoretic text⁷.

From a humanistic viewpoint, scribal copying traditions were very thorough and peculiar, following eight principles:

- (i) Vellum from a clean animal had to be used for the writing and binding material.
- (ii) Each column had between forty-eight and sixty lines.

- (iii) Ink must always be black and prepared by special formula.
- (iv) No copying from memory was allowed (an authentic master was required) and each word had to be pronounced before transcribing.
- (v) Prior to writing *Elohim* the scribe's pen must be wiped, and his whole body washed before *Jehovah*.
- (vi) Form, letter spacing and pen use had special rules.
- (vii) Revision of a completed roll must occur within thirty days. One mistake would condemn a sheet, three condemn the whole work.
- (viii) A checksum was performed by counting every letter. If one letter touched another the manuscript was condemned.

On the MT, Masoretes were scribes who lived in Babylon, Palestine and Tiberius from 500-1000AD which preserved the consonantal text. Some scholars (including the author) believed they also had the vowel points in from the beginning⁸.

The Hebrew text (used in the Reformation) is the Second Rabbinic Hebrew Bible, first printed 1516-17 by Daniel Bomberg, a Hebrew Christian, then revised 1524-25 by Jacob ben Chayyim. This edition contained Rabbinical notes.

The critical Hebrew text is Ben Asher, first published in 1937 (BHS), then 1967/77 (BHK). Apart from this, MVs use nineteen other sources to correct the MT (based on the author's study of 103 Hebrew text examples):

- (i) LXX, changed in 73 places (70%). The LXX is described as very deficient and a paraphrase.
- (ii) Conjecture (no reason), changed in 67 places (65%). This is simply guesswork, with a weak alibi of *legendum* ('L') sourced as 'evidence' of the changing.
- (iii) Syriac OT translation, 20 places (19%).
- (iv) 'A few Hebrew manuscripts' (no data given).
- (v) Latin Vulgate (").
- (vi) Dead Sea Scrolls, 8 times (8%). These scrolls were preserved by the Essenes, a heretical cult that left behind Jerusalem and Judaism. The closest writing to the MT is the Book of Isaiah⁹.
- (vii) Aquila's Greek translation (").
- (viii) Samaritan Pentateuch. The Samaritans were a mixed people (cf. Hs 7.8). (")

- (ix) Quotations from Jerome (").
- (x) Josephus' historical writings (").
- (xi) Ancient scribal tradition (").
- (xii) BHS/K (").
- (xiii) Variant MT margin readings (").
- (xiv) Changes from changing the MT consonant order (").
- (xv) Symmachus' Greek translation (").
- (xvi) Theodotion's Greek translation (").
- (xvii) The Targums-commentary on the Hebrew OT in Aramaic (").
- (xviii) Jerome's Juxta Hebraica (").
- (xix) Changed vowel pointing (").

Scriptural support for the MT comes from:

*Jesus' imprimatur on what existed at the time when he was fighting the devil.

*Mt 5.17-18 and Jesus' canonical statement Law and Prophets. The Law (*Torah*) meant the Pentateuch and Prophets Major, Minor (*neviim*) but also the Writings (*ketuvim*). This is made explicit in Lk 24.44.

Tellingly, Jesus offered no textual criticism while He was on the earth.

From 1898 to 2012 is 115 years which means a new Greek text approximately every four years! Apart from Nestle, workers on this text were Kurt Aland (Committee Chairman and German heathen), Matthew Black (heathen), Carlo Martini (Jesuit and Cardinal), Bruce Metzger (apostate) and Alan Wikgren (apostate).

The TR is best represented today by the TBS reprint of Dr Frederick H. A. Scrivener's Greek text, published by Cambridge University Press 1894. This is essentially the same as Beza's 5th edition of the TR produced 1598, which was the basic Greek text used by the AV translators. The translators departed about 190 places from this text from eight other sources.

Synonyms for the TR include Byzantine, Syrian, or Received text.

Dr Jack Moorman made a comparison between the TR and NA 26th and found the latter was short 2,886 words, equivalent to I & II Peter.

The author proposes thirty-seven historical witnesses to demonstrate why the TR is deserving of its title:

*All the Apostolic churches used it, including in Palestine and Syria.

*Early Churches (c100-312 [Constantine]) used it. This was the time of the greatest textual corruptions, including Marcion (160), Valentius (also 160), Cyrinthus (100) and Sabellius¹¹ (260).

The Peshitta, P⁶⁶, Vetus Itala, Gallic and Celtic, Irish, Scottish and Waldensian Churches are all witnesses.

*Byzantine Period (313-1453) used it. The Gothic version, W (Gospel of Matthew), A (in the Gospels only) and 5,210 cursives (~99%) are witnesses. The Greek Orthodox Church today even still uses the TR.

*Early Modern Period (1454-1881) used it. Reformation Churches, Erasmus' editions, 1522 Complutensian Polyglot of Roman Catholic Cardinal Ximenes, Luther's 1522 German Bible, Tyndale's 1525 NT, 1535 French Olivetan, 1535 Coverdale Bible, 1537 Matthew's Bible, 1539 Taverner Bible, 1539-41 Great Bible under Henry VIII, Robert Stephens' (a.k.a. Stephanus) Greek editions 1546-51), Geneva Bible (1557-60)¹², Bishop's Bible (1568, under Queen Elizabeth), Spanish Reina (1569), Beza's 1598, Czech Version (1602), Italian Diodati (1607), AV1611, Elzevir Brothers Greek Texts (1624-1633).

The modern apostate period (1881-) replaced the TR and the AV in particular by the claim it was hard to understand. The fact the Hebrew OT text and sources were different, and the WH/NA text different (by 10,000 words) were not cited. This is pure deception.

*Manuscript particulars: As at 1967 they totalled 5,255 ¹⁴. Only ~40 witness to the Alexandrian text type, however they are weighted equally as the TR by blind acceptance of Hort's Lucianic Recension Theory. The idea was an authorised revision of the NT which conflated Alexandrian and Western text readings to create the Byzantine text (Byz). This revision of course happened prior to the discovery of the 'old' uncials Aleph and B. Thus footnotes referencing Byz add *and many others* which helps

neutralises 'count' as a witness.

-There are 88 papyri and 15 agree with WH.

-Of 267 uncials only 9 support WH. Of these, 5 'old uncials' Aleph, A, B, C and D (4th-6thC) are most favoured by textual critics.

-Of 2,764 cursives 23 are WH.

-Of 2,143 lectionaries *none* support WH! These are critical witnesses for the authenticity of Mark 16.9-20. Burgon (*The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, 1871) states it was in post Easter readings of the Melchite Syrian and Greek Churches. Textual critic error is found in that Mark 15.43-16.8 was also a reading, after which *τελος* was placed, signifying the end of that lectionary portion, not the whole Gospel.

A tabular summary of the 'battleground' over the Greek NT text:

	TR	WH	Totals	TR%	WH%
Papyri	75	13	88	85%	15%
Uncials	258	9	267	97%	3%
Cursives	2741	23	2,764	99%	1%
Lectionaries	2143	0	2,143	100%	0%
	5,217	45	5,262	99%	1%

*Ancient version particulars: Peshitta Syriac(c150AD), Curetonian Syriac (3rd C) and Vetus Itala are the Received Text.

*Church Father particulars: Dean John Burgon catalogued 86,000 references of quotations in sixteen volumes each 10*12*1.5 in dimension. These are in *handwritten* form!

-From 100-300AD were ~100 writers ('Ante-Nicene').

-From 300-600AD were ~200 writers ('Post-Nicene').

Using 4,383 quotes from 76 writers (pre-400 AD) in Burgon's work, Edward Miller found a 3:2 ratio in favour of the TR. This is a deadly counter to the falsehood 'there are no witnesses to the TR prior to the 4thC'.

Jack Moorman examined 401 quotations of 86 writers from 110-397AD and found 279 support the TR, a higher ratio of 2.4:1.

Aleph and B are the two foundations of the critical text and so deserve scrutiny. Supposedly they are 4th C and the reason for preservation is the dry climate of Egypt and their lack of use (due to corruptions)¹⁵. Apostate German scholar Tischendorf purchased¹⁶ Aleph from the monks at St Catherine's monastery in 1859. A Dr James Quorllo had a canny way of valuing Aleph:

“I don't know which of them had the truer evaluation of its worth-Tischendorf, who wanted to buy it, or the monks, who were getting ready to burn it!”

Tischendorf reported 15,000 corrections in Aleph¹⁷. In *Codex B and It's Allies*, Herman C. Hoskier showed Aleph and B disagreed over 3,000 places in the Gospels alone.

Hort's 1881 theory had three principles: (a) agreement between Aleph and B showed a correct reading; (b) agreement between B and any one other manuscript showed a correct reading; (c) in the absent of agreement between B and at least one other manuscript, B alone was the correct reading!

The 'Lucianic drawcard' was again pulled out by Hort to explain away why the majority of Church Father quotations support the TR over Aleph and B. The Church Father editions were revised to align with TR.

⁴Kittel was an apostate German rationalist who subscribed to the JEDP hypothesis.

⁵This was published as a Hebrew Bible in 1937 by Paul Kahle who 'regarded it as superior' (see *Holy Bible: Next Millennium Edition* [New King James Version], (Review and Herald Publishing Association: Hagerstown, MD), 1990, Preface, vii.

⁶Ibid.

⁷This doctrine is sound but does not allow for the case where part of the Hebrew may have multiple witnesses, be 'lost' or unclear however anterior to this is was perfectly translated into another language for preservation. Such is the case with Erasmus' 1516 Greek for the end of Revelation.

⁸These are also called *matres lectiones*.

⁹There are actually two Isaiah scrolls, 'A' and 'B'

Today, the rival to the traditional Greek text, the TR is the Nestle/Aland Greek NT, 26th edition¹⁰. Eberhard Nestle began his tradition in 1898 with a mixed text based on Tischendorf, WH and Wheymouth (Wheymouth was substituted for Bernhard Weiss in 1901).

¹⁰The 28th was released 2012.

¹¹Responsible for the heresy of modalism prevalent in the Eastern Orthodox Church. Today it is found in Oneness Pentecostalism. This is thought to be the reason why there are no early Greek witnesses to the Johannine Comma.

¹²The first Bible with verse divisions for ease of reference.

versions, cursive manuscripts (mss), lectionary readings, and Church Father quotations¹³:

¹³Cursives, papyri, uncials and lectionaries also seem to be group together as simply 'manuscript' evidence.

¹⁴Today the count is up to ~5,600.

¹⁵As to their antiquity, Dr Constantine Simonides claimed he authored Aleph as a gift to Czar Nicolas I of Russia in 1840. B (Vaticanus) was only entered into the Vatican library in 1475.

¹⁶To this day the monks say he stole it.

¹⁷Today, the British Museum reports up to 35,000!

Chaldee, Syriac and Arabic, and had Hebrew 'at his finger's ends'.

The King James Bible is God's Words Kept Intact In English Because of Its Superior Translators (pp. 62-82)

Three important histories on the translators are:

* *The Translators to the Reader*, John Bois.

* *The Men Behind the King James Version*, Gustavus S. Paine.

* *Translators Revived*, Alexander McClure.

The translators had an unfeigned respect for the Word of God, its practical and spiritual power, and a desire to place it into the hand of the common man. Their familiarity and quotations of scripture have a different feel than similar sounding prefaces of the MVs.

The work began 1604 as an outcome of the Hampton Court conference.

Six groups were formed, two from Cambridge (OT and Apocrypha), Oxford (OT and NT) and Westminster Abbey (OT and NT). The Apocrypha was expressly denied as scripture by the Anglican Church's *Thirty-Nine Articles*.

Some of the fifty-seven men were Puritans, including John Reynolds who was their spokesman before King James. There were some magnificent scholars on the OT groups, including:

*Dr Lancelot Andrews: Wrote his private devotionals in Greek, thought skilful enough to be able to translate at Babel and conversant in fifteen languages.

*Dr William Bedwell: Wrote a Persian dictionary and revived the study of Arabic in Europe. This knowledge was important as cognate ('sister') languages can throw light on Hebrew meanings. MVs laud 'advanced' knowledge of cognate languages over the 'primitive' AV translators.

*Dr Miles Smith: Wrote a commentary on all 300 Greek and Latin Church Fathers, was expert in Standouts on the NT group:

*Sir Henry Saville: Greek and Mathematics tutor to Queen Elizabeth, translated all of John Chrysostom's (Greek) writings of eight large dictionary's worth, and translated the Latin histories of Cornelius Tacitus adding notes.

*John Bois: Could read the Hebrew Bible age five and write in Hebrew age six, write letters in Greek, would study Greek in the library from 0400 to 2000, and at death had accumulated ~30,000 pages of writings.

As a digression, Bois translated the Apocrypha, which the author denies:

*All were written in Greek, one in Latin.

*No author claimed inspiration.

*The Jews never accepted them.

*Not placed with scripture books in the Early Church Period¹⁸.

*Contain anachronisms, e.g Maccabees I and II where Antiochus Epiphanes dies three different ways.

*Suggests prayers for the dead.

*Contains evil doctrine: witchcraft potions, suicide, assassinations and lying.

McClure sums up the superiority of the translators:

“all the colleges of Great Britain and America, even in this proud day of boastings [1857AD] could not bring together the same number of divines...”

On the inferiority of modern translators:

“The newly-risen versionists...are not worthy to 'carry satchels' after those masters of ancient learning.”

He sums up the quality of the AV with the hostile witness Papist Dr Alexander Geddes.

¹⁸Jerome's Latin Vulgate (384-404AD) excluded them.

The King James Bible is God's Words Kept Intact In English Because of Its Superior Technique (pp. 83-130)

The translation technique had two parts: (i) the stipulated rules and practicality of teamwork, and (ii) the translation methodology itself. King James set fifteen rules for the committee to abide by and importantly to counter AV detractors did not carry out any translating.

(i) Each institution had two groups of approximately seven men. They all had to translate a personal version of each book in their own handwriting (Rule 8). Once all books were completed the company as a whole would agree on a final version. This would then be circulated to the other five companies for their input (Rule 9). A final revision committee of twelve (two per group) would then review each book (Rule 10). This process resulted in fourteen translations and revisions per book.

Knowledge was not restricted to the 57 translators¹⁹; if required any learned man in the whole land or that Bishops knew of in their parishes could be sought out (Rules 11 and 12).

MV translators do not all possess the ability to translate each book on their own and no technique is as rigorous as that involved in production of the AV.

Books were allocated as follows:

- *Oxford I: Isaiah to Malachi.
- *Oxford II: Gospels, Acts and Revelation.
- *Westminster I: Genesis to II Kings.
- *Westminster II: Pauline Epistles, Catholic Epistles, Hebrews.
- *Cambridge I: I Chronicles to Ecclesiastes.
- *Cambridge II: Apocrypha.

(ii) The dynamic translation method of MVs is an oxymoron; a 'movement' that somehow leaves the source unchanged. The opposite is formal and verbal equivalence which preserves the words, their order and grammar. DE aims to translate idiom or meaning and involves all three of adding, subtracting and changing the words of God as delivered in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. DE is also a paraphrase methodology and can transform the source text's grammar to suit.

The spirit behind DE is Satan, seen in Gn 3.1 when he subtracted part of God's commandment to Adam. In Gn 3.4 Satan changes (lies) about the consequences of eating the fruit, that they would not die. Satan adds to God's words in Gn 3.5 where their 'eyes would be opened'²⁰.

DE also divides changes into 'implicit' and 'explicit' groups. Implicit changes involve adding words implied by the text (e.g. 'when he descends from heaven' in I Th 4.14), explicit is removing 'redundancies' (e.g. 'well stricken in years' from Lk 1.18)

The Apostle of DE was Eugene Nida who began in Wycliffe Bible Translators and the Summer Institute of Linguistics. His major works span

1947-1966 (when the paraphrase *Good News for Modern Man* was released).

DE also fosters an apathetic mentality to source texts used for translation-if idiom has primacy over words and both text lines contain the same idioms in some way there is no real conflict.

The author studied DE usage in the MVs:

*NASV: 4,000 examples

*NIV: 6,653 examples. The NIV has completely eliminated the words 'sodomite', 'fornication', 'carnal', 'impute', 'abide', 'chasten', and 'concupiscence.'

*NKJV: 2,000 examples. This version places both NU and MT textual variants in the footnotes.

Comparisons were made with the AV, MT and TR. An annoying trait of DE in the MVs is to translate verbs in the subjunctive mood as indicative. Pronouns are also exchanged for nouns and vice versa.

A 1611 King James was compared with today's King James and 421 changes to the ear were recorded.

A true translation needs to 'carry' (*trans*) 'across' (*latus*) the source to the destination unchanged. A Doctor of Assyriology, Francis Steele, identified characteristics of a good translation, including:

*'Modern' idioms are expendable.

*Using the fewest words possible.

*Not adding words, including expansion or explanation.

*Closest possible approximation to the source language is required.

The future of translation is grim, firstly due to lack of finances required for such a project and secondly DE would be used.

¹⁹Only 48 names are listed in the British Museum.

²⁰Like the opening of one's Third Eye in Eastern Religions.

The King James Bible is God's Words Kept Intact In English Because of Its Superior Theology (pp. 131-183)

The major premise is the AV is superior, making the MVs necessarily deficient. This is judged on the basis of doctrine, particularly Eschatology, Soteriology and Christology.

The standard lie of Christian scholars is 'no major doctrine is affected in the Mvs'. This has been proffered by:

*Dr Philip Schaff-1901 ASV chairman and apostate.

*Dr John R. Rice-evangelist and editor of *Sword of the Lord*.

*Dr Robert L. Sumner.

*Dr Stanley Gundry.

*Dr Ernest Pickering.

Since there are 2,886 word differences in the critical Greek text compared to the TR it is absurd from the start to believe no doctrines are impacted. Dr Jack Moorman in *Doctrinal Passages* looked at 356 changes between the Greek texts.

The author took 158 of Moorman's 356 examples and expounds on their errors.

*(Serious) Miscellaneous: I Jn 5.7 (denial of the Trinity), Mk 16.9-20 (denial of the resurrection, the Great Commission and spiritual gifts), Jn 7.53-8.11 (denial of Christ's mercy over judgment), Lk 4.4 (weakening of verbal preservation).

*On Eschatology: Mt 25.13 (denial of Christ's return); Mk 6.11 (denial of Judgment degrees); Mk 9.44,46 (denial of a literal Hell); Lk 11.2 (denial of a literal Heaven).

*On Soteriology: Rv 21.24 (denial of limited salvation); James 5.16

(denial of confession of sins to God alone); I Cr 5.17 (denial of Christ's vicarious death for believers.; Cl 1.14 (denial of blood atonement); Mk 9.42 (denial of Christ *alone*).

*On Christology: Jn 3.13 (denial of Christ's omnipresence while on the earth); I Tm 3.16 (denial of Christ's deity); I Jn 4.3 (denial of Christ's bodily incarnation); Jn 7.8 (denial of Christ's sinlessness); II Jn 1.9 (denial of Christ's doctrine); Mt 1.25 (denial of Christ's virgin birth); Lk 2.33 (denial of Christ's Sonship); Lk 24.40 (denial of Christ's bodily resurrection); John 1.18 (denial of Christ's deity); Rv 1.8,11 (denial of Christ's eternal nature); Ac 8.37 (denial of Christ's Sonship);

Appendix A-The Importance of God's Words (pp. 184-196)

A plethora of verses (~130) are given proving the importance of God's words themselves and therefore condemning DE.

Again, it is worth remembering Jack Moorman found 2,886 Greek words have been completely omitted from the TR in WH.

*Ex 34.1 also demolishes the originals-only inspiration argument when God writes the same words on the second set of stone tables prepared by Moses;

*Dt 6.6-how can the words of God be in one's heart when they are unknown?

*I Sm 3.19 deals with preservation where none of God's words would be let fall to the ground.

*Job 19.23 is explicit regarding preservation, specifically in print in a book.

Appendix B-A Chronological List of Complete English Bibles and New Testaments Printed During The Last 612 Years, From 1380 to 1991 (pp. 197-215)

From 1380-1991, 428 NT (135) and complete bibles (293) have been printed in English, an average of 1 every 1.4 years! From the reformation

(1500ts-) .here is a clear statistical trend of increasing translation frequency per annum

The listing draws from William J. Chamberlin's, *Catalogue of English Bible Translations*.

On the AV, 19 special, and 23 curious year editions are given.

Appendix C-Questions and Answers On the Subject of “defending the King James Bible-God's Words Kept Intact In English.” (pp. 216-250)

Thirty-six common questions are answered.

*Beza's 1598 is taken as *the* infallible edition of the TR. This is the same type of question as 'where was the Bible before 1611'?

*The author admits even as a Professor of Greek at university he knew nothing of the sound case for the TR.

*Wine in the Bible etymologically comes from 'vine' (the first letter with one rather than two 'v's).

*On the different AV editions: 1629 (reviewed by original translators Dr Samuel Ward and Dean Bois); 1638 (again reviewed by original translators); 1762 (Dr Thomas Paris, Fellow of Trinity College); 1769 (Dr Benjamin Blayney's edition which contained 65,000 marginal notes and cross references. Out of 791,328 words, the author found only 421 audible changes, of which in turn only 136 are said to be material).

*Only the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words 'breathed out' by God are said to be inerrant (θεοπνευστος, cf II Tm 3.16). No translation can be inerrant according to the author since those words weren't breathed out. AV infallibility is denied.

*Easter is deemed an accurate translation of Ishtar's celebration, not Passover.