

Mark Ward - The Authorized Misuse of a Bible College Degree



In *Authorized, The Use & Misuse of the King James Bible*¹, BJU graduate Dr Mark Ward presents an über-cringeworthy critique of the Authorized Version (AV). Mark was a twenty-five King James Bible *reader*² before switching over to the ‘embarrassment of riches’ stashed away inside the modern versions. His seven main (overlapping) arguments are as follows, with comments added:

1. The AV is written in archaic Elizabethan English which is now significantly incomprehensible in parts and only fully accessible to specialists.

Mark equivocates this period with Shakespearean or Early **Modern** English, which is wrong as the Elizabethan Era ended with her death in 1603³. The 1611 AV, and to some extent Shakespeare, were the *genesis* and *creative forces* of “Modern” or “Standard” English, which is why they remain comprehensible today, orthographical changes notwithstanding.

Mark also turns to atheist Professor John McWhorter who says, “the language of the King James Bible was already somewhat archaic when it was written.”⁴

2. Children and adults alike cannot understand the AV.

Channelling Kenneth Taylor and his 1962 *Living Bible*, (“...he recalled his longstanding dissatisfaction with the King James Bible; the text simply didn't make sense to his children”)⁵, Mark confounds a modern-day ‘plough boy’ by asking “What is a shew of will worship?,” from Colossians 2.23, and then agrees he is equally baffled⁶. The confusion here is how a Christian ‘doctor’ doesn’t understand “will worship” is worship driven by the will or the fleshly mind of verse 18.

About adults, Mark recounts the story of how engineer Howard Long and his Pastor Peter De Jong birthed the NIV because Howard claimed, “the KJV just didn’t communicate,” and, “if we don’t have a satisfactory version, why don’t we get one?”⁷

¹Faithlife Films, 2018, produced by Reuben Evans.

²There is a vast gulf between this and a King James Bible *believer*.

³en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Early_Modern_English

⁴At 29:49-29:52

⁵christianitytoday.com/ct/2005/juneweb-only/55.0a.html?start=3, June 10, 2005

⁶At 01:50-2:27

⁷biblica.com/articles/history-of-the-niv-bible-translation/

3. The AV vocabulary contains many ‘false friends’.

After a definition from Prof. McWhorter, Mark shows how the AV errs in Psalm 23.1 (“The LORD *is* my shepherd, I shall not **want**”), since his brother-in-law at age six was confused and asked his AWANA leader, “why wouldn’t I **want** *him* [the LORD]?”⁸. Mark says it should say “lack”.

Perhaps the boy’s AWANA leader couldn’t straighten out his confusion over an imagined object, or was not able to read him some of the fifty other verses using “want” to teach the sense of the word, e.g.:

“And when they **wanted** wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, **They have no wine.**” John 2, 3 AV

See “KJV Quiz Time” below for equally lame examples.

4. The KJV is not the ‘language of the street’.

Mark claims that God had men use ‘vernacular’ or common Greek (and Hebrew) in writing the autographs, based on work by papyrologists Bernard Grenfell and Arthur Hunt. From 1896 to 1906, they dug up thousands of Greek papyri (not Hebrew) from a *rubbish dump* at Oxyrhynchus, Egypt.

He then claims the ‘Elizabethan-English’ KJV is *not* a vernacular translation⁹, showing Ephesians 6.5 [and promoting slavery]:

MW common translation: “**Slaves**, be obedient to your masters.”

AV: “**Servants**, be obedient to them that are *your* masters.”

The AV here is as ‘vernacular’ as Mark’s rendition, so what is his argument? He goes further, saying even the hardest NT Greek was still ‘current’, i.e., understandable. Mark is unfamiliar in II Peter 3.16, where even the Apostle Peter struggled with Paul’s NT Greek as did many common Greeks:

“As also in all *his* epistles, speaking in them of these things: **in which are some things hard to be understood**, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as *they do* also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.”

5. ‘Western’ English differs from ‘Eastern’ English and so has no right of primacy.

Basically, the AV’s english is to 20thC ‘English’ english as the latter’s is to Indian,

⁸ At 12:34-12:58

⁹ At 22:48-22:53

Singaporean or Kenyan english. In other words, because no one country's English can be better or worse than another's, the AV's english is a dying relic that should accept fate's decree and go quietly off into the night in the name of 'progress'.

6. Since everyone must 'trust the experts', modern version translators are equally trustworthy as the AV translators.

Mark holds in order to be justified in claiming authority of a particular English translation one must meet the following criteria:

1. You must know Hebrew.
2. You must know Greek.
3. You must know English.
4. You must check many existing translations.

Because Mark himself fails this test, he moves to an *argumentum ad populum*, that people trusting the AV (and 'voting' in a sense for its 47 superb translators) are therefore 'voting' *against* "hundreds of world class" modern version translators.

How many honest enquirers would conclude that *any* modern version translator on the planet has qualities 1-4, and could hold a candle to even *one* of the AV translators?

7. Since Miles Smith wrote, "the meanest translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession...is the Word of God", all modern versions are to be held as God's words.

Mark errs greatly in not even understanding this quote, in which the translators qualify their meaning with **men of our profession**. They would *never* have included the 1881/1885 RV, a product of heretic-Universalist Dr George Vance Smith, likewise Joseph Thayer's 1901 ASV, or the NIV by sodomites Dr Marten Woudstra and consultant Dr Virginia Mollenkott.

Mark ignored what it says in conclusion about their purpose, that they wanted the AV to be the "**one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against**; that hath been our endeavour, that our mark."

Addendum - "KJV Quiz Time"

These are Mark's seven 'egregious' examples why modern readers (himself included) cannot understand the AV. Do you agree?

Verse	False Friend	Quiz Option				MW Version
		A	B	C	D	
Psalm 23 (I shall not want)?	want	wish	pine	lack	desire	C
I Kings 18.21 (How long halt ye between two opinions?)	halt	stop	limp	vacillate	pause	B
Romans 5.8 (But God commendeth his love toward us)	commendeth	proves	showcases	demonstrates	recommends	B
I Timothy 3.2 (Apt to teach)	apt	eager	able	inclined	willing	B
Daniel 3.16 (we are not careful to answer thee in this matter)	careful	attentive	inattentive	worried	interested	C
Ephesians 5.4 (which are not convenient)	convenient	reasonable	appropriate	commodius	easy	B
Proverbs 22.28 (remove not the ancient landmark)	remove	move	take away	confiscate	detach	A

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v= 7jAH3O5AUA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7jAH3O5AUA)