

The 1611 Holy Bible Cleanses Fundamental Evangelical Modern Version Falsehood

Introduction

This writer has collated the following summary studies from numerous emails forwarded to believers with an interest in resisting false doctrine that issues from many pulpits today via the modern versions, even from fundamental evangelical pulpits.

The studies arose from this writer's responses carried out over a period of years to false doctrine concerning the scriptures that follow that was preached from fundamental evangelical sources.

The studies address the following **53** verses of scripture that directly or indirectly were subjected to false doctrine and/or contamination from fundamental evangelical sources in this writer's hearing during that period of time.

Genesis 12:3, Job 9:33, 38:12, Psalm 150:1, 6, Proverbs 25:18, Isaiah 59:19, Jeremiah 15:16, Matthew 7:24, 26, 13:44, Luke 2:11, 14, 22, 22:14, 24:40, 51, 52, 53, John 1:18, 3:5, 7, 13, 16, 18, 5:39, 13:2, 14:23, 21:15, 16, 17, Acts 1:3, 8, 3:19, 7:45, Romans 1:16, 1 Corinthians 10:16, 11:24, 2 Corinthians 6:14, 13:14, Ephesians 5:30, Titus 2:13, Hebrews 4:8, 11:11, 1 Peter 1:22, 2:2, 6, 9, 2 Peter 1:1, 7, 11, 1 John 3:1, Revelation 7:14

The studies are arranged as far as possible according to the order of the Books in the 1611 Holy Bible i.e. not chronologically. Note that some studies cover multiple topics with several scriptures cited from various Bible books. These are set in order of the scripture of earliest occurrence in the scriptures.

Study titles in *red bold italic text* have been imposed for this work but the studies are set out as first sent. Owing to the variety of the studies' contents a variety of formats has resulted. However, this writer's statements always appear in normal type or *blue text*. Replies received from among the recipients are reproduced anonymously in *shaded yellow text*. As will be seen, these replies resulted in extended study on the scripture in question. Anonymity of recipients has been preserved throughout this work and [name removed] appears wherever a reply was addressed to a particular individual.

Some annotations in *blue braces* [] have been inserted including references. Some repetition of citations will be observed in this work. This was done because those particular citations have wide application.

It is hoped that the studies will help readers to appreciate something of the lamentable state even of today's supposedly conservative branch of the Christian church in the UK but also serve as an encouragement to go on trusting unequivocally in the 1611 Holy Bible as God's cleansing agent against all modern version falsehood.

"Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you" John 15:3.

See at the conclusion of this work as a basis for this work essential summary information that the critics of the 1611 Holy Bible will not face because God says of each and every one of them *"Thou givest thy mouth to evil, and thy tongue frameth deceit"* Psalm 50:19.

Correcting the Greek with the King James English

Table The 1611 Holy Bible versus Vatican Versions, Disputed New Testament Verses.

See also the following summary on the superiority of 1611 Holy Bible over the Greek and the original. That summary sets the scene for this work, which it is hoped sheds light as Solomon said.

"But the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day" Proverbs 4:18.

The Superiority of the 1611 Holy Bible over the Greek and the Original

A common refrain from the enemies of the 1611 Holy Bible is this:

The AV1611 may be tolerated but it is still inferior to “the Greek” or to “the Original.”

There are at least 8 reasons why the AV1611 is in fact superior to ‘the Greek’ - and to ‘the Original’ [[Biblical Scholarship by Dr Peter S. Ruckman Appendix 7](#)]:

1. The AV1611 uses **“synagogues”** in Psalm 74:8, instead of the Hebrew *“meeting places,”* showing that the reference is yet future, to the great tribulation.
2. The Pre-millennial order of the books from 2 Chronicles to Psalms in the AV1611 preserves the order of events in the history of Israel from the destruction of Jerusalem 70 A.D. to the Second Advent. This order is superior to that of the Hebrew Bible.
3. In an age ruled by the television, **“pictures”** in Numbers 33:52 is far superior to the original Hebrew of *“carved stones.”*
4. The AV1611 alone uses **“forces”** in Daniel 11:38 instead of the literal Hebrew *“fortresses.”* The AV1611 reading is superior because it is a reference to the use of electricity, Luke 10:18, the highest form of energy, especially in the tribulation. See Revelation 13:13. It virtually rules our lives now.
5. The AV1611 has **“churches”** in Acts 19:37, showing where heathen devoted to the **“queen of heaven”** Jeremiah 7:18, 44:17, 18, 19, 25 actually WORSHIP. This is far superior to the ‘original Greek,’ which gives *“temples.”*
6. The AV1611 has **“Easter”** in Acts 12:4 instead of the literal Greek equivalent *“Passover.”* Note that **“(Then were the days of unleavened bread.)”** Acts 12:3. The reading *“Passover”* is obviously wrong in the context. In addition, J. A. Moorman in *Conies Brass and Easter* p 13 states that it was Tyndale who *invented* the word *Passover* but Tyndale used the word **“Easter”** in Acts 12:4 in his New Testament. Tyndale, like the King James translators, understood the scriptures better than modern version editors and their supporters.
7. The tense of the Greek in Galatians 2:20 is *“I have been crucified”* but Luke 9:23 shows that a man is to take up the cross DAILY. The AV1611 reading, **“I am crucified”** is therefore both correct and superior to ‘the Greek.’
8. The AV1611 alone has **“corrupt”** in 2 Corinthians 2:17, where the ‘original Greek’ is *“peddle”* according to the modern revisers. The AV1611 is superior because it is warning you against modern Bible corrupters.

Insistence on ‘the Greek’ or ‘the original’ is really a violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9 but fundamentalists do it all the time. They are what Spurgeon called *“little popelings”*!

See *The Greatest Fight in the World* archive.spurgeon.org/misc/gfw.php.

The Bible calls it being **“wise in your own conceits”** Romans 11:25.

Additional Note: Regenerative Translations Superior to Degenerative Originals

It should be understood that anyone who appeals to the original, so-called, or the Greek and the Hebrew, so-called and invariably undefined, over the King James English is saying that the word of God has lost information in transmission i.e. translation. Fundamentalists repeatedly say words to that effect. However, if the word of God has lost information in translation, it has degenerated. If the word of God is subject to degeneration, then anyone who appeals to the original, so-called, or the Greek and the Hebrew, so-called, over the King James English is saying that the Lord Jesus Christ lied when He said as recorded 3 times in scripture ***“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away”*** Matthew 24:35, Mark 13:31, Luke 21:33.

In addition, your salvation is predicated on the integrity and incorruptibility of ***“the word of God”*** as Peter states ***“Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever”*** 1 Peter 1:23. Anyone therefore who appeals to the original, so-called, or the Greek and the Hebrew, so-called, over the King James English is saying that the apostle Peter lied because the word of God is subject to degeneration and is therefore corruptible.

Therefore your salvation is subject to degeneration and it too is corruptible.

Further, anyone who appeals to the original, so-called, or the Greek and the Hebrew, so-called, over the King James English is also saying that the apostle James lied when he said ***“...receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls”*** James 1:21.

There’s no point because it isn’t and it won’t, according to anyone who appeals to the original, so-called, or the Greek and the Hebrew, so-called, over the King James English.

That is, you don’t have salvation and you can never have it, according to anyone who appeals to the original, so-called, or the Greek and the Hebrew, so-called, over the King James English.

That’s about as blasphemous as it gets but fundamentalists do it all the time.

You should of course be encouraged that translation is not degenerative but is always *regenerative*, an improvement over the original in scripture:

“So do God to Abner, and more also, except, as the LORD hath sworn to David, even so I do to him; To translate the kingdom from the house of Saul, and to set up the throne of David over Israel and over Judah, from Dan even to Beersheba” 2 Samuel 3:9-10.

“Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son” Colossians 1:13.

“By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God” Hebrews 11:5.

Genesis 12:3, John 14:23, 21:15, 16, 17, Acts 3:19, Hebrews 11:11, “curse...curseth,” “words,” “lovest...love,” “the times of refreshing,” “was delivered of a child”

As you’ll appreciate, two issues arose on Tuesday night that illustrate problems that most churches have and explain why God though merciful to His children is largely withholding blessing in these perilous times 2 Timothy 3:1.

1. The implication that God is all through with Israel

He is not. It is true that spiritual distinctions disappear in Christ and those in Christ are “Abraham’s seed,” although, as was said, spiritually not physically.

“There is **neither Jew nor Greek**, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye **Abraham’s seed**, and heirs according to the promise” Galatians 3:28-29.

However “God hath not cast away **his people** which he foreknew...” Romans 11:2, as Paul explains. “His people” [in the context] cannot be Christians, as Paul has already established, Romans 8:29-39.

“For I would not, brethren, that ye should be **ignorant** of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own **conceits**; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. **And so all Israel shall be saved**: as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins” Romans 11:25-27.

This will happen for Israel as a nation at the Second Advent, as Peter states. “Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, **when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord**” Acts 3:19. “The times of refreshing” are yet future. Modern versions, NIVs, NKJV, change the wording to cut out the prophetic aspect aimed at the nation of Israel.

Paul is saying to Christians therefore in Romans 11:25-27 that you are conceited and ignorant if you think that God is all through with Israel as a nation – as distinct from saved Jews now in the body of Christ.

2. The notion that the original languages have to be consulted to find out what God ‘really’ said according to a statement like ‘the translations don’t show the difference in meaning in the different Greek/Hebrew words used for the one English word etc.’ or words to that effect.

It should first be understood that serious problems arise with any attempts to consult the original languages, i.e. Hebrew and Greek, in order, supposedly, to understand the scriptures.

First, currently available Hebrew-English and Greek-English dictionaries and interlinears are not trustworthy references for word meanings because they were compiled by unsaved individuals antagonistic to the scripture i.e. the AV1611. That applies to ALL such sources today. For that reason alone, such sources are not authoritative and can never be exalted in authority over the AV1611, which defines its own terms e.g. Mark 13:11 for the Biblical definition of the word premeditate.

All this is explained by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger in her books *The Language of the King James Bible*, *In Awe of Thy Word* and *Hazardous Materials*.

Another equally serious problem arises with a statement like ‘the translations don’t show the difference in the Greek/Hebrew words used for the one English word etc.’

The usual example given is that of agape (Greek, self-giving love, supposedly) versus phileo (Greek, friendly but not self-giving love, supposedly) in John 21:15-17. However, the distinction is not valid either in Greek or in English. Anyone can see that the example is not valid from the expression “the third time” in John 21:17, showing that no real difference exists between agape and phileo. However, ordinary believers are easily misled into thinking that ‘the Hebrew’ and/or ‘the Greek’ have something to offer when they don’t. They never do, as such but the misleading notion that they might is a serious problem.

See for further detail:

samgipp.com/47-what-about-nuggets-found-only-in-the-greek-new-testament/ Question 47
samgipp.com/the-answer-book-appendix-1/.

See also the attached on ‘in the Greek,’ which I hope is helpful [\[at the conclusion of this work\]](#). You’ll note the mention in that item of differences between the 1984 NIV i.e. the church bibles and its replacement the 2011 NIV. See additional attached* item therefore showing [\[200\]](#) distinct differences in meaning between the two editions i.e. they can’t both be ‘the word of God.’ That list of [\[200\]](#) verses is not exhaustive.

*[\[See AV1611 versus Changing NIVs not included in this work www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/version-comparison.php.\]](#)

By way of illustration, see in particular Hebrews 11:11, which was read out on Tuesday night [\[see item at the conclusion of this work\]](#). The church bibles and the 2011 NIV are different. The wording and the meaning are both different. They are not the same thing expressed a different way and therefore for that reason alone they cannot both be ‘the word of God.’

The church bibles are in fact wrong but both editions are wrong in that they leave out “and was delivered of a child.” The excision of the phrase can be traced to Jerome’s Catholic Vulgate of the 5th century, from the corrupt Alexandrian sources he used and the Jesuit-Rheims New Testament of 1582, which cut the words out AFTER the faithful Bibles of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation i.e. Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew etc. included them. The church bibles are therefore basically just warmed-over Jesuit and Douay-Rheims versions made worse by even more omissions, www.av1611.org/niv.html. These are perpetuated in the 2011 NIV. The church bibles i.e. 1984 NIV and the 2011 NIV DO agree in that evil respect! Both editions show 100s of the same serious departures from the AV1611, including the cutting out of 17 entire verses in the New Testament; Matthew 17:21, 18:11, 23:14, Mark 7:16, 9:44, 46, 11:26, 15:28, Luke 17:36, 23:17, John 5:4, Acts 8:37, 15:34, 24:7, 28:29, Romans 16:24, 1 John 5:7. They nevertheless retain the established verse numbering system, which is of course inconsistent. Overall satanic progression of the new versions is however evident in other ways. Note how the church bibles make a liar out of the Lord Jesus Christ in the footnotes, John 7:8, 10. The 2011 NIV does so in its text, which is heinous.

In sum, no-one who really loves the Lord Jesus Christ, John 14:23 “Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my **words...**” * would touch the NIVs with a barge pole as ‘bibles.’

(The same is true for any modern version, including the NKJV, www.av1611.org/nkjv.html.)

*The NIVs change “words” to “teaching” and the NKJV changes “words” to “word.” Both changes are in this case the same i.e. it’s okay to change the words of scripture so long as you keep the content aka the fundamentals. That is doing “despite unto the Spirit of grace” Hebrews 10:29.

A further problem is that when a statement like ‘the translations don’t show the difference in meaning in the different the Greek/Hebrew words used for the one English word etc.’ is made, it implies that no bible is actually the word of God or God’s holy word etc. because something else (usually undefined but typically Nestle’s Greek-English Interlinear for the NT) must be used to ‘correct’ or ‘improve’ the book you have.

On the one hand this can easily demoralise and/or confuse – and “God is not the author of confusion” 1 Corinthians 14:33 - the ordinary believer who is attentive enough to see the problem (many of the Lord’s people aren’t). On the other hand, it is the height of hypocrisy then to assert, especially in prayer, that God should be thanked because we have studied His word. The deficiencies of the NIVs notwithstanding, see above, we didn’t, if something else must be consulted to bring out what the translations are said not to.

That kind of disinformation is a serious problem in that it is a violation of the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9 and “the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, **which thing I hate**” Revelation 2:15. Proper names have meaning e.g. Matthew 1:23 and Nicolaitans means conquerors of the laity en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nicolaitism. (This meaning can be gleaned from scripture without using other sources but that is a separate study.) One way to conquer the laity spiritually is to assert that you know what God ‘really’ said because you know Hebrew and/or Greek and the laity don’t, so they’ll have to trust in you to tell them what God ‘really’ said. That is “being lords over God’s heritage” 1 Peter 5:3, which the scripture forbids.

That is why I could not let that incident pass without comment. The verse in question was Genesis 12:3 and the words in question are “curse” and “curseth.”

“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.”

As a source like Young’s Concordance will show (it is useful for this purpose, though not necessarily for the word meanings it gives, see remarks above), ‘the Hebrew’ for “curse” in Genesis 12:3 is arar i.e. referring uniquely God’s curse, supposedly. ‘The Hebrew’ for “curseth” in Genesis 12:3 is qalal, referring uniquely to man’s curse supposedly and by implication not as strong as God’s curse, arar. That is what we were given to understand on Tuesday night though the actual Hebrew words were not mentioned.

However, the situation is not so clear cut, to say the least.

Young gives 10 Old Testament words for cursing with accompanying scripture references; alah, cherem, meerak (curse, noun) and meerah (cursing, noun), qelalah (noun) and qalal (verb), shebuah, taalal, arar, barak, naqab, qabab (i.e. qabab not kebab).

Some of the words do appear to apply uniquely to either God’s cursing or man’s cursing:

God’s cursing: cherem, meerak, shebuah, taalal

Man’s cursing: barak, naqab*

A distinction could therefore be drawn between God’s and man’s curse from the above words [that will nevertheless be clear in the AV1611 English, though see note on Job 5:3 below] but of course none of those words occurs in Genesis 12:3 so the distinction drawn in Genesis 12:3 between arar and qalal is still open to question.

*Note, however, Job 5:3 “I have seen the foolish taking root: but suddenly **I cursed** his habitation.” Though this is a man’s curse, it appears from the context that God honoured it. That rather complicates the issue. This may well be the case with the word qabab, where Balak’s perception appears to have been that God would honour and inflict a man’s curse i.e. Balaam’s such that a man’s curse instigated by a man then becomes God’s curse i.e. God and man can be

equivalent in cursing, which itself undercuts the sharp distinction drawn for arar and qalal in Genesis 12:3. See “**curse** me them” or similar, Numbers 22:11, 17, 23:13, 17, “God hath not **cursed**” Numbers 23:8, “**curse** mine enemies” Numbers 23:11, 24:10.

That said, some of the above words may definitely be used interchangeably for either God’s curse or man’s curse. I’ll deal in detail with arar and qalal below but for now, note the following examples, which are not exhaustive:

alah:

“Then the priest shall charge the woman with an oath of **cursing**, and the priest shall say unto the woman, **The LORD make thee a curse** and an oath among thy people, when the LORD doth make thy thigh to rot, and thy belly to swell” Numbers 5:21. Both words are clearly God’s curse.

“His mouth is full of **cursing** and deceit and fraud: under his tongue is mischief and vanity” Psalm 10:7. This is clearly man’s curse.

qelalah:

“Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a **curse**;...**And a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the LORD your God**, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known” Deuteronomy 11:26, 28. That is clearly God’s curse, delivered through Moses.

“And, behold, thou hast with thee Shimei the son of Gera, a Benjamite of Bahurim, which **curse**d me with a grievous **curse** in the day when I went to Mahanaim: but he came down to meet me at Jordan, and I sware to him by the LORD, saying, I will not put thee to death with the sword” 1 Kings 2:8. This is clearly man’s curse, the words qalal and qelalah being used in turn. (Note however remarks below on 2 Samuel 16:10, 11, where David allows that Shimei’s curse could have been God’s curse. Having been restored to the throne, he now knows that it was man’s curse only “As the bird by wandering, as the swallow by flying, so **the curse causeless shall not come**” Proverbs 26:2. See below for further remarks on Proverbs 26:2.)

Considering arar and qalal:

Arar, according to Young, occurs as follows, more than once in some of the following verses and in varying parts of speech. Note the bold references. Any with asterisks are in the same category as qabab, with both God and man equivalent in cursing. The verses are listed as Young lists them. Numbers 24:9, with a double asterisk, is a special case.

Arar:

Genesis 12:3, 27:29, **Exodus 22:28**, **Numbers 22:6***, **12***, **23:7***, **24:9****, Judges 5:23, **Job 3:8**, Malachi 2:2, Genesis 5:29, Numbers 5:18, 19, 22, 24, 27, Genesis 3:14, 17, 4:11, 9:25, 49:7, Deuteronomy 27:15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28:16, 17, 18, 19, **Joshua 6:26***, **9:23***, **Judges 21:18**, 1 Samuel **14:24**, **28**, 26:19, 2 Kings 9:34, Psalm 119:21, Jeremiah 11:3, 17:5, **20:14**, **15**, 48:10, Malachi 1:14, 3:9.

Numbers 24:9 states “He couched, he lay down as a lion, and as a great lion: who shall stir him up? Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and **cursed is he that **curseth** thee.” Note that the statement is a general one, not applying explicitly to an individual like Balaam through whom God evidently had inflicted curses that Balaam pronounced, see remarks above under qabab. However, the word arar is used for BOTH God’s curse i.e. “cursed” and man’s curse i.e. “curseth.” *Note especially that Numbers 24:9 reads similarly to Genesis 12:3. That in itself shows that the supposed distinction between arar and qalal in Genesis 12:3 is artificial.*

52 verses are listed for arar. Most do refer to God cursing but 13 verses, those in bold, Exodus 22:28, Numbers 22:6*, 12*, 23:7*, 24:9**, Job 3:8, Joshua 6:26*, 9:23*, Judges 21:18, 1 Samuel 14:24, 28, Jeremiah 20:14, 15, refer to curses by men or equivalent curses by God and man, showing again that a sharp distinction between arar and qalal in Genesis 12:3 is artificial.

Qalal according to Young occurs as follows, more than once in some of the following verses. The verses are listed as Young lists them. Again, note the bold references.

Genesis **8:21**, 12:3, Exodus 21:17, Leviticus 19:14, 20:9, 24:11, 14, 15, 23, Deuteronomy 23:4, Joshua 24:9, Judges 9:27, 1 Samuel 17:43, 2 Samuel 16:5, 7, 9, **10, 11**, 13, 19:21, 1 Kings 2:8, **2 Kings 2:24**, Nehemiah 13:2, 25, Job 3:1, Psalm **37:22**, 62:4, 109:28, Proverbs 20:20, 30:10, 11, Ecclesiastes 7:21, 22, 10:20, Isaiah 8:21, Jeremiah 15:10, **Job 24:18**.

37 verses are listed for qalal. Most do refer to men cursing but 6 verses; Genesis 8:21, 2 Samuel 16:10, 11, 2 Kings 2:24, Psalm 37:22, Job 24:18, if 2 Samuel 16:10, 11 can be included as David's perception of God having bidden a man to curse on His behalf, those in bold refer to curses by God, showing again that a sharp distinction between arar and qalal in Genesis 12:3 is artificial.

Note also the following, emphasising yet again how a distinction between arar and qalal in Genesis 12:3 is artificial.

"And he called his name Noah, saying, This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of **the ground which the LORD hath cursed**" Genesis 5:29, using arar.

"And the LORD smelled a sweet savour; and the LORD said in his heart, **I will not again curse the ground** any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done" Genesis 8:21, using qalal.

Moreover, by inspection, the verses cited in detail above; Genesis 12:3, Job 5:3, Numbers 5:21, Psalm 10:7, Deuteronomy 11:26, 28, 1 Kings 2:8, Numbers 24:9, show clearly IN ENGLISH who is directly bestowing the curse, whether God or man. Reference to 'the Hebrew' is wholly unnecessary. That is true for all the verses listed above and indeed all such verses in scripture.

In sum:

1. It is obvious IN ENGLISH who is doing the cursing in Genesis 12:3, whether God or man, without recourse to 'the Hebrew.'
2. The same is true for all verses of scripture on cursing.
3. Young's Concordance lists 10 words for cursing in Hebrew, not just two as implied by looking at Genesis 12:3 in isolation.
4. Some of those 10 words are used exclusively for God cursing and others for man cursing but none of them occur in Genesis 12:3 [and the English shows who is doing the cursing].
5. Although arar and qalal usually refer to God and man cursing respectively, as in Genesis 12:3, the words are nevertheless repeatedly used interchangeably. See especially Genesis 5:29, 8:21, Numbers 24:9.
6. Drawing a sharp distinction between arar and qalal in Genesis 12:3 is therefore artificial, unhelpful, unnecessary and potentially misleading.

Consider now, briefly, the scriptural position on cursing by God and man. The case of man, i.e. in the absence of God's directive will as in operation in Job 5:3 above, is easily dealt with.

"As the bird by wandering, as the swallow by flying, so **the curse causeless shall not come**" Proverbs 26:2.

For the case of God cursing, note the very first mention of the word curse, which in this case gives its basic usage for God's curse. This was the point I tried to make, that scripture with scripture 1 Corinthians 2:13 determines the meaning of Biblical word usage.

"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." Genesis 3:14.

This is what happens at the Second Advent to those who are still alive then but who have scorned Israel and are unrepentant in that respect. This is the future doctrinal import of Genesis 12:3, Numbers 24:9, which has of course also happened in history, see *Love The Jewish People* www.chick.com/reading/tracts/1000/1000_01.asp. See the following:

"They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust" Psalm 72:9. The first group is Israel who were taking refuge in the wilderness in the End Times leading up to the Lord's Return, **"And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent"** Revelation 12:14 i.e. the woman is Israel, not Mary like the Catholics teach and not the Church like the Calvinists teach.

The second group are the enemies of Israel who incur the Lord's judgement at the judgement on the nations. Note that Israel's enemies are immediately the enemies of the Lord Jesus Christ, Who has identified Himself with the Jews i.e. Israel as "my brethren" Matthew 25:40. (This is too deep for most evangelicals but so is a lot of "sound doctrine" these days, **"For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears"** 2 Timothy 4:3 i.e. they like to have their ears tickled by "good words and fair speeches" Romans 16:18.)

That said, the second group will include some prominent survivors in a worldly sense, who it seems get right with the Lord just in time. See Isaiah's prophecy that refers directly to both the Lord Jesus Christ and Israel at the Second Advent.

"And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that I am the LORD: for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me" Isaiah 49:23.

Note that as well as licking the dust, the anti-Israel members of this second group end up where, for them, "your father the devil" John 8:44 ends up. That is the end of God's curse on the cursed.

"Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: For I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal" Matthew 25:41-46.

Observe that none of the above insights comes from either 'the Hebrew' or 'the Greek.' They come "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; **comparing spiritual things with spiritual"** 1 Corinthians 2:13 in that **"the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life"** John 6:63 and they are readily available in the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible, "the royal law" James 2:8, which is far superior to anything

else, including the non-extant 'original.' 'The Hebrew' and 'the Greek' and the modern counterparts, all of them, don't win, place or show.

The question may arise, of course, why go to such lengths as this lengthy write-up? Paul gives the answer and I trust that the above has fulfilled it.

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good" 1 Thessalonians 5:21.

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ

Alan O'R

Job 9:33, 38:12, "Dayspring" and "daysman"

The "*dayspring*" verses are as follows. Both passages are in the context of the Second Advent.

"Hast thou commanded the morning since thy days; and caused the dayspring to know his place; That it might take hold of the ends of the earth, that the wicked might be shaken out of it?" Job 38:12-13.

"That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life... Through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us, To give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace" Luke 1:74-75, 78-79.

"The dayspring" is of course ***"the Sun of righteousness"*** Malachi 4:2, the Lord Jesus Christ at the Second Advent. ***"For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the LORD of hosts"*** Malachi 4:1 subduing ***"the proud helpers"*** Job 9:13 ***"the devil and his angels"*** Matthew 25:41 ***"all the children of pride"*** Job 41 *and their king* matching Job 38:13, Luke 1:74, 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9 on ***"the day of vengeance of our God"*** Isaiah 61:2.

Further New Testament passages associate the "*daysman*" with the Lord Jesus Christ showing that "*daysman*" is the precise term in Job 9:33. Note the word association.

"And he said unto the disciples, The days will come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it... And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man" Luke 17:22, 26. Those are clearly Second Advent passages as is the reconciliation between God and Israel by the Lord Jesus Christ.

"And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn" Zechariah 12:10.

Today's believer has the responsibility of urging others to come to his "*daysman*."

"Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God" 2 Corinthians 5:20.

Psalm 150:1, 6, Luke 2:14, Revelation 7:14, "Praise ye the LORD," "good will toward men," "great tribulation"

Further to this a.m.

Psalm 150

The expression **"Praise ye the LORD"** Psalm 150:1, 6 occurs 25 times in the AV1611 as an explicit call to corporate worship. The modern versions, 1984, 2011 NIVs, NKJV, cut out the word **"ye"** each time and lose the emphasis on an explicit call to corporate worship.

The expression **"P(p)raise the LORD"** occurs 32 times in the AV1611 either with **"ye"** in the context e.g. Psalm 117:1 or where **"ye"** would not fit the context e.g. Genesis 29:35.

The AV1611 is therefore always precise and always has the right emphasis because it is **"All scripture"** that **"is given by inspiration of God"** 2 Timothy 3:16.

Revelation 7:14

See the Ruckman Reference Bible pp 1651-1652 for details.

Revelation 7:14 states **"And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."**

Revelation 7:14 refers doctrinally not to Church Age saints i.e. Christians but to Tribulation saints who have gone through **"great tribulation"** Matthew 24:21 of Daniel's yet future 70th week, Daniel 9:24-27, described in detail in Revelation 6, 7-11, 12-14, 16-19. Those chapters are not chronological but four complementary accounts leading up to the 2nd Advent just as the four Gospels give four complementary accounts of the 1st Advent.

The saints of Revelation 7:14 have washed their own robes in the blood of Christ by martyrdom or willingness to be martyred according to Revelation 12:11 **"And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death"** [Note **"the death"** i.e. by beheading, Revelation 20:4. The NIVs miss that revelation]. Revelation 12:11 can apply practically to Christians but in Daniel's 70th week it applies explicitly to those of whom the Lord Jesus Christ said **"But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved"** Matthew 24:13.

That is, if you don't endure during that time period until the Lord comes back, you lose your salvation. That is the condition for Tribulation salvation that is not **"the gospel of the grace of God"** Acts 20:24 and it is yet future.

One essential condition for endurance to the end is not taking **"the mark of the beast"** Revelation 16:2, 19:20 as an angel makes clear. Note again this is not **"the gospel of the grace of God"** Acts 20:24, which is never preached by an angel and is accursed in the Church Age as Paul states **"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"** Galatians 1:8.

What follows is part of **"the everlasting gospel"** for **"every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people"** Revelation 14:6 during Daniel's 70th week and by inspection Revelation 14:6-10 do not say **"...Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved..."** Acts 16:31 because Church Age salvation is over and done with after the church is raptured, 1 Corinthians 15:50-54, 1 Thessalonians 4:16-18 (the heretic klutz who agitated your friend [name removed] by insisting that 1 Corinthians 15 does not refer to a rapture, forgot to read 1 Corinthians 15:35 [**"But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?"**]). Paul's scathing answer, 1 Co-

rinthians 15:36, does not dispute the return of God's saints, including Church Age saints, at the 2nd Advent, 1 Thessalonians 3:13 i.e. they have to have been raptured first).

“And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb” Revelation 14:9-10.

Revelation 7:14 therefore cannot apply to any Christian. John explains why. Spiritually, Christians don't wash anything and don't need to. They are already washed, by the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

“John to the seven churches which are in Asia: Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne; And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood” Revelation 1:5.

The lesson is that you will never get the Bible right without applying 2 Timothy 2:15 **“Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth”** changed one way or another in the 1984, 2011 NIVs, NKJV so that you won't get the Bible right.

Job 30 and the lost man in hell

See Job 29-31 attached Questions 6, 10, pp 4-6. Back issues of Job and other studies can be got either from Bro. Davis' site www.timefortruth.co.uk/bible-studies/alan-oreillys-studies.php or from me. Bro. Davis' site typically gets 1000 hits a day so somebody must be getting something in that **“the word of God is not bound”** 2 Timothy 2:9.

Persecution of Christians

I submit first the following. It is an extract from a response to an anti-Biblical book by James White, prominent cheer-leader for the 'originals-onlyism' fundamentalist band wagon in the US. [name removed, former church pastor] kindly lent me the book some years ago.

Luke 2:14 [“Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men”]

[Luke 2:14 is considered in more detail later, with a summary of manuscript evidence]

An insightful comment on the AV1611 reading **“good will toward men”** emerges from the pen of the late General Sir Anthony Farrar-Hockley^{1 p 259-60}, 1924-2006². In 1951, General Sir Anthony Farrar-Hockley was a captain and adjutant in the Gloucestershire Regiment, when it was surrounded and taken prisoner by the Communist Chinese after sustaining heavy casualties at the battle of the Imjin River during the Korean War.

General Farrar-Hockley spent two and a half years as a prisoner-of-war and made these observations about a special 'Christmas' message delivered to the Allied POWs by a representative of Camp Commandant Ding named Chang on Christmas Day, 1952.

“He began to read from a page of typescript in his hand...It was in the worst possible taste; for after starting mildly, Ding [the camp commandant] had been unable to restrain his fanaticism for the Communist cause. He quoted – or rather, misquoted – the Scriptures, particularly the teachings of Christ. We heard the beloved Christmas words, for instance, rendered as follows: “Peace on earth to men of good will”; and the only men of good will, it seemed, were those who followed the policies of the Cominform group of governments. As Chang read on, the silence seemed to intensify. When he had finished, no one spoke; but I have neither felt nor seen before such profound disgust expressed silently by a body of men.”

White's 'preferred reading' in Luke 2:14 is the same as Commandant Ding's, with slight variation (Calvinists might have to compete with CommUNists for favoured-species status). Little more need be said, except that, providentially, bible believers do not have to remain silent about their profound disgust with White's 'preference.'

References

1. *The Edge of the Sword* by General Sir Anthony Farrar-Hockley, Star, 1981

2. news.independent.co.uk/people/obituaries/article351548.ece

Berry's 1897 Greek-English Interlinear Edition of Stephanus' 1550 Received Text and the Farstad-Hodges Greek-English Interlinear Edition of the 'Majority' Text (it's only an approximation) mostly agree with the AV1611 Text. Their English interlinear readings agree with the AV1611 in Luke 2:14.

Nestle's 21st Edition Greek-English Interlinear reads "**peace among men of good will**" i.e. the same as that of the Communist camp commandant officials Ding and Chang. Nestle's 21st Edition text is very largely that of the 1984, 2011 NIVs which read respectively "**peace to men on whom his favor rests,**" "**on earth peace to those on whom his favor rests,**" the 2011 NIV doing its usual gender-neutral Apache dance to appease the pc contingent. Subject to a bit of paraphrase tweaking, the NIVs readings are clearly that of the Communist camp commandant officials Ding and Chang.

[The reds took "men of good will" to be kingdom-builders of their crowd i.e. 'making the world a better place etc.' The Calvinists on the NIV committee led by 5-pointer Edwin Palmer took "men of good will" to be those upon whom God's good will is bestowed i.e. Calvin's elect, those whom Calvin's God would exclusively favour i.e. Palmer and his crowd. Calvin's elect are of course yet more kingdom builders. AJO'R 22/12/14.]

The reaction of hard men, i.e. professional soldiers who were the modern counterparts of the centurions of old, Matthew 8:8, 27:54, Acts 10:1-2, to the Nestle, NIVs readings for Luke 2:14 should prayerfully be noted. Gail Riplinger notes in *The Language of the King James Bible* p 115 that linguistic analysis of the literary style of the pre-2011 NIV shows that it was written either by a woman or an effeminate man. The increased gender-neutral trend of the 2011 NIV would no doubt reinforce that conclusion.


The relevance to persecution is that whatever their persuasion be it Marxist, Mohammedan, Hindu etc., today's persecutors are simply those of *Mama's Girls* i.e. of the Catholic Church descended from ancient Babylon "**And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH...And in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth**" Revelation 17:5, 18:24 as the following items make clear.

www.chick.com/reading/tracts/1077/1077_01.asp

www.chick.com/catalog/books/0187.asp



Bro. Daniels shows in some detail how Mohammedans venerate Mary, pp 174-177 showing that they are definitely among *Mama's Girls*. (Bro. Daniels also shows how December 25th is the son god's birthday, pp 67-68, 120, 191-194, 206-207, 212. We know a lot more about Catholic attempts to infiltrate our belief system than the Allah gang think we do and we also know a lot more about the basics of their belief than even they do. Next time one of those junior jihadists confronts you, ask him what the word "Allah" means. John 4:22 can then be put on him, though he won't like it one little bit. ["Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews."](#))



Returning to persecution of Christians, it was not anything like it is today during the Philadelphian Church Age and the great missionary movement of the 19th and early 20th centuries. Note that as Dr Ruckman points out, the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1648, it was the Philadelphian Church, not the Apostolic Church of 'the originals,' that the Lord commended for keeping His word. ["I know thy works: behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it: for thou hast a little strength, and hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name"](#) Revelation 3:8.

The Philadelphian Church of the great missionary movement of the 19th and early 20th centuries had ONE Book as the Standard and the Lord promised His protection when that standard was upheld. Note the missionary emphasis in what follows.

["So shall they fear the name of the LORD from the west, and his glory from the rising of the sun. When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the LORD shall lift up a standard against him"](#) Isaiah 59:19.

That explains the great missionary strides of the 19th and early 20th centuries the like of which has long gone because the standard has been abandoned for the re-hashed Catholic Jesuit-Rheims version that the 1984, 2011 NIVs basically are as are virtually all modern departures from the AV1611 Text, including those of the NKJV ["falsely so called"](#) 1 Timothy 6:20.

The Great Bible Robbery attachment [not attached in this work, see www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *The Great Bible Robbery*] puts it in perspective. You'll note Dr Moorman's especially informative graphic. When God's Standard is abandoned, as it has been by the major missionary nations of the West, with added insult to injury by adopting the enemy's counterfeit standards, see *The Great Bible Robbery* Table 1 then ["the enemy shall come in like a flood"](#) and it is brothers and sisters in Christ overseas who are bearing the brunt of the defection from the Lord's Standard by their brothers and sisters in Christ in the West who should be their strongest support.

In sum, if you depart from the words of the AV1611 Text for any reason **“by any means”** 2 Corinthians 11:3 you aid and abet the persecutors of our brothers and sisters in Christ anywhere that they are suffering persecution. I have no doubt that the issue will come up at **“the judgment seat of Christ”** Romans 14:10.

In conclusion, I draw attention to Bro. Cuppett’s summary *Manuscript Ascension* that I believe to be the best exhortation for **“perilous times”** 2 Timothy 3:1 [**The Manuscript Dichotomy – Bro. Al Cuppett’s Vision Vindicated at the conclusion of this work**].

Note the masonic symbol for the NKJV and the tie-up between Nestle, the NIVs and Catholic versions. Much more can be made available on that confederation of evil against **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21 **“For they have consulted together with one consent: they are confederate against thee”** Psalm 83:5. Psalm 83 btw is a prophecy on Israel’s enemies today, which are all Mohammedan in the immediate vicinity. Note **“the Hagarenes”** Psalm 83:6 (slightly altered by Israel’s enemies in the 1984, 2011 NIVs, NKJV so that you could miss the cross reference) from Hagar, Genesis 16:12. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* pp 33, 826.

Bro. Cuppett rightly urges a return to **“the old paths”** Jeremiah 6:16. The tragedy is that too many folk today will react as they did in Jeremiah’s time. They did not choose **“the good and the right way”** 1 Samuel 12:23.

“Thus saith the LORD, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein” Jeremiah 6:16.

[Likewise the king of Ammon after receiving Jephthah’s reasoned and factual response to the king’s demand that was neither reasoned nor factual, Judges 11:11-27. **“Howbeit the king of the children of Ammon hearkened not unto the words of Jephthah which he sent him”** Judges 11:28]

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ
Alan O’R

Proverbs 25:18, Luke 2:11, John 3:13, 1 Corinthians 10:16, 2 Corinthians 6:14, 13:14, Ephesians 5:30, Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1, 7, 11, "maul," "saviour," "which is in heaven," "communion," "of his flesh, and of his bones," "God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," "charity"

Dear All

2 Peter 1:1 was read out this a.m. but not expounded as such. However, an issue exists over the wording of 2 Peter 1:1 and that of what is effectively a companion verse, Titus 2:13. Both verses are sometimes referred to as criticisms of the AV1611 for supposedly missing the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The reverse is true. King James Bible critics typically get the facts backwards. They are at least consistent in that respect.

See below _____

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ
Alan O'R

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ 'O Biblios' – The Book p 240. The verses are:

Titus 2:13

"Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of **the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ**" AV1611.

Note that the AV1611 reading points to the Rapture as "that blessed hope" according to 1 Thessalonians 4:16-18. The NIVs obscure that indication, probably because the translators under the late Edwin Palmer were a-millennial 5-Point Calvinists who deny the Rapture of the church, the permanent restoration of the nation of Israel in the land of Israel, Jeremiah 31:35-37, 33:19-26, Ezekiel 34:23, 24, 37:24, 25, Hebrews 4:6-8, and the millennial reign on earth of the Lord Jesus Christ in Jerusalem, Isaiah 2:1-4. They then allowed their theology to dominate their translation, which is why modern versions and/or any efforts at 'improving' the words of the AV1611 by any means, without exception, are "the word of men" never "in truth, the word of God" 1 Thessalonians 2:13.

"while we wait for the blessed hope—the glorious appearing of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ" 1984 NIV.

"while we wait for the blessed hope--the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ" 2011 NIV.

Note that in addition to obscuring the Rapture of the church, the 2011 NIV has shifted the emphasis away from the Lord's appearing, which is glorious, to the glory itself, which technically is neuter but allied to "the God of forces" Daniel 11:38, namely Satan, Luke 10:18 (!) - Daniel 11:38 having been changed in all the modern versions to cover up for the devil - and prompting the well-known Star Wars expression "May the force be with you."

2 Peter 1:1

"Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of **God and our Saviour Jesus Christ**" AV1611.

"Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, To those who through the righteousness of our God and Savior Jesus Christ have received a faith as precious as ours" 1984, 2011 NIVs.

The modern changes, found also in the NKJV, or rather reversion to earlier pre-1611 readings that the King James translators necessarily corrected, have now been resuscitated to reflect New Age

inclusiveness and heathen polytheism as shown by Jim Tetlow et al in *Queen of All*, Jeremiah 7:18, 44:17, 18, 19, 25, Revelation 17:1-5.

Note also the NIVs, NKJV switch from the AV1611's "saviour" 7 letters to "savior" 6 letters by the elimination of the letter u. The owner of an otherwise very informative site on the 1611 Holy Bible versus the modern versions got very upset when some readers called that to his attention www.jesus-is-savior.com/Believer%27s%20Corner/saviour_or_savior.htm. However, it is true that the word "saviour" has been changed to "savior" throughout the NIVs and the NKJV. Speaking practically, I for one would be very nervous about following a bible version that had cut "U" out of "saviour."

"For unto **you** is born this day in the city of David a **Saviour**, which is **Christ the Lord**" Luke 2:11.

"For so an entrance shall be ministered unto **you** abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and **Saviour Jesus Christ**" 2 Peter 1:11.

Returning to Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1, the AV1611 readings for Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1 are *exclusive* to the Lord Jesus Christ. That is a no-no for the devil's emerging one-world church under the final papal antichrist, Revelation 13. See below the extract below from John Davis' site.

The AV1611 reading in Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 is actually a superior testimony to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ than the NIV variation. "Our God" NIV, simply designates the Lord as God of the Christians. The expression "**God and our Saviour**" AV1611 shows that the Lord is GOD universally but effectually the Saviour of the Christian. Doctrinally, the Lord is, of course, "**Saviour of the world**" John 4:42. [Note 1 Timothy 4:10](#).

"For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe."

P.S. Again, the word in 2 Peter 1:7 is "charity" w.r.t. to love between Christians as it should be and God's love in giving the Lord Jesus Christ to individuals desperately in need of *God-given* charity as a free hand-out, John 3:16, "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift" 2 Corinthians 9:15. However, the distinction exists *in English, not in Greek*.

See samgipp.com/47-what-about-nuggets-found-only-in-the-greek-new-testament/ Question 47.

I therefore strongly suggest take the exercise that Dr Gipp sets out if you haven't already done so – and as he in effect urges, *don't cheat!* (Never fall into line lock-step with fundamentalist folklore passed down through successive evangelical generations from one fundamentalist camp-fire to another. Always stick with "the scripture of truth" Daniel 10:21 as David exhorts. "**I have stuck unto thy testimonies**: O LORD, put me not to shame" Psalm 119:31.)

The distinction has been lost in modern versions such as the 1984, 2011 NIVs, NKJV, which changed the word "charity" to "love" on each of the 28 occasions it occurs in the AV1611.

P.P.S. The word "communion" is found in 4 places in the AV1611, 1 Corinthians 10:16 twice explicitly with respect to the communion service and in 2 Corinthians 6:14, 13:14 i.e. the well-known grace. The NKJV retains the term but the 1984, 2011 NIVs have changed the word in each place i.e. they have eliminated the word "communion" entirely from their texts. I suggest that, for fairly obvious reasons, there may be an issue here.

P.P.P.S. My better half informs me that the word “maul” Proverbs 25:18 came up last Thursday evening:

“A man that beareth false witness against his neighbour is **a maul**, and a sword, and a sharp arrow” Proverbs 25:18 (!).

At first I thought the word meant club and that is what I said in reply to Gill. Having found that the 1984, 2011 NIVs, NKJV use that word, I now don't think it's right – a departure from the 1611 Holy Bible invariably results in either error or inferiority.

With the words “a sword” in the context of Proverbs 25:18, on the basis of comparing scripture with scripture, which is always how to define scripture terms, 1 Corinthians 2:13, I've concluded that the Biblical usage of the expression “a maul” in Proverbs 25:18 is defined as follows, which would fit seamlessly into the context of Proverbs 25:18, where “club” doesn't. See below. Most commentaries will probably go with club or hammer. Club never appears in the AV1611. “Hammer” appears 10 times, singular and plural; Judges 4:21, 5:26 twice, as a means of execution via Jael's nail, 1 Kings 6:7, Isaiah 41:7, 44:12, Jeremiah 10:4 as a construction tool, Psalm 74:6, Jeremiah 23:29, 50:23 as a means of destruction, by God Himself, Jeremiah 23:29, or by men under the devil, Psalm 74:6, Jeremiah 50:23.

That is, “hammer” is never used in the context of bearing false witness. That is also why I go with the following definition. See words in bold.

“There is that speaketh like **the piercings of a sword**: but the tongue of the wise is health” Proverbs 12:18 (!).

Proverbs 12:18, 25:18 show that the liar is a maul in the hurt that he inflicts on his victim, a sword in that he himself is the means for the hurt that he inflicts and a sharp arrow, for emphasis, which is as a sword in that it pierces as a sword.

Note with respect to Proverbs 25:18 the context of Proverbs 12:18, especially the warning in the second reference that follows against messing with the *words* of the AV1611 by *any* means, ancient or modern.

“He that speaketh truth sheweth forth righteousness: **but a false witness deceit**” Proverbs 12:17.

“The lip of truth shall be established for ever: **but a lying tongue is but for a moment**” Proverbs 12:19.

Dear Alan and fellow saints,

Thanks for interesting comments on last Sunday's am service.

Referring to the 2 verses I give my own literal translation of the Nestle Greek text:- no divine inspiration or copyright is claimed, just 55 years of Greek (and Hebrew) Scriptures.

1 P 1vs 1,2 Simon Peter a slave and apostle of Jesus Christ to the ones equally precious with us having obtained a faith in the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ :

2. Grace to you and peace be multiplied in a full knowledge of our God and of Jesus our the Lord of us.

vs.1. states that Jesus is both God and Saviour. J.W.s in their NWT translate and concur with KJV understanding of this to deny the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. They then use this incorrect translation to rightly point out that verse 2 refers to 2 distinct persons. We believe these are the 1st and 2nd persons of the Trinity.

T 2 vs 13 ...expecting the blessed hope and appearance of the glory of the great God and Saviour of us Christ Jesus, 14, who gave Himself for us...

Here Paul refers to one person who is both God and Saviour. J.W.s happily concur with the KJV translation to deny the deity of Christ.

Saviour is the American spelling. No doctrinal issue is at stake. How they have messed up our English language. We are 2 nations separated by a common language.

Thank you for carefully observing what I said on 1 Cor. 10 vs 16 ,17.

koinonia - basic meaning " sharing in. " Root -koin meaning common.

If of persons the sense is fellowship. If of sharing in something the sense is participation. NIV uses the latter. NEB " a means of sharing ".

" Communion " - is useful in referring to the service as Holy Communion ", but does not give a clear meaning either here or in 2 Cor 13vs 14 particularly to modern readers Also there is no definite article ie it should read " a communion " I suspect that the Anglican clerics in their translation of the KJV.still retained some Romish ideas both with regard to both baptism and the Lords Supper

Hi [name removed]

Thank you for your note and interesting comments.

The over-arching issue then becomes what is all scripture that is given by inspiration of God 2 Timothy 3:16 as single book between 2 covers in words easy to be understood, 1 Corinthians 14:9 (with God's help, Luke 24:45)?

That is the key issue and always has been.

Some folk, myself included, believe that the 1611 Holy Bibles that we have answer that question. My experience has been (ever since 1967) that no-one who rejects the AV1611 as that single source has any single book to put in its place as such. How does that help anyone on the mission field [or the professing atheists amongst the local 6th Form students encountered on the high street]? Are we to say to them 'This version is all right except for this or that passage where we think 'the original' might have said this or that'? If that was put on me, I'd be inclined to echo Deuteronomy 1:28 "our brethren have discouraged our heart" – especially when the pundits disagree about what 'the original' may/may not have said, which they do.

You understandably disavow any divine inspiration. I obviously respect that stance. However, it begs the question where, then, *is* divine inspiration? Where are all the words of spirit and life John 6:63 that the Lord Jesus Christ wants believers to have, again, as the Lord would want, in words easy to be understood? I repeat, that is the key issue and always has been. I suggest that it will be until the Lord comes back. (Sadly, many of the Lord's folk appear to be indifferent i.e. lukewarm on this issue, Revelation 3:16, not caring, it seems, so long as there's nice companionship, whether the cow calves or the bull breaks its neck, to use a farming analogy.)

As indicated, I get the impression (ever since 1967) that most of the body of Christ is twisting in the wind on this issue – and significantly the UK has seen no major national revival for well over 100 years, the extenuating circumstances of WW1, 2 notwithstanding. Most folk evade the issue, sometimes resorting to Hort's refrain that 'not 1/1000 part of what we're supposed to believe is affected by any changes to the text etc.' He and his crony Westcott then steered through 5000+ changes in the New Testament via their 1881 RV prototype NIV that Dean Burgon decisively trashed over 100 years ago. [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ 'O Biblios' – *The Book* pp 31-34] Burgon's work *The Revision Revised* has never been answered by W-H's allies, or even seriously addressed. I don't think it ever will be.

[www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/36722?msg=welcome_stranger#toc9]

The trouble with any NT Greek text is that 1st century Greek is a dead language, like Latin, yet 1 Peter 1:23 states that the word of God liveth and abideth forever. That can't apply to a dead language.

Nestle's Greek NT is the best known and I have the 21st Edition. In 1980, Nestle's 26th Edition came out that had inserted about 470 readings that had been absent from all previous editions and the insertions were essentially in favour of the Authorized Text [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ 'O Biblios' – *The Book* p 27]. Coupled with the fact that its text consists of a dead language, how can Nestle therefore be authoritative for anything where the words of the Lord Psalm 12:6 are concerned, having had to resort, it seems, to the AV1611 Text to update its own text, thereby showing itself to be a moveable feast, effectively?

In addition, I know for a fact that missionaries do not use 1st century Greek when ministering to native Greek-speaking Greeks e.g. in modern day Thessalonica. They don't understand it (i.e. without someone translating it for them). Why then should 1st century Greek be authoritative for English speakers, if native Greek-speaking Greeks don't understand it? "First century Greek to us is funny" – [name removed], Chemical Engineering Honours Degree student UoT circa 1990s, a native Greek-speaking Greek, when asked by [staff member, name removed] about NT Greek. Do you suppose [student, name removed] would take you seriously about Christian belief if you put Nestle on him?

Further, if one has to resort to 1st century Greek to explain what God 'really' said in the NT, that requires specialist knowledge that most folk, myself included, have neither time nor inclination to acquire i.e. they have to accept a translation which must come from a source other than the scripture itself. That is a violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.

We should also note that recourse to the ancient languages for what God 'really' said implies that the word of God has degenerated i.e. lost information, in translation, when the Lord said it wouldn't, Matthew 24:35, Mark 13:31, Luke 21:33. If, however, the word of God had degenerated, so has salvation i.e. you don't have salvation, though James said you did, James 1:21, and Peter said it wouldn't, 1 Peter 1:23.

Concerning Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1, the King James translators mostly though not entirely made use of Beza's editions, 1589, 1598, for their Greek references.

[[The King James Version a Variety of the Textus Receptus standardbearers.net/uploads/The King James Version Defended Dr Edward F Hills.pdf](http://standardbearers.net/uploads/The_King_James_Version_Defended_Dr_Edward_F_Hills.pdf) Chapter 8]

Beza's wording matches the AV1611 readings i.e. it is different from Nestle, which is largely W-H's text derived from the Vatican ms. B and its allies. Beza's text is essentially the Traditional Text, as Burgon called it, overwhelmingly attested by ms. sources and vernacular versions that sustained Dark Age true believers like the Waldenses and Albigenses, savagely persecuted by Catholics. Beza's text also reflects non-Nestle readings of the Gothic and early Anglo-Saxon vernacular Bibles which are in the lineage of the pre-1611 Bibles e.g. Tyndale, Bishops', Geneva of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation and ultimately the AV1611.

[kiv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html and *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* by Gail Riplinger pp 2-28]

The major problem with Nestle's and similar interlinear readings for Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1 is that, as indicated, our God and Saviour Jesus Christ allows for New Age inclusiveness i.e. Jesus Christ is the Christians' God. The Mohammedans can have Allah as their god and the Hindus can have as many gods as they like etc. The AV1611 readings cut out that kind one one-world inclusiveness.

The expression the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ actually refers not to two but to one individual. The expression is a hendiadys i.e. two nouns joined by the conjunction and that express the same idea, person or thing e.g. back in 1997 the folk in Sedgefield could have referred to the PM and our former local MP the Rt. Hon. (saints preserve us) Mr Tony Blair. A Biblical example is Revelation 1:6 “God and his Father,” referring to one person, not two.

Re: Saviour, an early US version, the ASV has Saviour, e.g. Titus 2:13 but later American versions, NASVs, NIVs, NKJV switched to Savior. My point was more of a practical, devotional one than doctrinal. However, we should note though that the AV1611 today, always reading Saviour, is Dr Blayney’s text of 1769, from Oxford [[The Hidden History of the English Scriptures p 49](#)]. The 1611 AV1611 never reads Savior. It uses the word Sauivour, the first u being v, having that spelling common with the pre-1611 Bibles such as the Bishops’ and Geneva Bibles. (It never uses Sauior.)

Re: the King James translators, it has to be remembered that, owing to the unparalleled results of their work, many treatises have been written to try to discredit them, and King James 1st himself, of course – the definitive book that disproves the accusations against James 1st is *King James Unjustly Accused?* by Stephen A. Coston [[Sr](#)]. What we know about the King James translators is that they rejected baptismal regeneration [[The Hidden History of the English Scriptures p 36](#)]. By contrast, papists maintain that baptism is necessary for salvation [[Are Roman Catholics Christians? www.chick.com/catalog/tractlist.asp](#)]. Concerning communion, they would have believed that the mass is a blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit in accordance with Article XXXI of the Church of England Articles of Religion – I’ve not heard *that* declared in *any* communion service since 1967 even though Paul says we are to reprove the works of darkness, Ephesians 5:11.

We might also note that the AV1611 brought about the largest anti-Catholic Baptist conventions in the world, in the USA.

I would suggest that anything thought to be Romish about the King James translators is dispelled not only by an examination of the men themselves e.g. *The Men Behind the KJV* by Gustavus Paine but by the events of November 5th 1605 and the statements in the Epistle Dedicatory to the effect that the pope is “that man of sin” and the following: “So that if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by Popish Persons at home or abroad, who therefore will malign us, because we are poor Instruments to make GOD’s holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness; or if, on the other side, we shall be maligned by self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their Anvil; we may rest secure, supported within by truth and innocency of a good conscience, having walked the ways of simplicity and integrity, as before the Lord; and sustained without by the powerful protection of Your* Majesty’s grace and favour, which will ever give countenance to honest and Christian endeavours against bitter censures and uncharitable imputations.”

*Note that the pronouns thee and thou etc. in the AV1611 are not 17th century English but retained for precision as the second person singular personal pronouns. Modern English and modern versions lack that precision.

www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm

When did you last hear a message along those Epistle Dedicatory lines? The prefaces to the NIVs, NKJV etc. don’t dare raise the subject.

Moreover, why is nothing said by evangelicals about the late Cardinal Carlo Martini who helped with the compilation of the UBS Greek Text underlying the NIV (very similar to Nestle)?

[\[New Age Bible Versions p 497\]](#)

Concerning the word communion and the definite and indefinite articles, my understanding is that strict one-to-one correspondence does not exist between 1st century Greek and Biblical English re articles. I believe it is the case that Greek texts will sometimes read 'the Jesus' when the correct English reading is simply 'Jesus.' I have various examples of this elsewhere.

www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ 'O Biblios' – The Book p 148]

I would say that in all three cases where the word communion occurs, 1 Corinthians 10:16, 2 Corinthians 6:14, 13:14, it is exact and cannot be improved upon any which way.

Communion is defined as fellowship in the context of 2 Corinthians 6:14 "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what **fellowship** hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what **communion** hath light with darkness?"

However, note the embedded word union, which is unity, also found three times in scripture, Psalm 133:1, Ephesians 4:3, 13. I strongly suggest that unity and in turn communion is a much stronger term than either sharing in or participation. It is possible to share in or participate in something without being unified. A demoniac can share in or participate in a church meeting but is not in unity or communion with any believers present, Mark 1:23-27.

We're supposed to be unified i.e. "made nigh by the blood of Christ" Ephesians 2:13. That is communion, 1 Corinthians 10:16 "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones" Ephesians 5:30* as in 2 Corinthians 6:14, 13:14, again much stronger than either sharing in or participation. Scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, shows that communion in scripture is unity with the Lord Jesus Christ and within the body of Christ 1 Corinthians 12:27 such that all evil is dispelled, 1 John 1:7, as the Lord Jesus Christ says of Himself "Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me" John 14:30.

*Note that the words "of his flesh, and of his bones" have been cut out or disputed by the W-H RV, ASV, NIVs, NKJV, Nestle 21st Edition based on the flimsiest of ms. evidence that relies principally on the Vatican ms. and associated corruptions. The ancient evidence in terms of Greek mss. and versions i.e. Old Latin, Syriac, overwhelmingly support the words that are also in the Geneva and Bishops' pre-1611 Bibles. See J. A. Moorman's work *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version* p 130. Again, therefore, why would anyone trust Nestle for "words of truth and soberness" Acts 26:25, when, as indicated, Nestle is a moveable feast anyway? Moreover, I don't know that Eberhard Nestle or any of his associates were/are even saved in which case "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one" Job 14:4.

The words "of his flesh, and of his bones" are of course another testimony to the fact that you leave your blood behind at the Rapture. Modern versions and Nestle's 21st Edition cut out or obscure that testimony

Hope the above helps, one and all.

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ

Alan

A couple of additional items, note the emphases:

“Looking for that blessed hope, and **the glorious appearing** of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” Titus 2:13.

Titus 2:13 refers to *one* glorious appearing not two. “The great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” can therefore only refer to *one* Person, not two.

“Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through **the righteousness** of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” 2 Peter 1:1.

2 Peter 1:1 refers to *one* righteousness not two. “The righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” can therefore only refer to *one* Person, not two.

Concerning the accuracy of translation from Greek to English in the 1611 Holy Bible, this site gives the biographies of the King James translators. They were past-masters at their work, such that I don't believe that they would have made any of the mistakes that critics accuse them of making. See:

www.jesus-is-savior.com/Bible/The%20King%20James%20Bible/Translators/translators.htm

www.jesus-is-savior.com/Bible/The%20King%20James%20Bible/Translators/transl14.htm

and note that Dr John Spencer who was on the translation committee for the Letters of the New Testament was elected Greek lecturer for Corpus Christi College Oxford at the age of 19. Despite objections to his appointment partly because of his youth, Dr Spencer appears to have been more than equal to his responsibilities.

Dr Richard Kilbye, who was a member of the translation committee for Isaiah to Malachi is a case in point for answering criticisms of the AV1611 Text.

See:

www.jesus-is-savior.com/Bible/The%20King%20James%20Bible/Translators/transla9.htm and this extract.

“There is one incident, however, related by “honest Izaak Walton,” in his life of the celebrated Bishop Sanderson. The incident, as described by the amiable angler, is such a fine historical picture of the times, and so apposite to the purpose of this little volume, that it must be given in Walton's own words.

““I must here stop my reader, and tell him that this Dr. Kilby was a man of so great learning and wisdom, and so excellent a critic in the Hebrew tongue, that he was made professor of it in this University; and was also so perfect a Grecian's that he was by King James appointed to be one of the translators of the Bible; and that this Doctor and Mr. Sanderson had frequent, discourses, and loved as father and son. The Doctor was to ride a journey into Derbyshire, and took Mr. Sanderson to bear him company; and they, resting on a Sunday with the Doctor's friend, and going together to that parish church where they then were, found the young preacher to have no more discretion, than to waste a great part of the hour allotted for his sermon [on] exceptions against the late translation of several words, (not expecting such a hearer as Dr. Kilby,) and shewed three reasons why a particular word should have been otherwise translated. When evening prayer was ended, the preacher was invited to the Doctor's friend's house, where, after some other conference, the Doctor told him, he might have preached more useful doctrine, and not have filled his auditors' ears with needless exceptions against the late translation; and for that word for which he offered to that poor congregation three reasons why it ought to have, been translated as he said, he and others had considered all them, and found thirteen more considerable reasons why it was translated as now printed; and told him, 'If his friend,' (then attending him,) 'should prove guilty of such indiscre-

tion, he should forfeit his favor.’ To which Mr. Sanderson said, ‘He hoped he should not.’ And the preacher was so ingenuous [open and honest enough] as to say, He would not justify himself.”

Finally, some information on John 3:13, included in the passage for [name removed] message today.

“And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man **which is in heaven**” John 3:13 AV1611

“No one has ever gone into heaven except the one who came from heaven — the Son of Man” John 3:13 1984 church versions NIV, footnote Some manuscripts Man, who is in heaven. The implication of the footnote is that inclusion of the phrase is the exception rather than the rule.

Considering the phrase, the AV1611 has given a very strong testimony to the Lord’s omnipresence i.e. to His Deity. John 3:13 in the AV1611 is actually the only direct reference to the Lord’s omnipresence in the New Testament. The modern versions, NIVs, NKJV f.n. along with the NWT of Watchtower and the Catholic NJB*, have cut out that testimony and reference. Nestle’s 21st Edition also cuts them out. *The JB has the reading and so does the earlier Catholic Douay-Rheims version. Even the SJ did not feel inclined to cut the words out back then.

I draw attention to these ‘Some manuscripts.’

See brandplucked.webs.com/john313whichisinheaven.htm:

Will Kinney’s article for the overwhelming support for the AV1611 reading “which is in heaven.” That includes the ancient ms. and version support that Bro. Will lists.

See also J. A. Moorman’s work *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version* p 101 for the overwhelming majority of ancient witnesses in favour of the AV1611 reading versus the few against it. J. A. Moorman lists 21 of the old uncial or upper case Greek mss. that have the AV1611 reading versus 9 old uncials that don’t, including as usual Aleph and B the Vatican ms. and the 3rd century Egyptian papyri P66, 75 that are on the whole poor mss. but often support the AV1611 against the NIVs. J. A. Moorman also states that the vast majority of the later cursive or lower case Greek mss. contain the words along with all 10 extant Old Latin sources that contain John 3 and the Peshitta Syriac version. The texts of the Old Latin and Peshitta Syriac versions date from at least as far back as the 2nd century A.D.

It should first be noted that the pre-1611 Bibles, Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Great, Bishops’, Geneva all read with the AV1611.

‘Some manuscripts’ therefore turns out to be the vast majority of available ancient sources versus a very few that don’t contain the words “which is in heaven.”

The 1984 church version NIV footnote is therefore misleading and its text has cut out a portion of the Lord’s words. The 2011 NIV also cuts out the words. It must be stressed again that the NIV omission has here cut out the only NT reference to the omnipresence of the Lord Jesus Christ and in turn cut a vital testimony of scripture to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The NIVs have therefore attacked MAJOR DOCTRINE.

Yet these things are never mentioned. That is serious because pleading the 5th is not scriptural, as Paul shows.

“**Prove all things**; hold fast that which is good” 1 Thessalonians 5:21.

I suggest that while there is still time before Romans 14:10 comes to pass, that the following warning should be carefully considered. The direct reference is to the Book of Revelation but the princi-

ple applies to any part of the scripture of truth Daniel 10:21, including John 3:13. The warning is not about a Christian losing salvation, which cannot happen, but it is about losing eternal reward.

“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” Revelation 22:19.

Alan O’R

Isaiah 59:19, Jeremiah 15:16, “a standard,” “Thy words...thy word

Note that for today’s a.m. message:

Jeremiah 15:16 “Thy **words** were found, and I did eat them; and thy **word** was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart: for I am called by thy name, O LORD God of hosts” was quoted, although from the NKJV.

The significance of Jeremiah 15:16 is that the **word** of God, singular, is the sum total of the **words** of God, plural. That is basic but that was not stated at any time this a.m.

Note that the church version 1984 and 2011 NIVs state “When your words came, I ate them; they were my joy and my heart’s delight, for I bear your name, O LORD God Almighty.” “thy **word**” has been changed to “they” so that you won’t get the essential connection between “Thy **words**” and “thy **word**.”

Praise God for that? “I trow not” Luke 17:9.

Likewise see [Matthew 17:21](#), [18:11](#), [23:14](#), [Mark 7:16](#), [9:44](#), [46](#), [11:26](#), [15:28](#), [Luke 17:36](#), [23:17](#), [John 5:4](#), [Acts 8:37](#), [15:34](#), [24:7](#), [28:29](#), [Romans 16:24](#), [1 John 5:7](#), 17 whole verses of scripture.

Are we to say Praise God the King James translators included those verses but also Praise God the NIV translators cut them out while keeping the same verse-numbering system and did so in line with Rome and Watchtower?

“I trow not” Luke 17:9.

Btw, you may have observed the NIVs’ “the message” instead of the AV1611’s “the word” in Acts 17:11 this a.m. The two readings are not the same.

Concerning other points made this a.m.:

‘Only the originals were the pure, perfect, inspired word of God’ or a comment to that effect. No scripture.

‘Multiple versions are needed’ or a comment to that effect. No scripture.

‘Multiple versions must be sifted through to get what God really said’ or a comment to that effect. No scripture.

‘Decide for yourself which version to use on the basis of whatever you think is best for you out of all the versions available to you’ or a comment to that effect. No scripture.

‘Go back to the Hebrew and the Greek to get what God really said’ or a comment to that effect. No scripture – and no identification of which Hebrew or which Greek to go back to and no explanation of why God was evidently unable to preserve His words perfectly from the perfect originals to what is extant today, in spite of Psalm 12:6-7 “The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.”

This is what Gail Riplinger had to say in her book *Which Bible is God’s Word?* 2007 Edition p 116 about the multiple-whatever-suits-you-DIY-version approach.

“It is scandalous for rich Americans to have ten versions of the bible, instead of just one. Four million dollars was invested in the New King James Version; subsequent to that; several million dollars was spent on advertising campaigns. Many tribes and peoples around the world have no King James Bible type bibles at all; the Albanian bible was destroyed during the communist regime. Many of the tribes in New Guinea do not have a bible in their language. But, these countries have no money to pay the publishers. The publishers are not interested in giving these people bibles; they are just interested in making bibles that can produce a profit for their operation.”

Do you want to be counted with that crowd at “the judgment seat of Christ” Romans 14:10?

The Lord’s evaluation in sum is “To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them” Isaiah 8:20.

It may be added that the Greek LXX was never used by believers in the 1st century. Parts of it were being put together in about the 2nd century. The actual LXX was a 3rd century document no longer extant but it was the 5th column of bible corrupter Alexandrian Origen’s 6 column Hexapla. Today’s LXX compiled by Sir Lancelot Brenton is the 4th century A.D. Vaticanus manuscript supplemented by the 5th century A.D. Alexandrinus manuscript, both Egyptian i.e. of the world. The LXX also includes the Apocrypha as part of the OT scriptures, that no 1st century believer would do.

www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ ‘O Biblios’ – The Book pp 5-6]

The end result is that the individual is left with being his own final authority on what God said according to the mind-set “I will be like the most High” Isaiah 14:14. That is not a good situation. “no king in Israel” applies equally to “the word of a king” Ecclesiastes 8:4 not in a church.

“In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes” Judges 21:25.

Concerning Spurgeon, it is well-known that he made statements for and against the AV1611 [see **1 John 3:1, alluded to at the start of the service this a.m.**]. Towards the end of his life, however, in his final address to his students, he made this statement. Note that Spurgeon refers to “this Book” and quotes from that Book, not any other. You get one guess what Book that is, not two. Note also that most departures from the AV1611 Text including those of the NKJV are in line with modern Catholic and Watchtower versions. See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ What is the Bible? – AV1611 Overview.

www.timefortruth.co.uk/alan-oreilly/ O Biblios Overview p 6]

See *The Greatest Fight in the World* www.spurgeon.org/misc/gfw.htm.

“It is sadly common among ministers to add or subtract a word from the passage, or in some way debase the language of sacred writ. Our reverence for the Great Author of Scripture should forbid all mauling of His Words.

“No alteration of Scripture can by any possibility be an improvement. Today it is still the self-same mighty Word of God that it was in the hands of our Lord Jesus.

“If this Book be not infallible, where shall we find infallibility? We have given up the Pope, for he has blundered often and terrible, but we shall not set up instead of him a horde of little popelings, fresh from college.

*“Are these correctors of Scripture infallible? Is it certain that our Bibles are not right, but that the critics must be so? But where shall infallibility be found? The depth saith, ‘It is not in me’ yet those who have no depth at all would have us imagine that it is in them; or else by perpetual change they hope to hit upon it! [Gail Riplinger in *New Age Bible Versions* p 583 states “The NIV translators say, Preface vii, “...the work of translation is never wholly finished.” The New Age boasts of their plans*

for a new bible from the “archaeological archives.” The stage is set for the Antichrist to pull back the veil and launch HIS FINAL VERSION of the story.”]

“We shall gradually be so bedoubted and becriticized that only a few...will know what is Bible and what is not, and they will dictate to the rest of us. I have no more faith in their mercy than in their accuracy.

“They will rob us of all that we hold most dear, and glory in the cruel deed. This same ‘reign of terror’ we will not endure, for we still believe that God reveals Himself rather to babes than to the wise and prudent. We do not despise learning, but we will never say of culture or criticism, ‘These be thy gods, O Israel.’

“To those who belittle inspiration and inerrancy we will give place by subjection, no, not for an hour!”

It is simple to resolve the apparent inconsistency of Spurgeon’s statements on the scriptures. You only have to ask, was he speaking by “the Spirit of God” 1 Corinthians 3:16 or by “a spirit of an unclean devil” Luke 4:33 (all of which are fundamentalists and more knowledgeable on the scriptures than most saved folks)?

I guess for the above statement of Spurgeon’s most fundamentalists would choose the latter. Strange business...

Concerning lost souls on the mission field etc., it is regrettable that while multiple versions were being pushed in the West, Rome has taken control of Bible translation on the mission field. See www.chick.com/catalog/bibleversions.asp *Why They Changed the Bible* by Bro. David Daniels.

Concerning the mission field, this site is also instructive.

See:

purebiblepress.com/bible/
purebiblepress.com/bible/mission.html etc.

[See also:

www.baptistchurchgoa.org/ Grace & Truth Baptist Church, Goa, India, where under the leadership of King James Bible Baptist Pastor Lordson Roch ***“a great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries”*** 1 Corinthians 16:9]

Note that Isaiah 59:19 has been totally distorted in the 1984 church version and 2011 NIVs so that no-one has any standard from the Lord. Praise God for that? “I trow not” Luke 17:9.

On the question of will the Lord be angry with the multiple-whatever-suits-you-DIY-version approach when He comes back? I believe that He will be.

Note that what follows is a condemnation of adulterating “The words of the LORD” Psalm 12:6 either by cutting them out as Jehudi did Jeremiah 36:23 or distorting/changing them in some way, as Eve did, Genesis 3:2-3, which no-one has the authority to do, any more than to produce his own version of *The Highway Code*. See also:

www.av1611.org/niv.html
www.av1611.org/nkjv.html

excellent tracts by Bro. Terry Watkins. “Burden” in the context has to do with God’s judgement on the burden bearer.

“Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the LORD, that use their tongues, and say, **He saith...**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**” Jeremiah 23:31, 36.

Alan O’R

Matthew 7:24, 26 "a rock," "the sand"

This is a follow-up to this a.m. As always, [name removed] was an encouragement but I think that some observations are in order.

The first has to do not with [name removed] message as such but rather with Matthew 7:26 and the parallel passage in Luke 6:49.

I was unsure why the Lord refers to sand in Matthew 7:26. I could understand His use of the term the earth in Luke 6:49 in the context of the parallel passage in Luke 6:47-49. The term the earth is of course often used interchangeably with the term the world, Psalm 33:8, 96:13, 98:9 etc. and the world is evil, John 7:8, Galatians 1:4, 1 John 2:17, 5:19.

The house built on the earth passeth away and eventually so will the earthy-worldly foundation itself. And the world passeth away, and the lusts thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever 1 John 2:17. That fits Luke 6:47-49 and that much is clear. It is unwise to build on an earthy or worldly foundation. Neither the building nor the foundation will last.

It can be inferred from Matthew 7:26 and the context that sand is an insecure foundation. [name removed] likened it to the shifting opinions of men – very ironic in a church that officially has no fixed extant Bible version that is finally authoritative but in fairness that is a reasonable likeness - Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Galatians 4:30 with respect to the Lord's particular use of the word sand.

That is where Gail Riplinger's help came in for she hath been a succourer of many, and of myself also Romans 16:2.

I am re-reading Gail's book *New Age Bible Versions* atm. On p 516 she refers to Egyptian sand. That was what helped with Matthew 7:26. The term sand has several applications in scripture but its first mention in scripture apart from in association with the sea Genesis 22:17, 32:12, 41:49 is Exodus 2:12 And he looked this way and that way, and when he saw that there was no man, he slew the Egyptian, and hid him in the sand.

Egypt is as we know a type of the world in scripture. It is the iron furnace Deuteronomy 4:20, 1 Kings 8:51, Jeremiah 11:4 that the Lord brings His people out of and does not want them ever to return there e.g. by means of Alexandrian texts that underlie virtually all departures from the 1611 Holy Bible and He is wrathful towards those who do, Deuteronomy 17:16, Jeremiah 44:11-14, 26-30 and all the remnant of Judah, that are gone into the land of Egypt to sojourn there, shall know whose words shall stand, mine, or theirs Jeremiah 44:28 i.e. AV1611 or any text that incorporates departures from the AV1611 Text.

The Lord in Matthew 7:26 was therefore referring to Egypt by means of the term the sand, Exodus 2:12, and in turn the world as in the term the earth in Luke 6:49. However, the connotation with Egypt, see above, gives further insight into the nature of the threefold calamity that befell each house, Matthew 7:25, 27 including no doubt the prince of the power of the air Ephesians 2:2. This can be taken a number of ways but the connotation via the sand with Egypt indicates to me w.r.t. the threefold calamity of Matthew 7:25, 27 corrupt Alexandrian scribes e.g. Origen, corrupt Alexandrian manuscripts e.g. Aleph and B and corrupt Alexandrian editors and commentators from Westcott, Hort and Schaff to the present day such as those of Nestle-Aland/UBS, the Scrivener TBS TR and the Majority Text, which it isn't, Greek editions that oversee all current departures from the AV1611 NT Text, as Gail describes in NABV etc.

If I understood correctly [name removed] likened this threefold calamity to God's final judgement on men, some of whom get through it, Matthew 7:25, and some don't, Matthew 7:27 and he used the judgement seat of Christ, Romans 14:10, to depict it but those points cannot be right.

Today's believers' judgement on sin is past, at Calvary, Colossians 2:13-14.

Romans 14:10, 2 Corinthians 5:10, is the judgement of Church Age believers' works, 1 Corinthians 3:11-15. It is yet future and has nothing to do with individual salvation i.e. whether the individual will make it through God's final judgement or not. He already has via John 5:24 [***“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”***].

The final judgement for unbelievers is the judgement of the great white throne, Revelation 20:11-15. It is also the final judgement for saints from other eras e.g. OT, tribulation and millennial saints, which is why their judgement is according to their works Revelation 20:12, 13. See Dr Ruckman's Reference Bible p 1667.

The great white throne judgement is separated from the judgement seat of Christ by 1000 years and from the judgement on Church Age saints' sins by 2000 years.

In sum, the unwise builder should have known that in addition to its inherent instability the sand holds nothing but a dead Egyptian, Exodus 2:12, in type whether an Egyptian scribe, text or modern editor/commentator. There's lots of sand in the land of Israel of course but those of the Lord's listeners who'd done what He'd told them to do and searched the scriptures, John 5:39, would know Exodus 2:12 and its follow-up where the Lord did a much more thorough job than Moses Thus the LORD saved Israel that day out of the hand of the Egyptians; and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the sea shore Exodus 14:30. The Lord will do a thorough job on the Alexandrian Egyptian relics when He comes back, all sorts, Matthew 13:41-43.

[name removed] also referred to the rock, Matthew 7:24, as the Lord's sayings, with reference to Matthew 7:21, 24, 26. However, I can find nowhere in scripture where the Lord's sayings, word or words are likened to a rock. See attached. Dr Ruckman's analysis is comprehensive with respect to the figures in scripture used to describe the Lord's words [***Symbols of the Word, Theological Studies 15*** by Dr Peter S. Ruckman. They include a sword, fire, a hammer, seed, milk, a mirror, a lamp, meat, bread, honey, nails, Hebrews 4:12, Jeremiah 20:9, 23:29, 1 Peter 1:23, 2:2, James 1:22-25, Psalm 119:105, Proverbs 25:11, 1 Corinthians 3:2, Matthew 4:4, Psalm 19:10, Ecclesiastes 12:11].

The Lord is therefore the rock, Matthew 16:18, 1 Corinthians 10:4, Romans 9:33, 1 Peter 2:3-8 and vividly in the Old Testament. The capitals are in the text.

Because I will publish the name of the LORD: ascribe ye greatness unto our God. He is **the Rock**, his work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he Deuteronomy 32:3-4.

But Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked: thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered with fatness; then he forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed **the Rock** of his salvation Deuteronomy 32:15.

Of **the Rock** that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that formed thee Deuteronomy 32:18.

How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight, except **their Rock** had sold them, and the LORD had shut them up? For their rock is not as **our Rock**, even our enemies themselves being judges Deuteronomy 32:30-31.

The God of Israel said, **the Rock** of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God 2 Samuel 23:3.

Scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, therefore shows that a rock, Matthew 7:24, 25, Luke 6:48 twice, pictures the Lord Himself rather than His sayings, aspects of which could nevertheless

be used to help build the house of Matthew 7:24-25, Luke 6:48 as King Solomon advises, to whom should be given the final word.

The words of the wise are as goads, and **as nails** fastened by the masters of assemblies, which are given from one shepherd Ecclesiastes 12:11.

Matthew 13:44 "...he hideth..."

As indicated, Matthew 13:44 refers as a parable to the Lord hiding Himself from Israel for their sin, Deuteronomy 31:17, Psalm 13:1, Isaiah 45:15, 57:17, 59:2.

Note "...the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field; the which when a man hath found, he hideth..." Matthew 13:44. That's the man hiding himself, not the man hiding the treasure again. It's already hid.

The man is the Lord Himself, Matthew 13:37 and Israel is the Lord's peculiar treasure, Psalm 135:4, even though Israel has sinned against Him. The field is the world Matthew 13:38. Israel, though a current, literal, visible political, social and geographical entity, is hid because Israel shall not be reckoned among the nations Numbers 23:9.

The Lord did find His treasure Israel long ago, Deuteronomy 32:10. This is from Dr Ruckman's Reference Bible p 1262.

The buying and selling process is the Lord redeeming Israel and by extension the whole earth from the curse He placed on the earth in Genesis 3:17-19, Isaiah 24:6 hence the crown of thorns the Lord wore at Calvary Luke 23:33 - don't look for Calvary in an NIV, it isn't there, Matthew 27:29, Mark 15:17, John 19:2, 5. See Psalm 130:8, Isaiah 41:14, 43:1, 44:6, 23, 47:4, 48:17, 49:7, 54:5, 63:16. The Lord is Israel's Redeemer.

That is what prompted the disciples' disappointment in Luke 24:21, because the 1st Advent had brought in entry to the kingdom of God, Romans 14:17, by the new birth, John 3:3, 1 Peter 1:23, but not anticipated restoration of the kingdom of heaven as such. Note the disciples' question in Acts 1:7. This will happen following the 2nd Advent "And there shall be no more curse" Revelation 22:3 but the Lord's redemption will also have secured at the 2nd Advent redemption of the physical body for believers, Romans 8:23 and of the earth and animals as well, Isaiah 11:4-9, Romans 8:19-22. That is, the redeeming pictured in Matthew 13:44 includes both Advents.

Note that Matthew 13:44 is a parable for the kingdom of heaven, not the kingdom of God and not of heaven in the sense of the third heaven, 2 Corinthians 12:2 as the term heaven is usually understood.

By contrast the parable of the leaven is for both, Matthew 13:33, Luke 13:20, because the kingdom of heaven includes the earthly kingdoms that will be the Lord's at the 2nd Advent, Revelation 11:15 but they have evil spiritual rulers over them now, Daniel 10:20-21, apart from Israel which has Michael the archangel Jude 9. See also Ephesians 6:12-18. This is what happens when you get born into the spiritual kingdom of God, John 3:3.

There is a spiritual battle and it will even explode in the third heaven in the near future and have its literal fallout on earth, Revelation 12:7-17, particularly against the nation of Israel. I say that because whatever else the commentators might say, there's no particular battle going on in Job except in the sense of that which is raging in Job himself, understandably, e.g. Job 30:17.

The Book of Job is overall about the patience of Job James 5:11, even if Job doesn't seem patient at times, and the end of the Lord, Who not only restored Job, Jeremiah 29:11, as Israel will be at the 2nd Advent, but gave Job twice as much as he had to start with, Job 42. Apart from the first two chapters where God permits the devil to persecute Job, as the devil will persecute Israel in particular in the End Times, the spiritual battle as such, unusually, apart from within Job himself, is a quiet sector for the next 40 chapters.

Don't take any notice of anything by Chuck Swindoll btw. I've seen his name before. He's just one more Bible denier with no Bible other than his own opinion.

See: “The Bible is without error in its original manuscripts” - See www.insight.org/about/essential-beliefs.html. CS & co are not part of the solution to the turmoil that this present evil world Galatians 1:4 is experiencing - and it ain't seen nothin' yet Isaiah 13:9-16 - they're part of the problem.

Note that the NIVs, NKJV, totally botch Matthew 13:44 along with the Catholic Douay-Rheims, JB, NJB and the Watchtower NWTs so you won't get any of the above. I'm coming to the view that modern editors have an unusual ability to botch anything more challenging than opening a screw-top jar and even that comparison might be pushing the boat out a bit.

As indicated the kingdom of heaven is not heaven as such but includes earthly kingdoms, Daniel 4:17, 25, 32, 35, 37, of which the Lord will make Israel the head at her restoration, having obliterated the satanic counterfeit in downtown NYC that stole part of the prophecy of Isaiah 2:1-4. See Dr Ruckman's *The Sure Word of Prophecy*.

It may be wondered why none of the above information is preached in most churches - though it is in spades in Bro. Davis' church [www.timefortruth.co.uk/]. The reason is that we are at the end of the Church Age where folk won't endure sound doctrine 2 Timothy 4:3 by and large.

It's to be hoped that the Lord puts things right very soon, 2 Thessalonians 3:5.

Further to [\[this study\]](#), note another reason why the modern version editors totalled the verse and totally misled the reader. I hope they never get a job updating the GPS or satnavs.

The treasure of Matthew 13:44 is a treasure hid in plain sight. That's why the man could find it without a 1st century metal detector or even a spade. It therefore does not have to be hidden again as the modern versions read. The man, being God, knew what he was looking for, see again Deuteronomy 32:10.

The treasure is like the tabernacle. If you saw it, you could think it was just an ordinary old grey tent. It was much more than that. [\[See the Ruckman Reference Bible p 172\]](#)

The treasure is like this man. “For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not” Isaiah 53:2-3.

The treasure is as Israel is now, not reckoned among the nations, Numbers 23:9. However, Israel's destiny is to be the head of all nations at the 2nd Advent - if Reformed folk along with Mohammedans and British Israelites don't like that, tough, it will happen regardless. That is Israel as a treasure.

“And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD’S house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem” Isaiah 2:2-3.

The Lord has another kind of treasure hid in plain sight, of which the tabernacle was a type. It has to identify itself.

“For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us” 2 Corinthians 4:6, 7.

Alan O’R

Luke 2:14 “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men”

Luke 2:14 is read out in Christmas services, only a few months away.

The following may therefore be helpful. It has been extracted from responses to two Christian fundamentalists who used a 7th Day Adventist site for a list of supposed errors in the AV1611.

The Book brings all sorts of individuals together as its Author did. **“And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together: for before they were at enmity between themselves”** Luke 23:12.

See below _____

The response is in **red bold**.

It comes down to whether or not you care about the Lord’s words.

“Jesus answered and said unto him, **If a man love me, he will keep my words**: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him” John 14:23.

www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-7434.php *Twist and Curl – Your Fiendly Neighbourhood Bible Correctors pp 9-10*

Luke 2:14

KJV Bible: “Glory to God in the highest, **and on earth peace, good will toward men.**”

Better Translation: “Glory to God in the highest, **and on earth peace among men of God’s good pleasure or choosing.**”

Comments: There will be peace on earth among men who have God’s good will in their hearts.

The BT is yet another aberration of English expression and the comment is yet more pious waffle that contradicts John 14:27 and 16:33. Peace on earth is separate from peace given by the Lord Jesus Christ to His followers and will not be achieved until the Return of “The Prince of Peace” Isaiah 9:6.

The BT corruption came from Origen and was adopted by the Catholic Church which inserted it into all Catholic bibles, such as the DR, Douai-Rheims and the JB, NJB, Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles. The NWT, New World Translation of the Watchtower cult and the NIV, TNIV, NKJV footnote have similar readings. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 1333 and “*O Biblios*” – the *Book*, by this author, p 68. See p 49 of the uploaded file www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.

[See end of this extract, text in blue is 2012 updates – AJO’R]

Dean Burgon showed in the 19th century that the supporting evidence in favour of the AV1611 reading is overwhelming.

The following item should also be noted with respect to Luke 2:14. It may be that the extract below identifies some of the commentator's bedfellows.

The item is from the book *The Edge of the Sword* by General Sir Anthony Farrar-Hockley, 1924-2006, pp 259-260.

In April 1951, the late General Sir Anthony Farrar-Hockley was a captain and adjutant in the Gloucestershire Regiment, when it was surrounded by the Communist Chinese and sustained heavy casualties at the battle of the Imjin River during the Korean War. The survivors were then taken prisoner.

General Farrar-Hockley spent two and a half years as a prisoner-of-war and made these observations about a special 'Christmas' message delivered to the Allied POWs by a representative of Camp Commandant Ding named Chang on Christmas Day, 1952.

"He began to read from a page of typescript in his hand...It was in the worst possible taste; for after starting mildly, Ding had been unable to restrain his fanaticism for the Communist cause. He quoted – or rather, misquoted – the Scriptures, particularly the teachings of Christ. We heard the beloved Christmas words, for instance, rendered as follows: "Peace on earth to men of good will"; and the only men of good will, it seemed, were those who followed the policies of the Cominform group of governments. As Chang read on, the silence seemed to intensify. When he had finished, no one spoke; but I have neither felt nor seen before such profound disgust expressed silently by a body of men."

The Communist reading is also that of Nestle's 21st Edition of the Greek New Testament, found with variation in the modern sources listed above. Nestle's 21st Edition reads *"on earth peace among men of goodwill"* in Luke 2:14. Note in passing that extant Greek sources e.g. Nestle, Ricker Berry, Farstad-Hodges along with their interlinear readings are not trustworthy, even if occasionally they may identify an aberrant reading with no Greek support, [Matthew 24:22 is an example where the critics arbitrarily inserted the word *"alive"*]. Greek sources, however, should never be used to change or, supposedly, to correct or clarify the English Text of the 1611 Holy Bible. See *Hazardous Materials* by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger.

Support for the AV1611 in Luke 2:14:

Luke 2:14

"on earth peace, good will toward men" is changed to "on earth peace to men on whom his favour rests" or similar wording by the RV, 1978, 1984 NIV, JB, NJB or to "towards men of good will" or similar wording by the DR, Ne, NKJV f.n. and NWT. [The gender-neutral 2011 NIV changes "men" to "those."](#)

The evidence in favour of the AV1611 against the modern textual critics is cited by Burgon [*The Revision Revised* pp 42-43, 422-423], by Fuller quoting Burgon [*Which Bible?* 5th Edition p 96] and the TBS [article]) *Good Will Toward Men*. Only five codices (Aleph, A, B, D, W) support the modern textual critics, against *"every existing copy of the Gospels, amounting to many hundreds"* Fuller, *ibid*.

Although the Latin, Sahidic and Gothic versions support the modern textual critics, the AV1611 reading is supported by:

2nd Century: Syriac versions, Irenaeus

3rd Century: Coptic version, Origen, Apostolical Constitutions

4th Century: Eusebius, Aphraates the Persian, Titus of Bostra, Didymus, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyssa, Ephraem Syrus, Philo, Bishop of Carpasus, Chrysostom

5th Century: Armenian version, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, Theodotus of Ancyra, Proclus, Paulus of Emesa, Basil of Seleucia, the Eastern bishops of Ephesus collectively

6th Century: Georgian and Ethiopic versions, Cosmos, Anastasius Sinaita, Eulogius, Archbishop of Alexandria

7th Century: Andreas of Crete

8th Century: Cosmos, Bishop of Maiuma, John Damascene, Germanus, Archbishop of Constantinople, pope Martinus.

Berry's Greek text supports the AV1611.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *Luke 2:14 "Good will toward men" or Vatican version "men of good will"?*

Luke 2:22, 22:14, "her purification," "the twelve apostles"

Dear All

Further to this a.m.:

Luke 22:14

"And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the **twelve** apostles with him" AV1611.

"When the hour came, Jesus and his **OMIT** apostles reclined at the table" 1984 church version, 2011 NIVs

The Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthew, Bishops', Geneva Bibles all have the word twelve in Luke 22:14.

So does the Catholic Douay-Rheims, 1749-1752 Challoner's Revision. Later it no doubt became apparent to Rome that it was not good to have Judas taking part in what Catholics have corrupted into the mass. Rome regards Judas as "an unfit communicant for the Holy wafer" and in this Rome was assisted by Dr A. T. Robertson, American Baptist theologian and Greek grammarian of Louisville Theological Seminary, Ky. [See *The Book of Matthew* by Dr Ruckman p 595 and the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1289]

Obviously the word twelve had to go from Luke 22:14. (No doubt Luke 22:21 would later have to be tinkered with.)

Robertson was a lifelong supporter of Nestle's Greek Text that cuts the word twelve out of Luke 22:14. Ricker Berry's Edition of Stephanus' 1550 Greek Received Text and the Farstad-Hodges 'Majority' Text – not a Majority Text but addressing more mss. than Nestle – have the word twelve in Luke 22:14.

The later Catholic versions, JB, NJB and the 1984, 2013 NWTs all omit the word twelve from Luke 22:14, along with the 1881 RV i.e. they agree with the 1984 church version, 2011 NIVs.

Robertson helped Rome's deception because he tried to prove with a harmony of the Gospels that Judas was not present during the events of Matthew 26:26-28. This is impossible with the AV1611

reading of John 13:2 “**And supper being ended**, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon’s son, to betray him.”

What follows is interesting.

It is noteworthy that the Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthew, Bishops’, Geneva Bibles all read with the AV1611 in John 13:2 though some with different wording.

The Douay-Rheims version reads with the AV1611 as well.

However, the 1984 church version, 2011 NIVs have “The evening meal was being served” and “The evening meal was in progress” respectively in John 13:2.

The 1881 RV, JB, NJB, 1984, 2013 NWTs read with the 1984 church version, 2011 NIVs in John 13:2, though with differing wording.

Likewise Nestle’s 21st Edition Interlinear and Ricker Berry’s Interlinear of Stephanus’ 1550 Received Text Edition. The Farstad-Hodges ‘Majority’ Text Interlinear reads with the AV1611. Greek-English interlinears tend to be something of a moveable feast.

In sum, the modern omission of twelve from Luke 22:14 and alteration of John 13:2 help support Rome’s dogma that Judas was not present during Matthew 26:26-28. After all, you can’t have a devil taking mass, John 6:70. Otherwise, some folk might think your church was founded on the devil, Matthew 16:22-23.

As indicated, the 1984 church version, 2011 NIVs are at the centre of Rome’s deception, aided and abetted by Watchtower.

Whether a life or a church, therefore, don’t expect God’s blessing or even approval from anything NIV-based.

“If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me” Psalm 66:18.

Alan O’R

Hi [name removed]

Thank you for your notes. I think – not untypically – some clarification is needed on my part. See inserts below via in [blue](#). I think I got all the glitches, apologies for any I missed.

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ

Alan

Thank you for an interesting discussion of Luke 22 vs.14.

It is unlikely that the evangelical team of NIV translators had any RC sympathies particularly with the heretical mass.

It is not only likely, it is certain. See this extract from another work on the compilation of the NIV, my emphases:

[TBS] *Quarterly Record*, Oct.-Dec. 1987 No. 501, p 8. “Advice was also sought from Jewish, **Roman Catholic**, and atheistic scholars, according to a news release by the publishers.”

The TBS article continues, p 11 “Attention must also be drawn to the fact that, although the NIV professes to be an evangelical translation, the Greek text on which it is mainly based was not prepared by evangelical scholars but by the editors of the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament. The UBS editors included several who deny the inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures, **working in co-operation with a Roman Catholic Cardinal, Carlo Martini**. The soundness of a translation which relies upon such a source must be questioned by every one of the NIV’s evangelical readers.”

I can show you 141 important NT Readings where the 1984, 2011 NIVs depart from the 1611, 2011+ AV1611s along with the 1582 Jesuit-Rheims NT and the Catholic NJB, often by means of serious omissions. I have an extended list of 262 verses, taken from both Testaments, many with important doctrinal implications, where the 1984, 2011 NIVs depart from the AV1611 in 97% of the verses, in company with the NJB, 95%, and the NWT, 92%.

An earlier separate study on 1218 NT verses where the NIV departs from the AV1611, approximately 15% of the 7959 verses of the New Testament, shows that the NIV departs with the JB in 1026 verses, 84% of the total, with the NWT in 1094 verses, 90% of the total and with both in 958 verses, 79% of the total.

The NIV is a Vatican/Watchtower Version.

See brandplucked.webs.com/kjbarticles.htm by Will Kinney:

Undeniable Proof the ESV, NIV, NASB are the new "Vatican Versions"

Undeniable Proof the ESV, NIV, NASBs are the new "Vatican Versions" Part Two

You can only refer to the NIV as the word of God if you accept that God gave His word and indeed His words, plural, Jeremiah 15:16, to Rome and Watchtower.

I don't.

Compared to the KJV team who were more of an ecumenical mix with some being High Church Anglicans.

They were high church and low church – but did not believe in baptismal regeneration, interestingly, or infant baptism – and none were pro-papist or ecumenical in the current sense, quite the reverse, as the Dedicatory Epistle and *The Translators to the Reader* show. As I've said, no modern version editor, for English or Greek NTs, dares raise the subject, my emphases:

*...the zeal of Your Majesty toward the house of God doth not slack or go backward, but is more and more kindled, manifesting itself abroad in the farthest parts of Christendom, by writing in defence of the Truth, (which hath given such a blow unto **that man of sin** [2 Thessalonians 2:3], as will not be healed,)*

*...if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by **Popish Persons** at home or abroad, who therefore will malign us, because we are poor Instruments to make God's holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness...*

*...on the other side we have shunned **the obscurity of the Papists**, in their AZIMES, TUNIKE, RATIONAL, HOLOCAUSTS, PRAEPUCE, PASCHE, and a number of such like, **whereof their late Translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sense, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof, it may be kept from being understood**. But we desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of Canaan, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar...*

I highly recommend *The Men Behind the KJV* by Gustavus S. Paine, *Translators Revived* by Alexander McClure and especially *The Hidden History of The English Scriptures* by Gail Riplinger. Gail has the note on the translators' disavowal of baptismal regeneration and infant baptism, pp 35-36.

Interestingly, the C of E calendar that is included in the front of the 1611 AV1611 refers to the purification of Mary, February 2nd, showing that the then C of E got Luke 2:22 right [**"her purification"**], whereas today's evangelicals, so-called, got it wrong [**"their purification"**]. Check the NIVs, Nestle's etc.

The calendar also lists 4-5 OT and NT chapters for the believer to read *per day*. I doubt if many of today's evangelicals would read that much scripture in 4-5 days. [3 readings minimum, the remaining 2 taken from the Apocrypha]

The calendar further enjoins 13 fast days in the year. That could help with prayer for revival but folk today – self included – might find it a challenge. I'm only saying that whatever is said about the King James translators, any of us today would have to run hard to keep with their devotional and Biblical mind-set. That is reflected in their work.

The situation is clear from the other two synoptists:-

Beware of words like synoptic etc. They were devised to put the Gospel of John in a class by itself as a theological treatise instead of a historical account whereas the references on "the branch" Jeremiah 23:5, Zechariah 3:8, 6:12-13, Isaiah 4:2 show John to be complementary with Matthew, Mark, Luke and no artificial distinction should be imposed.

Mt 26 vs20 When evening, came Jesus was reclining at the table with the Twelve.

vs23 Jesus replied, " The one who has dipped his hand in the bowl with Me will betray Me.

Mk 14 vs17 When evening came, Jesus arrived with the Twelve.

vs20 " It is one of the Twelve," He replied " one who dips bread into the bowl with Me."

The situation is also clear in Luke :-

22 vs 21 " But the hand of him who is going to betray Me is with mine on the table.

Yours in our Lord Jesus Christ.

[name removed]

All of which is true, which is why I mentioned John 13:2, which is most decisive in the AV1611 *though changed in the NIVs and Nestle* and why I mentioned that Luke 22:21 would have to be tinkered with – see earlier post.

What is also true is that the modern versions are *wrong* in cutting "twelve" out of Luke 22:14 as the NIV, Nestle do,

It is wrong to condone that omission,

It is wrong to condone *any* weakening of Biblical testimony because "**the little foxes**...spoil the vines" Song of Solomon 2:15 and "**a little leaven** leaveneth the whole lump" 1 Corinthians 5:6,

A leading Greek scholar, Dr A. T. Robertson, tried to exit Judas before the partaking of the elements in Matthew 26:26-28 by means of his Greek harmony of the Gospels *and that is what Rome wants and would still want.*

She will probably try again in the future by means of something like a resuscitation of what are called The Western Omissions.

These cut out all or vital parts of Luke 22:19-20 – i.e. they only just missed Luke 22:21, 24:3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52. Nestle's 21st Edition supports *all* those omissions except Luke 24:3.

Later versions don't support those omissions but as the NIV Preface says, the work of translation is never wholly finished p vii and Rome now controls most Bible translation efforts, exercising a controlling interest in the content of the Nestle-Aland-UBS Greek NT which is the basis of almost all new version NTs (and of course the NKJV footnotes that are given as viable alternatives to the actual NKJV Text). See www.chick.com/catalog/books/0220.asp *Why They Changed The Bible* by David Daniels.

Nestle-Aland-UBS has of course restored almost 500 AV1611 readings to its text thanks to the heat from Bible believers last century but I suggest that Rome is never so dangerous as when appearing conciliatory. That is what led to the massacre of the Waldenses in 1655, about which Milton wrote and necessitated Cromwell's intervention on the Waldenses' behalf. From another study:

[www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ 'O Biblios' – *The Book* p 11]

An eyewitness account of the massacre had this to say.

"My hand trembles so that I scarce can hold the pen, and my tears mingle in torrents with my ink, while I write the deeds of these children of darkness - blacker even than the Prince of Darkness himself" Jean Leger, Waldensian pastor 1655

That's what you get for thinking Rome is doing you a favour – or will let you remain 'evangelical' once she can call all the shots. Pastor Leger warned his church members but they didn't listen (this writer has a certain Déjà vu here).

This is what Rome really thinks of the AV1611, especially when her 1605 Gunpowder Plot against King James 1st failed – his critics never mention that. Extract from another work:

[www.timefortruth.co.uk/alan-oreilly/ *The Lord the Unknown Warrior* pp 7-8]

This is from *The Secret Plan*, compiled in the Jesuit College near Turin in Northern Italy in 1825. The plan was written up by Fr. Leone, SJ, translated and published in 1848 by Augusta Cooke. This is what the Jesuits had to say about the Authorized King James Bible of 1611.

"Then the Bible, that serpent which with head erect and eyes flashing threatens us with its venom while it trails along the ground, shall be changed into a rod as soon as we are able to seize it [1881, Revised Version, Westcott and Hort, Cambridge University; 1881, 'Originals-onlyism,' Hodge and Warfield, Princeton Theological Seminary, "Traitors, heady, highminded" 2 Timothy 3:4]...for three centuries past this cruel asp has left us no repose. You well know with what folds it entwines us and with what fangs it gnaws us."

It's much later than we think. The Church Age is just about done and in this depiction it's nearly time to clock off. Note the following, messed with by the NIVs, Nestle.

"I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work" John 9:4.

Luke 24:40, 51, 52, Nestle's Omissions and Reinsertions, Luke 24:53 "Amen"

Dear All

On Nestle, it is useful to note the following. Remember that Nestle's 21st Edition English Interlinear is very similar to the 1984 church version NIV even though not identical.

Luke 24:40 "And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet" Ne 21st Edition omits, Ne 26th Edition re-inserts

Luke 24:51 "and carried up into heaven" Ne 21st Edition omits, Ne 26th Edition re-inserts

Luke 24:52 "worshipped him, and" Ne 21st Edition omits, Ne 26th Edition re-inserts

Early post-WW2 modern versions e.g. the RSV also omitted the above words. Later modern versions e.g. the 1984, 2011 NIVs together with the NRSV New Revised Standard Version now include them. Ancient witnesses in favour of the excision of those words are very few and known to have been corrupted. Ancient witnesses in favour of their inclusion are overwhelming. See *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version* by J. A. Moorman pp 99-100.

However, if you followed Nestle from 1897-1979, you'd have to profess that those portions of Luke 24 were not scripture and did not become scripture until 1979 onwards, when Ne 26th Edition was first published.

If you followed the AV1611 from the year 1611 to the present you wouldn't have that problem. The problem nevertheless persists in the form of The Alexandrian Cult. See under:

Note further though that modern versions such as the NIVs, RSV, NRSV, NKJV etc. have cut out or disputed the word "Amen" from Luke 24:53. The word "Amen" ends 24 of the 27 New Testament Books, the exceptions being Acts, James, 3 John (I think I can explain why over and above textual considerations but that is a separate issue).

The 1984 and 2011 NIVs have cut out "Amen" from the endings of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews, 1 Peter, 1 John, 2 John i.e. 17 New Testament Books out of 24. "Amen" is retained in the endings of only 7 Books, Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 2 Peter, Jude, Revelation.

Ne 21st Edition cuts "Amen" from the endings of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, 1 John, 2 John, Revelation i.e. 21 New Testament Books out of 24. "Amen" is retained in the endings of only 3 Books, Romans, Galatians, Jude.

Other Greek Editions e.g. Farstad-Hodges 'Majority' (see note below) Text, Stephanus' 1550 Received Text, retain "Amen" at the end of the 24 New Testament Books as the AV1611 does.

Christians invariably end prayer with the word "Amen." Why are the excisions of "Amen" by the NIVs and most other modern versions from the endings of 17 out of 24 New Testament Books condoned?

A prime-mover in cutting "Amen" from the endings of New Testament Books was the 18th-19th century unsaved Bible-rejecting academic J. J. Griesbach. Dr Edward F. Hills in [standardbearers.net/uploads/The King James Version Defended Dr Edward F Hills.pdf](http://standardbearers.net/uploads/The_King_James_Version_Defended_Dr_Edward_F_Hills.pdf) Chapter 3, *The King James Version Defended* says of Griesbach:

J. J. Griesbach (1745-1812), pupil of Semler [another Bible rejecting academic, see Hills, *ibid.*] and professor at Jena, early declared himself a skeptic regarding the New Testament text. In 1771 he wrote, "The New Testament abounds in more glosses, additions, and interpolations purposely introduced than any other book"... And during his long career there is no indication that he ever changed this view. He was noted for his critical editions of the New Testament and for the comprehensive way in which he worked out a classification of the New Testament manuscripts into three "rescensions" or ancestral groups...[[Our critic, '*O Biblios*' – *The Book*], appealed to this classification method in order to dismiss AV1611 readings that the NIV had either changed or cut out. Dean John Burgon showed 120 years ago in *The Revision Revised* [that Griesbach's classification method is a hoax].

www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/36722?msg=welcome_stranger#toc9

[Griesbach] also developed the thought implicit in Bengel's [another Bible-rejecting academic, see Hills *ibid.*] rule, "The hard reading is to be preferred to the easy reading"...Like Bengel he interpreted this rule to mean that the orthodox Christians had corrupted their own New Testament text [standardbearers.net/uploads/The King James Version Defended Dr Edward F Hills.pdf](http://standardbearers.net/uploads/The_King_James_Version_Defended_Dr_Edward_F_Hills.pdf) Chapter 4 "extremely bizarre" as Dr Hills also states)... According to Griesbach, whenever the New Testament manuscripts varied from each other, the orthodox readings were to be ruled out at once as spurious. "The most suspicious reading of all," Griesbach wrote, "is the one that yields a sense fa-

avorable to the nourishment of piety (especially monastic piety) [i.e. faithful Bible belief, as perceived by Griesbach].” And to this he added another directive: “When there are many variant readings in one place, that reading which more than the others manifestly favors the dogmas of the orthodox* is deservedly regarded as suspicious.”

*i.e. faithful Bible believers, as perceived by Griesbach, who thereby threw out major doctrinal passages such as those found in Matthew 6:13, 20:22, Mark 6:11, 13:14, Luke 2:33, 11:2, 4, Acts 2:30, Romans 1:16, 11:6, 1 Corinthians 6:20, 1 Timothy 3:16, Revelation 1:11, 21:24 etc. These are also passages where Griesbach agrees with the 1582 Jesuit-Rheims NT against the AV1611. The NIVs, Ne 21st Edition follow Griesbach’s Edition in all 14 references cited and in scores more – I have noted 141 passages where the NIVs follow the 1582 Jesuit-Rheims NT against the 1611 and 2011+ AV1611s in www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *The Great Bible Robbery* pp 9-14 and [13] more elsewhere. [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ ‘O Biblios’ – *The Book* pp 202-204]

J. J. Griesbach is the ‘scholar’ who along with the SJ and their Jesuit-Rheims NT of 1582* and Westcott and Hort, two more Bible-rejecting academics [samgipp.com/44-who-were-westcott-and-hort/ Question 44], plus Eberhard Nestle, a Bible-rejecting Greek NT Edition publisher, gave you your NIV.

Griesbach in his Greek NT Edition cut the word “Amen” from the endings of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, 1 Peter, 1 John, 2 John, Revelation i.e. 16 New Testament Books out of 24. “Amen” is retained in the endings of only 8 Books, Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 2 Thessalonians, Hebrews**, 2 Peter, Jude. **Ne 21st Edition and the NIV editors cut “Amen” from the ending of Hebrews on the basis of ONE 19th century editor, another Bible-rejecting academic by the name of Tischendorf.

Solomon’s admonition should be followed:

“Go from the presence of a foolish man, when thou perceivest not in him the lips of knowledge” Proverbs 14:7.


*The 1582 Jesuit-Rheims NT is the vintage NIV, rejected by the English people back then who had better sense than today’s generation. That is why Philip 2nd of Spain, with the pope’s blessing, sent the Armada to catholicise England against her will. See *Sabotage?* by Chick Publications www.chick.com/catalog/comics/0111.asp.

Contrary to papal and SJ aspirations, God blew with His winds and they were scattered. See:

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/He_blew_with_His_winds,_and_they_were_scattered.

It was an answer to prayer: “*To my very loving friend John Foxe [the martyrologist, compiler of Foxe’s Acts and Monuments aka in abridged form Foxe’s Book of Martyrs edited by Forbush, every Christian should have a copy]...continue a faithful remembrance of us in your prayers that our present service may take that good effect as God may be glorified, His Church, our Queen and country preserved and the enemy of truth [“thy word is truth” John 17:17] utterly vanquished, that we may have continued peace in Israel* - our enemies are many, but our Protector commandeth the whole world, let us pray continually, and our Lord Jesus will help in good time mercifully*” - *Francis Drake* *England.

Drake wrote to Foxe in 1587. The Lord Jesus Christ did answer prayer the following year.



In sum, I guess there's nothing that "the judgment seat of Christ" Romans 14:10 won't fix – the NIVs, Ne 21st Edition btw and most other modern versions subvert the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ in Romans 14:10, see Romans 14:11-12, by changing "Christ" to "God." Other Greek Editions e.g. Farstad-Hodges 'Majority' (see note below) Text, Stephanus' 1550 Received Text, read as the AV1611 (though they don't always, 'the Greek' is variable*). The change from "Christ" to "God" is a violation of John 5:23 according to the Lord Jesus Christ in "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."

*Likewise its renditions in English. See samgipp.com/47-what-about-nuggets-found-only-in-the-greek-new-testament/ Question 47.

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ
Alan O'R

P.S. For anyone interested in some more material on a Biblical approach to 5-Point Calvinism, see www.timefortruth.co.uk/bible-studies/alan-oreillys-studies.php *The AV1611 versus TULIP*.

P.P.S. We were assured – rightly – this a.m. that God can do anything. Can He therefore provide a perfect Bible that is "all scripture...given by inspiration of God" 2 Timothy 3:16 in "words easy to be understood" 1 Corinthians 14:9 so that you don't need an array of 'helps' in either ancient languages or various alternative versions in order to find out what God 'really' said? I believe that to be a key question. Such a document is unlikely to be the New International Version according to the Preface p vii "There is a sense in which the work of translation is never wholly finished. This applies...uniquely so to the Bible*." *Not any Bible that this writer follows. That has been a self-fulfilling prophecy for the NIV translation committee. See brandplucked.webs.com/kjbarticles.htm *What about the NIV 2011?, What about the NIV 2011 Old Testament?* You will see that the changes that Will Kinney lists are distinct changes such that the 1984 church version NIV and the 2011 NIV cannot both be right where 100s of these changes have been made. Genesis 49:14, Matthew 11:12 are but two examples out of hundreds. See also:

biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/
www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/version-comparison.php *AV1611 versus Changing NIVs*

The following was put together by Dr Ruckman many years [ago]. It is what non-AV1611 believers would have to tell a new Christian if they were prepared to "Provide things honest in the sight of all men" Romans 12:17.

It's interesting how supposedly fine Christian folks malign Dr Ruckman online. As Dr Ruckman himself has observed, when the sword goes in, the dirt comes out, Judges 3:22 with Hebrews 4:12, 13.

store-hicb8.mybigcommerce.com/2013-monthly-downloads/

December, 2013 B.B.B. Page 15

THE CREED OF THE ALEXANDRIAN CULT

1. There is no final authority but God.
2. Since God is a Spirit*, there is no final authority that can be seen, heard, read, felt, or handled.

*The cultists had to go John 4:24 in the AV1611 to get that. The modern versions, RSV, NRSV, NASVs, NIVs, NKJV, can't tell the difference between "the Spirit of God" 1 Corinthians 3:16, "a spirit of an unclean devil" Luke 4:33 and "the spirit of man...and the spirit of the beast" Ecclesiastes 3:21. Neither could Nestle's 21st Edition Interlinear English nor Farstad-Hodges 'Majority' [based on <8% of extant mss.**] Text Interlinear English underlying the NKJV, though not quite, though Ricker Berry's Interlinear English of Stephanus' 1550 Received Text Edition could. [**See *The James White Controversy Part 5* by Gail Riplinger. Italics and emphases are the author's:

www.avpublications.com/avnew/content/Critiqued/james5.html

*Readers (& White) naturally assume that the term 'Majority Text' and the German sigla "M" represent a numerical majority of a *full* collation of the five thousand-plus Greek New Testament documents. Nothing could be further from the truth. This *so-called* 'Majority Text' White cites is based on von Soden's collation of **414** of the **5,000+** documents. Even these 414 were not *fully* collated. White must not have carefully read the preface which admits, "We were forced to rely on von Soden's work...his presentation of the data leaves much to be desired....The present edition does not cite the testimony of the ancient versions or church fathers."
3. Since all books are material, there is no book on this earth that is the final and absolute authority on what is right and what is wrong, what constitutes truth and what constitutes error.
4. There WAS a series of writings one time which, IF they had all been put into a BOOK as soon as they were written the first time, WOULD HAVE constituted an infallible and final authority by which to judge truth and error.
5. However, this series of writings was lost, and the God who inspired them was unable to preserve their content through Bible-believing Christians at Antioch (Syria), where the first Bible teachers were (Acts 13:1), and where the first missionary trip originated (Acts 13:1-52), and where the word "Christian" originated (Acts 11:26).
6. So God chose to ALMOST preserve them through Gnostics and philosophers from Alexandria, Egypt, even though God called His Son OUT of Egypt (Matthew 2), Jacob OUT of Egypt (Genesis 49), Israel OUT of Egypt (Exodus 15), and Joseph's bones OUT of Egypt (Exodus 13).
7. So there are two streams of Bibles. The most accurate — though, of course, there is no final, absolute authority for determining truth and error; it is a matter of "preference" — are the Egyptian translations from Alexandria, Egypt, which are "almost the originals," although not quite.
8. The most inaccurate translations were those that brought about the German Reformation (Luther, Zwingli, Boehler, Zinzendorf, Spener, et al.) and the worldwide missionary movement of the English-speaking people: the Bible that Sunday, Torrey, Moody, Finney, Spurgeon, Whitefield, Wesley, and Chapman used.
9. But we can "tolerate" these if those who believe in them will "tolerate" US. After all, since there is NO ABSOLUTE AND FINAL AUTHORITY that anyone can read, teach, preach, or handle, the whole thing is a matter of "PREFERENCE." You may prefer what you prefer, and we will prefer what we prefer. Let us live in peace, and if we cannot agree on anything or everything, let us all agree on one thing: THERE IS NO FINAL, ABSOLUTE, WRITTEN AUTHORITY OF GOD ANYWHERE ON THIS EARTH.

This is the Creed of the Alexandrian Cult.

John 1:18, 3:5, 7, 13, 16, 18, “the only begotten Son,” “of the Spirit,” “Ye must be born again,” “which is in heaven,” “his only begotten Son”

Just a few observations from this morning:

John 3:5 of the Spirit AV1611

of is not a weak translation as was said this morning. It is a precise translation. It shows that the born-again believer, John 3:3, is endowed with and infused with **the life of God** Ephesians 4:18. That is why the saved individual **hath everlasting life** John 5:24 because God is **the everlasting God** Genesis 21:33.

The 1984 NIV church bibles and 2011 NIV miss out the word **of** and in turn miss out the cross-references above and give an inferior reading.

Moral: Don't use the NIV for anything other than a doorstop or a paperweight, certainly not for serious Bible study.

John 3:7 Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again AV1611

The Lord is speaking to Nicodemus, an individual. However, the Lord uses the second person plural personal pronoun **Ye**, not the singular equivalent **Thou**.

The Lord has already made it clear that **a man** i.e. an individual **must be born again** John 3:3, 5.

However, the Lord is saying to Nicodemus by means of the plural word **Ye** that ALL men must be born again. This is God's preferred will for ALL men.

For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth 1 Timothy 2:3-4.

The NIVs missed that, naturally, because like all modern texts they got rid of the distinction between the singular and plural second person personal pronouns. This distinction, found only in the AV1611 Text, leads to an informative study on the rise of modern feminism aka femiNazism from Genesis 2:16, 17, 23, 3:1, 2 but that's a separate study.

[\[www.timefortruth.co.uk/alan-oreilly/ O Biblios Overview p 9\]](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/alan-oreilly/O_Biblios_Overview_p9)

John 3:13 And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven AV1611

Note first the underlined words **man** and **he**. They will be addressed below.

For now, note that the NIVs and other modern versions cut out or dispute the underlined words **which is in heaven** in John 3:13. This is a direct attack on the Lord's omnipresence by the NIVs and is therefore a direct attack on the Lord Jesus Christ as **God...manifest in the flesh** 1 Timothy 3:16, *changed or disputed by all modern texts*. The 1984 NIV church bibles footnote for John 3:13 says that some manuscripts have the words *which is in heaven*. The truth is that *all* extant Greek manuscripts have the words - along with the Old Latin and Syriac ancient versions - except for what the 19th century textual scholar Dean Burgon says are a mere 5 manuscripts of bad character. These include the usual suspects, Sinaiticus the convent manuscript and Vaticanus B the pope's manuscript.

[\[www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php\]](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php)

KJO Review Full Text – White's fraudulent claims against the 1611 Holy Bible refuted in detail! pp 637-638]

All the pre-1611 Bibles; Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Bishops', Geneva have the words *which is in heaven*. The words are extremely well-attested.

Whatever you call the NIV, don't ever call it the word of God.

John 3:13 No one has ever gone into heaven except the one who came from heaven — the Son of Man 1984 NIV church bibles, 2011 NIV

Note first that the NIVs substitute *one* for **man** AV1611 above. This indicates the increasingly gender-neutral trend of the modern versions that is noticeable in the 1984 NIV and has been greatly extended in the 2011 NIV.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/version-comparison.php AV1611 vs Changing NIVs.

NIV-supporting Christians in the UK wonder why our 5th Column Government successfully railroaded sodomite 'marriage' through parliament. **Perilous times** 2 Timothy 3:1...

It gets worse.

The NIVs substitute *the one* for **he**. This is New Age Luciferian doctrine concerning the Coming One, Lord Maitreya's New Age Christ i.e. the final antichrist, who is also the Sexless 'One' to fit today's gender equality or neutrality, so-called i.e. sodomite 'rights.' See [[New Age Bible Versions](#)] by Gail Riplinger Chapter 5 *The One vs. the Holy One*. Gail Riplinger has shown that modern versions like the NIVs are riddled with this Luciferian doctrine.

John 3:16, **18 only begotten Son** AV1611 versus one and only Son 1984 NIV church bibles, 2011 NIV.

The NIVs give a wholly misleading reading, as well as wrongly translating the underlying ancient language equivalent words, monogenes in Greek and unigenitus in Latin. Note that the ancient languages are *not* the final authority, the AV1611 *English* is the final authority, but translations and their ancient sources should match.

The objection is raised that *one and only Son* must be correct because the Lord Jesus Christ is the unique Son of God. This objection is wrong, though, because Adam was the son of God, Luke 3:38 and he was unique, having been made out of ground, Genesis 2:7, angels as sons of God Job 38:7 are unique because they are directly *spiritually* created sons of God, as distinct from a directly *physically* created son of God i.e. Adam. Moreover, Christians are unique because they are *spiritual* sons of God by *adoption* Romans 8:15 and the new birth, John 3:3, 5.

Israel collectively is also God's son, Hosea 11:1, even though that scripture is later applied to the Lord Jesus Christ, Matthew 2:15.

In sum, God has other sons besides the Lord Jesus Christ. The NIVs obscure this Biblical fact.

The term **only begotten Son**, S being capitalised because the Lord Jesus Christ is **the Word** John 1:1 and the second Person of the Godhead, 1 John 5:7, conveys the Lord's uniqueness precisely because He was **made of a woman, made under the law** Galatians 4:4 and no other son of God is, as such.

This extract shows that the NIVs reading *one and only Son* is actually blasphemous. The extract is from www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ 'O Biblios' – the Book p 263.

Dr Mrs Riplinger [www.avpublications.com/avnew/content/Critiqued/james1.html *The James White Controversy* Part 1] writes, her emphases, with respect to White's (and our critic's) opinion of "**only begotten.**"

*““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?”*

Emphatically no. However, that extract shows the mess you can get into with the 1984 NIV church bibles – and the 2011 NIV, which is now the mainstream NIV. Sadly, most folk haven’t got a clue and most likely don’t want to know.

That section btw, p 260, shows that the NIV is in any event not altogether certain about the reading *one and only Son*. See this extract for John 1:18. The NIVs are more consistent for John 3:16, 18 but the Gideons NIVs have *only begotten Son* as distinct from the other NIVs that have *one and only Son* i.e. they conflict.

In sum, for John 1:18:

1978 NIV: “God the only [Son]”

1983, 1996, 2007 Gideons NIV: “God, the Only Begotten [Son].” The corner brackets mean that the word bracketed was in the footnotes of the original NIV edition, not necessarily that the word should now be part of the Biblical text.

1984 NIV: “God the One and Only”

2011 NIV: “the one and only Son, who is himself God”

All editions of the AV1611 from 1611 to the present read **“the only begotten Son”** in John 1:18.

Since the NIV editors state in their Preface that they haven’t actually finished their translation work, you wonder what they’ll come up with next.

Finally, concerning John 3:7 **Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again** AV1611, this is good from www.jmm.org.au/articles/2581.htm concerning George Whitefield:

“Why, Mr. Whitefield,” inquired a friend one day, “why do you so often preach on ‘Ye must be born again?’”

“Because,” replied Mr. Whitefield, looking solemnly into the face of his questioner, “Ye must be born again!”

Adapted from *Life Verses*, Vol. 3, by F.W. Boreham

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ

Alan O’R

John 5:39 “Search the scriptures”

John 5:39 is an example of how misleading the modern versions are when it comes to getting into the scriptures. By way of comparison:

John 5:39-40, 1611 AV1611

Search the Scriptures, for in them ye thinke ye haue eternall life, and they are they which testifie of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might haue life.

John 5:39-40, 2011+ AV1611

Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.

The AV1611 reading has stood for over 400 years.

However, watch what happens in these perilous times 2 Timothy 3:1.

John 5:39-40, NIVs (any of them, they're all just as degenerate as each other, whether the 1978, 1984 (church version), 2011 editions, the Gideons edition or the 2005 TNIV edition – now yesterday's NIV, having been superseded by the 2011 NIV)

You diligently study the Scriptures because you think that by them you possess eternal life. These are the Scriptures that testify about me, yet you refuse to come to me to have life.

John 5:39-40 NKJV (as shown above, no AV1611 reads like the NKJV, it isn't a KJV by any stretch of the imagination)

You search the Scriptures, for in them you think you have eternal life; and these are they which testify of Me. But you are not willing to come to Me that you may have life.

The modern versions change a command into a form of rebuke and downplay the importance of searching the scriptures in order to know the Lord Jesus Christ, in conflict with Luke 24:27, 44-45. The Lord was right there in Luke 24:27, 44-45, yet He still taught the disciples from the written scriptures.

And beginning at **Moses** and **all the prophets**, he expounded unto them **in all the scriptures the things concerning himself**.

And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were **written in the law of Moses**, and **in the prophets**, and **in the psalms, concerning me**. Then opened he their understanding, **that they might understand the scriptures**.

The modern reading is actually the opposite of what the Lord actually said and implies that Bible study is optional just so long as you 'come to Jesus,' which is potentially disastrous for a new believer in the light of 2 Timothy 2:15 (also corrupted by the modern versions, 2 Corinthians 2:17 applies just as much now as in Paul's day – and has also been corrupted by the NIVs, NKJV) and 1 Peter 2:2 (corrupted by the NIVs).

That is how the body of Christ has been leavened with false doctrine in the last 130 years, Galatians 5:9, the 1881 RV reads the same as the NIVs, NKJV in John 5:39 and folk wonder why there's no revival.

The damage is probably irreparable this side of the Rapture.

Re: James 2:19 Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: **the devils also believe, and tremble**.

James 2:19 may be seen as a warning against head belief without heart belief but note Isaiah 66:2 For all those things hath mine hand made, and all those things have been, saith the LORD: but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and **trembleth at my word**.

God is looking for genuine belief in Him and His word and no doubt the devils' belief is genuine and extends to the Lord's word, particularly since their champion 1 Samuel 17:4 has no doubt never forgotten the thrashing our Captain Hebrews 2:10 gave him with it in the battle in the wilderness, Matthew 4:4, Luke 4:4. That's why he uses the modern versions to try to get you away from it.

It follows though that the devils' belief in the Lord's word with trembling is actually something admirable, being genuine.

Our belief in and regard for the Book, the King James 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, should therefore at least match that of a spirit of an unclean devil Luke 4:33. However, how many of the Lord's people do we know who actually tremble at the Lord's word? I've encountered a number of professing believers, even locally, who are quite ready to run down the AV1611.

As indicated above, they then wonder why there's still no revival.

Finally, if you look at Hebrews 4:13, you'll see how the AV1611 actually personifies the word of God from Hebrews 4:12. The NIVs and to some extent the NKJV, with His and Him capitalised, obscure this personification, which emphasises how the word of God is indeed quick and powerful and is authoritative, as the King James 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, Ecclesiastes 8:4, having itself the life of God Ephesians 4:18.

The modern scholars, who want to be like the most High Isaiah 14:14, don't like that challenge to their authority, so they get rid of the personification of the word of God in Hebrews 4:13 – and while they satisfy their academic egos, we get no revival and the nation goes to hell on a handcart.

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ

Alan O'R

Acts 1:3, 8, Romans 1:16, “infallible proofs,” “witnesses unto me,” “the gospel of Christ”

Please note:

It is **infallible proofs**, not *convincing proofs*, Acts 1:3. The NIV is wrong here. A thing can be convincing e.g. a good-looking business deal that goes bust but not infallible.

Acts 1:8 is **witnesses unto me** not *my witnesses* that tells you nothing about the nature of the witness. See Colossians 1:27-28 for an application of **witnesses unto me**.

To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus

It is **the gospel of Christ** Romans 1:16. The NIV cuts out *of Christ* to help promote New Age false gospels as part of its inclusivity. **The gospel of Christ** is exclusive of those.

If you want power, you need a Bible translation translated under the aegis of a king, Ecclesiastes 8:4 **Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou?**

The AV1611 was translated under a Christian king with a Hebrew name, James, or Jacob. Without that, the Lord’s people are left poor with no power. See Dr Gipp’s analysis below under _____ and note the powerlessness of any modern version to bring revival once the AV1611 has been abandoned.

Apart from the extenuating circumstances of WW1, 2, this country has not seen a real national revival for 130+ years approximately though it saw repeated such revivals for the best part of 8 centuries before then [*Operation World – A Handbook for World Intercession* by P. G. Johnstone p 53]. Contrary to popular belief, the faithful, non-Catholic English scriptures were being widely circulated amongst the English long before Wycliffe in the 14th century e.g. by Anglo-Saxon kings such as Alfred the Great in the 9th century. See *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* by Gail Riplinger, a must-read, I think, for anyone who professes to love Jesus, as we sometimes hear professed, John 14:23 [**“Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him”**].

Note especially point 5 below for this country with the horror of the Rotherham child molestation atrocity on an industrial scale, with [over 1400] victims in [16] years, perpetrated by Pakistani Mohammedan adult males...

[See:

www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/crime/11391314/Rotherham-child-sex-abuse-scandal-council-not-fit-for-purpose.html *Rotherham council ignored child abuse by Asian gangs because of 'misplaced political correctness', report concludes*

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rotherham_child_sexual_exploitation_scandal

Rotherham child sexual exploitation scandal with links revealing that this Mohammedan atrocity is endemic in other large towns and cities in the UK]

What is worst of all is that while all these atrocities are being committed in Rotherham and elsewhere, the leading Christian reform groups, Barnabas Fund, Christian Action and Research Education, Christian Concern for Our Nation, Christian Institute, have to the best of my knowledge, said nothing. If it is argued that ‘Moslems should be led to Christ etc.’ the figures I have show that over the years about 3000 Moslems max. have become Christians [in the UK] – and are in fear of their lives for reprisals from their former co-religionists – but 100,000 Brits, including [56,000] women, have become Moslems. [The figures are difficult to compare because no time frame data are readi-

ly available. However:] That is, for every one of theirs we get, they get 33 of ours, [up to 20] of them females.

[See:

www.telegraph.co.uk/news/religion/8238812/Surge-in-Britons-converting-to-Islam.html
Surge in Britons converting to Islam

www.safe-haven.org.uk/about/the-need/ *Why is Safe Haven Necessary?*]

It seems to me that for the church in Britain as a whole, including its evangelical, fundamental component, 2 Timothy 1:7 isn't working too well.

For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.

Please let me know if on any out-of-town trip you hear the above preached on.

It also seems to me that the church in Britain as a whole, including its evangelical, fundamental component, is not taking the Lord Jesus Christ seriously with respect to the child victims mentioned above. The Lord said ***Suffer the little children to come unto me***, not *Suffer them simply to suffer, at the hands of fat-cat cowards and alien savages*. Note the embedded warning for believers in what follows.

But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God Mark 10:14.

Remember, I will help with any passage in the AV1611 that anyone finds hard to understand.

In case you're wondering, please feel free to circulate this anywhere.

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ

Alan O'R

[www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-7434.php *The 1611 Holy Bible versus Lying Satanic Jacob Prasch – Prequel* p 63]

As for the “merits” of the respective translations supported by James 1 on one hand and Westcott on the other, I quote again from Dr. Gipp [*The Answer Book* Dr. Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D., Samuel C. Gipp, 1989. 2014 update. See samgipp.com/42-arent-modern-english-translations-easier-to-understand/ Question 42] p 113:

“Today’s modern translations haven’t been able to spark a revival in a Christian school, let alone be expected to close a bar. In fact, since the arrival of our modern English translations, beginning with the ASV of 1901, America has seen:

1. God and prayer kicked out of our public school.
2. Abortion on demand legalised.
3. Homosexuality accepted nationally as an “alternate life style”.
4. In home pornography via TV and VCR.
5. Child kidnapping and pornography running rampant.
6. Dope has become an epidemic.
7. Satanism is on the rise.

If this is considered a “revival” then let’s turn back to the King James to STOP it”.

Acts 7:45, 1 Corinthians 11:24, Hebrews 4:8, "Jesus," "Take, eat...broken," "Jesus"

I see I had not included the material on Hebrews 4:8 in the email of January 30th. Apologies for that. It is as follows. See under _____.

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ
Alan O'R

P.S. The versions being used for Communion appear to be a mixture as follows:

1 Corinthians 11:24:

1978, 1984 (church bibles), 2011 NIVs: "and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, "This is my body, which is for you; do this in remembrance of me.""

NKJV: "and when He had given thanks, He broke it and said, "**Take, eat**; this is My body which is **broken** for you; do this in remembrance of Me.""

CEV, Contemporary English Version: "Then after he had given thanks, he broke it and said, "This is my body, which is **given** for you. Eat this and remember me.""

OR

NLT, New Living Translation: "and gave thanks to God for it. Then he broke it in pieces and said, "This is my body, which is **given** for you. Do this to remember me." [Further observation has shown that the NLT is the version being used for the word "given"]

The AV1611 in all its editions reads: "And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, **Take, eat**: this is my body, which is **broken** for you: this do in remembrance of me."

1 Corinthians 11:24 is the only place where the phrase "**is broken for you**" is found.

The 1881 RV and the other post-1881 versions listed below in fairly wide use all cut out "Take, eat" and "broken" apart from the NKJV and the CEV, NLT that change "broken" to "given."

None of the Greek Inter-linears listed below read "given" in 1 Corinthians 11:24, Nestle's 21st Edition cutting out "Take, eat" and "broken" like most of the modern versions do, including the Catholic JB, NJB and the Jehovah's Witnesses NWT, which the NIVs agree with in 1 Corinthians 11:24 in cutting out "Take, eat" and "broken."

The term "given" does match what the Lord said in Luke 22:19 "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is **given** for you: this do in remembrance of me" and Luke 22:19 is the only place where the phrase "**is given for you**" is found but note that the words "**Take, eat**" are not found in Luke 22:19. Aside from in 1 Corinthians 11:24 they are found as follows:

"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, **Take, eat**; this is my body" Matthew 26:26.

"And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, **Take, eat**: this is my body" Mark 14:22.

Matthew 26:26, Mark 14:22 do not of course include the word "**given**."

What Paul has done in 1 Corinthians 11:24 under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost has therefore been to collate all the Lord's statements in the Gospels about the communion and give further revelation by means of the word "**broken**" instead of "**given**" that directly associates communion with the manner of the crucifixion and the Lord Jesus Christ with the Messiah and the Second Advent, "**till he come**" 1 Corinthians 11:26.

“For dogs have compassed me: the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they **pierced** my hands and my feet” Psalm 22:16, i.e. the skin and flesh are broken, not the bones, John 19:36 with Exodus 12:46, Psalm 34:20.

“And again another scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they **pierced**” John 19:37. Note in passing the use of the sinister New Age term “the one” instead of “him” in the NIVs in John 19:37, denoting the false messiah of the End Times. See Gail Riplinger’s book [[New Age Bible Versions](#)] Chapter 5 *The One vs. the Holy One*.

“And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon **me** whom they have **pierced**, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn” Zechariah 12:10. Note again the New Age term “the one” substituted for “me” in the NIVs.

Substitution of the word “given” for “broken” in 1 Corinthians 11:24 covers up the above revelation.

As well as being influenced by the wording of Luke 22:19, use of the word “given” in 1 Corinthians 11:24 may stem in part from the readings of the 1582 Jesuit Rheims New Testament and the later Douay-Rheims Challoner’s 1749-1752 Revision:

1582 JR: “And giving thanks brake, and said: Take ye and eat, This is my body which shall be **delivered** for you: this do ye for the commemoration of me.”

DR: “And giving thanks, broke and said: Take ye and eat: This is my body, which shall be **delivered** for you. This do for the commemoration of me.”

“Delivered” seems to be a halfway reading between “broken” and “given” and may therefore partly explain why “given” occurs in 1 Corinthians 11:24 in a couple of the modern versions. Note that the change from “broken” to “given” and even more the cutting out of the word “broken” in 1 Corinthians 11:24 is a sop to the pope, who would not like the word “broken” directly associated with the Lord’s body because the papist communion wafer (aka the little Jesus cookie, Jack Chick, *Smokescreens*) is a little round object that is administered whole, not broken.

Finally, J. A. Moorman in *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version*, p 124, notes that the words “Take, eat” and “broken” in 1 Corinthians 11:24 are found in the great majority of ancient sources, including extant Greek manuscripts both uncial and cursive and the Peshitta Syriac version, which is agreed to reflect a 2nd century text. The extant Old Latin copies, also agreed to have a 2nd century text, omit “Take, eat,” (it is known that various copies were deliberately corrupted by ancient church writers such as Origen and Jerome) but most of them include “broken.” The early Gothic version, forerunner to the English versions, includes “Take, eat” and “broken.”

Prominent among the few sources that omit “Take, eat” and “broken” are P46, one of the early i.e. 3rd century papyrus manuscripts and known to be dodgy, see [[New Age Bible Versions](#)] Chapter 35 *The Earliest Manuscripts* (Gail shows that early papyri manuscripts nevertheless repeatedly read with the AV1611 against the NIVs, being mixed texts) and uncial codices Aleph Sinaiticus and B Vaticanus, the Vatican manuscript. Aleph and B, especially B, were beloved by Westcott and Hort, the two apostate Anglicans who master-minded the 1881 RV and in turn most of the NIV departures from the AV1611. See *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* by David W. Daniels [www.chick.com/catalog/bibleversions.asp].

Appendix – Deficiencies of the NIVs [[www.timefortruth.co.uk/alan-oreilly/ Hebrews ch 4 pp 10-12](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/alan-oreilly/Hebrews_ch_4_pp_10-12)]

Acts 7:45 with Hebrews 4:8. The 1978, 1984, 2011 NIVs change “**Jesus**” found in the 1611 AV1611 and the 2011+ AV1611 to “*Joshua*.”

Of the pre-1611 versions:

The 1385, 1395 Wycliffe Bibles have “*Jesus*” in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8.

The 1582 JR Jesuit Rheims New Testament has “*Jesus*” in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8.

The Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Great Bibles have “*Joshua*” in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8.

The Bishops’, Geneva Bibles have “*Jesus*” in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8.

Of the post-1611 versions:

The 1749-1752 DR Douay-Rheims Bible Challoner’s Revision has “*Jesus*” in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8.

The 1881 RV, ASV, NASV, RSV, NRSV, JB Jerusalem Bible, NJB New Jerusalem Bible, NWT New World Translation, CEV Contemporary English Version, ESV English Standard Version, GNT Good News Translation, HCSB Holman Christian Standard Bible, NCV New Century Version, NET New English Translation, NLT New Living Translation have “*Joshua*” in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8.

Nestle’s 21st Edition Interlinear has “*Jesus*,” “*Jesus (Joshua)*” in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8.

Ricker Berry’s Edition of Stephanus’s 1550 Received Text Edition Interlinear has “*Joshua*,” “*Jesus (i.e. Joshua)*” in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8.

The Farstad-Hodges ‘Majority’ Text Edition Interlinear and the NKJV have “*Joshua*” in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8.

The pre-1611 witnesses are clearly mixed with respect to the AV1611 reading “**Jesus**” in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8 but appear to stabilise in favour of the AV1611 in the final Bibles of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation, the Bishops’ and Geneva Bibles, returning in effect to the reading of the Wycliffe Bibles that is retained in both the 1582 JR Jesuit Rheims New Testament and post-1611 1749-1752 DR Douay-Rheims Bible Challoner’s Revision.

The witness of the three Greek-English Interlinear texts with respect to the AV1611 reading “**Jesus**” in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8 is also mixed but nevertheless indicates that the underlying word for the AV1611 reading is the same as it is for “**Jesus**” throughout the New Testament. Young’s *Analytical Concordance To Holy Bible* confirms that this is the case.

By inspection, the post-1611 English versions from 1881 onwards uniformly reject the reading “**Jesus**” in spite of God’s evident vindication of that reading in the later stages of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation.

The AV1611 reading “**Jesus**” in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8 may be shown to be correct by means these extracts from this writer’s work “*O Biblios*” – *The Book* pp 35, 268-269 and the online expanded edition www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ pp 26, 209-210:

Critics will change a ‘clear’ verse in the AV1611 to make it more ‘accurate’ and alter an ‘accurate’ verse to make it ‘clearer’. Obviously the overriding aim is to alter the AV1611 Text at any cost. Note that where the AV1611 correctly translates “**Jesus**” in Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8, the critics insert “*Joshua*” because they cannot understand that Joshua is an Old Testament type of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ, associated with the destruction of an accursed city, Joshua 7:26 and Revelation 18, 19:2, [*Problem Texts* Dr Peter S. Ruckman] pp 337-338. Moreover, Joshua 5:13-15 shows that the Lord Jesus Christ did command the people of Israel during their invasion of the Promised Land as “**captain of the host of the Lord**”, Who received worship from Joshua, just as He did from the disciples centuries later, Matthew 14:33. This Old Testament appearance of the Lord “**whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting**” Micah 5:2, was promised in Exodus 23:20-

23, which refers to “**mine Angel**” of Whom God says “**for my name is in him**”. The modern translations all overlook this essential feature of the conquest of Canaan and in so doing fail to give glory due to the Lord Jesus Christ...

Our critic’s last comment on Tyndale is with respect to **Acts 7:45** and **Hebrews 4:8**. Tyndale here agrees with the NIV etc. in inserting “Joshua” instead of “**Jesus**.” Our critic’s explanation is as follows *“The reason why the KJV puts “Jesus” has nothing to do with your theological but highly implausible explanation. It lies simply in the rules drawn up by King James that there should be no attempt to maintain uniformity between the OT and the NT. Hence the OT gives the Hebrew form of the name and the NT gives the Greek form of the name.”*

What our critic calls *“Your theological but highly implausible explanation”* is not mine but Dr Ruckman’s and was referenced as such, Section 5.7. [See also the Ruckman Reference Bible p 1441.](#)

Further, the explanation was not “*theological*” but BIBILICAL. THREE passages of scripture were cited, including one entire Chapter of the Book of Revelation, Chapter 18. (Another relevant passage would be **1 Kings 16:34**.) In his denunciation of what the Lord has graciously shown Dr Ruckman, our critic discussed NONE of these references in relation to Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8.

The rules were not drawn up by King James but *“Bishop Bancroft, with advice from others, had prepared or at least approved”* these rules [[The Men Behind the KJV Gustavus S. Paine](#)] p 70.

Our critic ought at least to have quoted the rule to which he refers. It is Rule 2 and states:

“The names of the prophets and holy writers with the other names of the text to be retained as nigh as may be, according as they were vulgarly used.” This rule obviously aims at authenticity with respect to common contemporary usage of proper names, not deliberate non-uniformity between the Old Testament and New Testament.

It is also interesting that in Acts 7, the names of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, David and Solomon appear exactly as they do in the Old Testament. Why not Joshua, if “Joshua” is the correct rendering? If “**Jesus**” is merely “Joshua,” am I supposed to believe that not ONE of the other EIGHT names had a “*Greek form*,” especially when our critic is so quick to point out “**Esaias**,” “**Jeremy**,” “**Elias**” etc.?

Moreover, why is “**Saul**” referred to as such in Acts 7:58, when he was also called “**Paul**,” Acts 13:9? Doesn’t “**Saul**” have a “*Greek form*”? It is, after all, a HEBREW name, 1 Samuel 9:2.

Elsewhere our critic criticises the AV1611 for *“Failure to render the same Hebrew and Greek word by the same English equivalent.”* See Section 10.8. This is very ironic.

After all, “Iesou” is “**Jesus**” everywhere else in the New Testament.

Our critic provides NO statement from ANY of the AV1611 translators that they were applying their Rule 2 in using the name “**Jesus**” in Acts 7:45.

I continue with Dr Ruckman’s study of Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8, from his commentary *The Book of Acts*, p 225. See also *Problem Texts* pp 337-338 and Section 5.7.

*“The Greek text (any Greek text anywhere) says Iesou (Greek for “**Jesus**”), and if your “Bible” says “Joshua”, you have an inferior translation produced by inconsistent critics who cared nothing about ANY Greek text in a showdown. God the Holy Spirit wrote “**Jesus**”...to remind you that when Jesus returns He enters the land of Canaan by the same route Joshua entered, attacking a cursed city (Revelation 17, 18) after a seven year period (Joshua 6:15). His rule will be a military dictatorship (Psalm 110, Revelation 20), as Joshua’s was, and the celestial phenomena of Joshua 10:12 will accompany His Advent (Matthew 24:29, Luke 21:25). Furthermore, the Jews will divide the land (Ezekiel 40-48) and repossess it at this time.*

“Moral: where scholars find “mistakes” in the King James Bible, the HOLY SPIRIT has often given an ADVANCED REVELATION expressly for the purpose of confounding the “leading authorities who agree.”“ Moreover, Joshua 5:13-15 and Exodus 23:21 reveal that “**the captain of the Lord’s**

host” is **“the captain of their salvation”** Hebrews 2:10, JESUS, to Whom Joshua was subordinate for the entire campaign, Joshua 4:14, 6:27, 7:6-13, 10:25, 42.

It is hoped that the above extracts would satisfy a Bible believer, even if not a Bible critic, whose mindset Paul understood long ago:

“...so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith” 2 Timothy 3:8.

Finally, only **“Jesus”** fits the context of Hebrews 4:7-8, with the quotation from Psalm 95:7 *in the context of Psalm 95:7-11*.

“Again, he limiteth a certain day, saying in David, To day, after so long a time; as it is said, To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts. For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day.”

Note also 2 Samuel 23:1-2.

“Now these be the last words of David. David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet psalmist of Israel, said, The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue.”

Psalm 95:7-11 state as follows:

“For he is our God; and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand. To day if ye will hear his voice, Harden not your heart, as in the provocation, and as in the day of temptation in the wilderness: When your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my work. Forty years long was I grieved with this generation, and said, It is a people that do err in their heart, and they have not known my ways: Unto whom I swear in my wrath that they should not enter into my rest.”

2 Samuel 23:1-2 with Hebrews 4:7 show that the Spirit of God is speaking through David in Psalm 95:7-8. Note that **“he limiteth a certain day”** because the earth will have seen no day like it since Joshua 10:13-14, which is a prelude to the Second Advent and Zechariah 14:3, because the Lord will “hearken” to **“the captain of the LORD’S host”** Joshua 5:15, Who is **“the captain of their salvation”** Hebrews 2:10 **“the man Christ Jesus”** 1 Timothy 2:5. See extracts above and the Ruckman Reference Bible pp 347-348, 355, 1224. Joshua 10:13-14, Zechariah 14:3 read as follows, the link between them being the phrase **“the day of battle.”** See also Question 2.

“And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the book of Jasher? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day. And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the LORD hearkened unto the voice of a man: for the LORD fought for Israel.”

“Then shall the LORD go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle.”

Inspection of Psalm 95:7-11 shows further that God Himself is speaking in Psalm 95:7-8.

However, inspection of Hebrews 4:7-8 shows that the words **“To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts”** are attributed to **“Jesus,”** Who is the antecedent for the personal pronoun **“he”** in Hebrews 4:8. **“Jesus”** is undoubtedly the correct name because Joshua the historical leader of Israel never spoke the words **“To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.”** The modern textual reversion from **“Jesus”** to **“Joshua”** is therefore not only wrong but blasphemous, a blatant attack on the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

2 Samuel 23:1-2, Psalm 95:7-11, Hebrews 4:7-8 therefore show that the Lord Jesus Christ is indeed **“God...manifest in the flesh”** 1 Timothy 3:16 and one of the Three Persons of the Godhead, Acts 17:29, Romans 1:20, Colossians 2:9:

“For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one” 1 John 5:7.

1 Peter 1:22, 2:2, 6, 9, 1 John 3:1, “through the Spirit...pure,” “the sincere milk of the word,” “a chief corner stone,” “a peculiar people,” “called the sons of God”

[name removed] mentioned about comparing the AV1611 with the NIV for the word fear and associated expressions.

These are the figures.

Occurrences in turn for the expressions fear God, fear of God, fear the Lord, fear of the Lord, fear

AV1611: 10, 8, 30, 30, 400

1984 NIV: 11, 9, 26, 22, 260

2011 NIV: 13, 10, 31, 21, 271

When it comes to fear the Lord, fear of the Lord, fear, the NIVs are on the downward trend [from the AV1611].

Here are some additional notes arising from this morning.

1 Peter 1:22, 2:2, 1 John 3:1 have been addressed from www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ ‘O *Biblios*’ – *The Book* pp 62, 122-124, 203, 218-219. NIV, NIVs refer to 1984 church version, 2011 NIVs, NWT refers to 1984, 2013 NWTs unless otherwise stated. Inserted references and some additional notes for the extracts are in blue except for those labelled *2012 or embedded in the text without blue braces [].

1 Peter 1:22, not mentioned this a.m. but important w.r.t. the beloved subject of love

1 Peter 1:22

“**through the Spirit**” and “**pure**” have been omitted by the DR (changes “**pure**” to “sincere”), RV, Ne [Nestle’s 21st Greek-English Interlinear Edition], NIV, NKJV f.n. omits “**through the Spirit**” only, JB, NJB, NWT.

Ruckman [*The Bible Babel*] p 82, indicates that the authority for the omissions is B. However, the AV1611 readings are found in Papyrus 72, written 80 years before B, as well as in the Receptus - see Berry’s Greek text [Stephanus’ 1550 Greek-English Interlinear Edition of the Received Greek Text].

[The 2011 NIV shows its gender-neutral bias by changing “brothers,” 1984 NIV, to “each other.” Do not overlook the fact that the NIVs have made very serious omissions in 1 Peter 1:22 based on the contaminated Vaticanus B manuscript held in the Vatican Library. That cannot be pleasing to God]

1 Peter 2:2

Our critic fails to mention that instead of “**the sincere milk of the word**” 1 Peter 2:2, AV1611, the obscure reading “crave pure spiritual milk” is found with minor variation in the NIV, JB, NJB, NWT (which adds “belonging to the word” [1984 NWT, 2013 NWT is slightly altered]). He also neglects to mention the addition “unto salvation” found, with variation, in the NIV, JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W [Minority mss. Greek texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth].

Dr Ruckman states [*The NIV*] p 38 of the NIV reading in 1 Peter 2:2 “you just “grow up in your salvation,” *IMPLYING YOU MIGHT ALREADY HAVE IT**2012. *In the AV you simply grow by feasting on the sincere milk AFTER you are saved. “eis soterian” has been ADDED to the text by “conflation” (Aleph, P72, A, B and C) and this time, going completely contrary to Griesbach’s “canons”, the “SHORTER READING” WAS REJECTED. The “shorter reading” was the TEXTUS RECEPTUS.*”

*2012 That is, without having received the Lord Jesus Christ by faith, John 1:12. The modern i.e. Catholic reading allows for baptismal regeneration. See *Are Roman Catholics Christians?* by Chick Publications, www.chick.com/reading/tracts/0071/0071_01.asp.

It is ironic that in the morning service on October 30th 1994, our critic quoted once, if not twice, the words “**the sincere milk of the word**” with respect to the requirements for Christian growth. In his introductory letter, see Chapter 8, he assures me that “*if a translation from the KJV is for some reason preferable I am always prepared to say so.*”

However, he was not, on this occasion. Like many of the quotations in his document, this one remained anonymous.

As indicated, the NIVs have “grow up **in** your salvation.” The JB, NJB have “grow **up to** salvation.” The NWTs have “grow **to** salvation.” The Rome and Watchtower readings imply works-based salvation that is of course fine with them. However, Rome and Watchtower are closer to the sources they translated from than the NIV translators, who tinkered with the reading – unsuccessfully, see Dr Ruckman’s evaluation above – in order to avoid works-based salvation and to keep up the pretence that they are evangelical.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php:

[KJO \[King James Only\] Review Full Text pp 382-383.](#) [[KJO Review Full Text](#) is my review of the book *The King James Only Controversy* by James White, lent to me by [name removed] back in 2007. Some of you will have seen the attached but it is instructive so I’ve included it again.]

[attachment inserted at the conclusion of this work]

Dr Ruckman [*The Books of the General Epistles Volume 1* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman] ^{p 247} affirms that, his emphasis, “Here in 1 Peter 2:2, the RSV reads, “Like newborn babes, long for the pure spiritual milk, that by it you may grow up to salvation.” **That’s works salvation.** If you get saved, you get saved instantaneously, the moment you trust Christ as your Saviour. **No one “grows up to salvation.”**

“The NASV and NIV have tried to cover up the heresy of the text which they translated (Nestle’s). The NASV text says, “grow up **in respect** to salvation.” The NIV says, “grow up in your salvation.” But those **aren’t** translations. Those are paraphrases to make you think that the Westcott-Hort text of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus is an orthodox text.

“The Nestle’s text, which contains the Alexandrian reading, says, “εις σωτηριαν” (eis soterian). The “formal equivalence” (i.e. word-for-word) translation is “into” (or “unto”) “salvation.” A little problem with “the original text” there, eh what?

“Anything to get rid of the **King James** text!”

1 Peter 2:6

The NIVs, JB, NJB, NWTs change “a **chief** corner stone, elect, precious” AV1611 to “a chosen and precious cornerstone” or similar i.e. they omit “**chief**” and obscure the omission by fronting “cornerstone” with strong adjectives i.e. “precious” and/or “chosen.” Note also for the NIVs the insertion of the term “the one” instead of “he.” This is a New Age insertion for a disciple of the New Age false Christ. See *New Age Bible Versions* by Gail Riplinger Chapter 5 *The One vs. the Holy One*.

It appears that “a **chief** corner stone” AV1611 is an idiomatic translation. The King James translators thereby gave pre-eminence to the Lord Jesus Christ and that is reflected in their Bible translation. “The idol shepherd” Zechariah 11:17 doesn’t want the Lord Jesus Christ to be “**chief**” and that is reflected in his bible versions.

1 Peter 2:9

The NIVs, JB, NJB, NWTs change “a **peculiar** people” to “a people belonging to God,” “God’s special possession,” “a people set apart,” “a people to be a personal possession,” “a people for special possession” both editions. Note that the 1984, 2011 NIVs reading are different. “God’s special possession” can be His entire creation, Isaiah 45:18, not simply “a people belonging to God.” The 2011 NIV is edging towards New Age pantheism.

This time even Rome and Watchtower are closer to the correct reading than the NIVs, in which the word “God” has been arbitrarily inserted. Not even the ESV follows suit. Earlier modern versions, RV, ASV, NASVs, inserted the word “God’s” in italics showing that they had made it up but in so doing, like the NIVs, they got the sense of the verse wrong. The sense of the verse is that “a **peculiar** people” are an holy people, as the adjacent term shows with respect to “an **holy** nation.” They are also a pure people – see remarks on 1 Peter 1:22 above – who are holy and pure because they do what God says out of “a **pure** heart.” The term “peculiar” is thereby defined elsewhere in scripture. The sense of the word “peculiar” in scripture shows that the term includes the current and restricted meaning of the word as strange or odd.

“For thou art an **holy** people unto the LORD thy God, and the LORD hath chosen thee to be a **peculiar** people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth” Deuteronomy 14:2.

“And the LORD hath avouched thee this day to be his **peculiar** people, as he hath promised thee, **and that thou shouldst keep all his commandments**” Deuteronomy 26:18.

“Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, **and purify unto himself a peculiar people**, zealous of good works” Titus 2:14.

Note w.r.t. the 1984 NIV reading that “Behold, **all souls are mine**; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die” Ezekiel 18:4 would fit 1 Peter 2:9 in the 1984 NIV but not all souls are holy.

Note w.r.t. the 2011 NIV reading that “**the LORD made the heavens**” 1 Chronicles 16:26, Psalm 96:5 would fit 1 Peter 2:9 in the 2011 NIV but “**the heavens are not clean in his sight**” Job 15:15 i.e. they are not holy. That is, the NIVs got the sense of 1 Peter 2:9 wrong w.r.t. “a peculiar people” even worse than Rome and Watchtower did.

Note brandplucked.webs.com/1peter29apeculiarp.htm Will Kinney’s remarks on the NIVs readings for 1 Peter 2:9.

It is a bit hypocritical to hear the new versionists complain about the KJB “adding” the word ‘God’ to such expressions as “God forbid”, and then turn around and add the word ‘God’ themselves when it most [definitely] is not in any Greek text at all. (By the way, the expression ‘God forbid’ IS correct - See brandplucked.webs.com/godforbid.htm)

However the use of the English word ‘peculiar’ has a long history and it is still used today in several Bible translations.

*The word ‘peculiar’ as in the phrase ‘a peculiar people’ or ‘the peculiar treasure of kings’ is found in the following Bible translations: Wycliffe bible 1395, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, Matthew’s Bible 1549, the Bishops’ Bible 1568 - “But ye are a chosen generation, a royall priesthood, an holy nation, **a peculiar people**”, the Geneva Bible 1587, 1599, 1602, the King James Bible 1611...*

The word ‘peculiar’ as in ‘a peculiar people unto Himself’ and ‘the peculiar treasure of kings’ is not at all archaic and the King James Bible is right, as always. Why exchange the infallible Bible which clearly has the blessing and the hand of God upon it like no other, for an inferior bible version like the ESV, NASB, NIV or NKJV that nobody believes is the 100% true words of God?

[If the 100% true words of God is NOT the AV1611, then what are they as a single BOOK between two covers in “words easy to be understood” 1 Corinthians 14:9? Apart from AV1611 believers, no evangelical Christian fundamentalist today can give an unambiguous, unequivocal answer to that question – and they wonder Why no Revival?] I and thousands of other Bible believing Christians will stick to the King James Holy Bible, thank you very much.

Will Kinney

1 John 3:1, alluded to at the start of the service this a.m.

www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ ‘O Biblios’ – The Book pp 123, 203, 218-219]

The AV1611 is accused in **1 John 3:1** of having omitted “And that is what we are” found with variation in the NIV, JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A and therefore detracting from “assurance,” according to our critic. The clause is superfluous in 1 John 3:1 for two reasons:

1. “**Sons of God**” in 1 John 3:1 is obviously a term applied by the Father to those who have believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, in order to show the “**manner of love**” which He, the Father “**hath bestowed**” on them. If “**the sons of God**” are “**called**” such, it follows immediately that that is what they ARE, because God CANNOT lie, Titus 1:2. (Note here that the NIV, JB NJB have only that “God DOES not lie.” [The NWT has the correct reading on this occasion.](#))
2. The statement “**now are we the sons of God**” follows in 1 John 3:2 so that the extra clause in 1 John 3:1 adds NOTHING by way of “assurance.” By contrast, the omission of “**and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God**” from 1 John 5:13 by the NIV, JB, NJB, NWT, Ne eliminates one of the main reasons why John wrote his letter, to instil, encourage and consolidate faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. See also John 20:30, 31. (The omission no doubt stems from G, L, T, Tr, A, W, although these editions actually omit “**that believe on the name of the Son of God.**”)

Can our critic prove that the converts of the soul-winners of the past, who were faithful to the AV1611, Moody, Finney, Sunday etc., lacked ASSURANCE, compared to those who are ‘the fruits’ of ministries based on the NIV etc.??...

1 John 3:1	Added: and we are, or similar	DR (has “and should be”), RV, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
------------	-------------------------------	--

Our critic then commends Spurgeon for adding the words “And we are” to 1 John 3:1, from the RV and “*the Vulgate and the Alexandrian family of MSS.*” See Section 10.3. Spurgeon evidently believed that these words “*are clearly the words of inspiration.*” “*This fragment*” said Spurgeon “*has been dropped by our older translators and it is too precious to be lost.*”

The Jesuits who translated the 1582 Jesuit Rheims NT and the 1749-1752 Douay-Rheims Challoner Revision NT thought so too. Their versions read “that we should be named and be the sons of God” and “that we should be called, and should be the sons of God” respectively. See Section 11.4 and **Table 6** [See extract above]. Tyndale, whom they burnt at the stake, did NOT. His New Testament reads as the AV1611 “that we should be called the sons of God.”

Spurgeon then evidently preached “*a marvellous sermon on the assured position of the child of God from the Revised Version.*” Our critic concludes this section with the statement “*In the light of these facts I wonder why you used his name in your own support.*”

Any “support” accruing from Spurgeon’s name was aimed at vindicating the AV1611 as the pure word of God. It was not advanced for my particular benefit.

The reason that I used Spurgeon’s name in support of the AV1611 was simply to show that God honours the ministry of a man who is faithful to it, which Spurgeon was, for most of his ministry.

William Grady [*Final Authority*] p 235 describes God’s blessing on Spurgeon’s early ministry. “*After being saved for only two years, a seventeen-year-old Spurgeon was called to pastor the Water-*

beach Church of London in 1852. Using a King James Bible, the teenage pastor converted nearly his entire community.” There follows a detailed description from Spurgeon’s own autobiography.

However, Spurgeon, like any other Christian, had a carnal nature, which was manifest towards the end of his ministry. Dr Ruckman states [[How To Teach The Original Greek](#) Dr Peter S. Ruckman] pp 28-29: *“God is no respecter of persons. Whenever, and wherever, Spurgeon messed with that Book (the AV), God messed with his mind...Spurgeon began to correct the Protestant reformation text, in the universal language, with the DEAD language of the Alexandrian text (RV) used for the Jesuit Rheims Bible of 1582. God trapped him and stumbled him (Ezek. 14:1-6). God is no respecter of persons.*

““The first Sabbath after his return from the sunny South - February 8, 1891 - the pastor (Spurgeon) preached at the Tabernacle from Isaiah 62:6, 7, using both the Authorised and Revised Versions...He had been especially struck with the revisers rendering of the text.” The Lord took Charles H. Spurgeon home the year after he preached that message (C. H. Spurgeon Autobiography, Vol. 2, Banner of Truth Trust, p. 497).”

Spurgeon was only 58 years old when he died. In spite of our critic’s opinion, see above, the Lord had cut short the ministry of *“the Prince of preachers.”*

In fairness to him, Spurgeon’s final word on the scriptures may be found here. [See] *The Greatest Fight in the World* www.spurgeon.org/misc/gfw.htm.

It appears that he returned to the AV1611 before his death. This is an extract from what he said and with this I close. Note that Spurgeon is particularly scathing towards DIY-versionists. He refers to one BOOK and it was not the RV. The expression “The depth saith, It is not in me” Job 28:14 is from the AV1611, not the RV, which changed “depth” to “deep.” Note further that Spurgeon is rebuking all ‘originals-onlyists’ and Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek devotees in his concluding statement, without exception.

“It is sadly common among ministers to add or subtract a word from the passage, or in some way debase the language of sacred writ. Our reverence for the Great Author of Scripture should forbid all mauling of His Words.

“No alteration of Scripture can by any possibility be an improvement. Today it is still the self-same mighty Word of God that it was in the hands of our Lord Jesus.

“If this Book be not infallible, where shall we find infallibility? We have given up the Pope, for he has blundered often and terrible, but we shall not set up instead of him a horde of little pope lings, fresh from college.

“Are these correctors of Scripture infallible? Is it certain that our Bibles are not right, but that the critics must be so? But where shall infallibility be found? The depth saith, ‘It is not in me’ yet those who have no depth at all would have us imagine that it is in them; or else by perpetual change they hope to hit upon it!

“We shall gradually be so be doubted and be criticized that only a few...will know what is Bible and what is not, and they will dictate to the rest of us. I have no more faith in their mercy than in their accuracy.

“They will rob us of all that we hold most dear, and glory in the cruel deed. This same ‘reign of terror’ we will not endure, for we still believe that God reveals Himself rather to babes than to the wise and prudent. We do not despise learning, but we will never say of culture or criticism, ‘These be thy gods, O Israel.’

“To those who belittle inspiration and inerrancy we will give place by subjection, no, not for an hour!”

Alan O’R

Seven Aspects of ‘in the Greek’

Based on Dr Donald Waite and *The DBS* [Dean Burgon Society], *Dead Bible Society* pp 32-34

“In the Greek” – Once Only in Scripture!

1. No single, definitive Greek text exists¹. As Gail Riplinger shows, “*in the Greek*” Revelation 9:11 is “*upon the sand*” Matthew 7:26 and “*ready to fall*” Isaiah 30:13 with “*none to help*” Psalm 107:12.
2. Koine i.e. New Testament Greek is a dead language. The DBS² admits “*Biblical Greek is a dead language*” but 1 Peter 1:23 says “*The word of God...liveth and abideth for ever.*” So “*the word of God*” cannot be “*in the Greek.*” Moreover, neither 1600’s writers like Shakespeare nor Greek philosophers can dictate Bible word meanings or usage. Dr Hills³ states.


“The English of the King James Version is not the English of the early 17th century. To be exact, it is not a type of English that was ever spoken anywhere. It is biblical English, which was not used on ordinary occasions even by the translators who produced the King James Version...Even in their use of thee and thou the translators were not following 17th-century English usage but biblical usage, for at the time these translators were doing their work these singular forms had already been replaced by the plural you in polite conversation.”

David W. Norris⁴ states:

“Shakespeare certainly knew how to use English, but he also knew how to be vulgar, suggestive, and anything but pure-minded in his writing. Rather than being so much influenced itself by the language around it, the Authorised Version has given to the English language many words, phrases, and proverbs...[it has] had an impact on English prose that remains to this day.

*“The 1611 Bible was never the ‘modern version’ of its day. The Authorised Version possesses its own unique English. It gave to English far more than it took from it...Bible words must be defined for us by the way they are used in the Bible itself. Scripture is its own lexicon [see *The Language of the King James Bible* and *In Awe of Thy Word*, Parts 1-4, both by Dr Mrs Riplinger]...It is for preachers of the Word to explain and expound these words according to their very specific biblical usage, which will often be different from their secular use. For example, *dikaiosune* is translated ‘righteousness’ in our Authorised Version, but in English translations of the Greek philosopher, Plato, the same word is translated ‘justice’. *Dikaiosune* when used in Scripture means to be right before God, to be as we ought before God, to stand in a right relationship to Him. Used in Plato, it means to be right with our fellowmen, to be as we ought with other men. In Scripture, the word is directed towards God, in Plato towards men.”*

Plato leavens the 1984 NIV in Acts 17:31, Romans 3:25, 26, Hebrews 11:33, Revelation 19:11, where “*righteousness*” is changed to “*justice.*” The 2011 NIV has “*righteousness*” in Romans 3:25, 26 but retains “*justice*” where “*righteousness*” is “through faith” Hebrews 11:33 and



“The angel of the bottomless pit...in the Greek tongue hath his name Apollyon”

Revelation 9:11 (!)

where God **“will judge the world”** Acts 17:11 and **“judge and make war”** against it Revelation 19:11. **“Sinners...are afraid”** Isaiah 33:14 of that **“righteousness”** and would prefer Plato!

3. Koine Greek was a stage in the development of the scriptures, Psalm 12:6, 7, with God bringing forth vernacular Bibles in many languages⁵; Latin, Syriac, Gothic, German, English etc. However, Koine Greek is now history, as Dr Mrs Riplinger explains⁶, this writer’s emphases.

“The desire to appear intelligent or superior by referring to ‘the Greek’ and downplaying the common man’s Bible, exposes a naivety concerning textual history and those documents which today’s pseudo-intellectuals call ‘the critical text,’ ‘the original Greek,’ the ‘Majority Text,’ or the ‘Textus Receptus.’ There existed a true original Greek (i.e. Majority Text, Textus Receptus). It is not in print and never will be, because it is unnecessary. No one on the planet speaks first century Koine Greek, so God is finished with it. He needs no ‘Dead Bible Society’ to translate it into “everyday English,” using the same corrupt secularised lexicons used by the TNIV, NIV, NASB and HCSB [Holman Christian Standard Bible]. God has not called readers to check his Holy Bible for errors. He has called his Holy Bible to check us for errors.”

4. Paul never said go to ‘the Greek’ for what God ‘really’ said. “Except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken?” 1 Corinthians 14:9.
5. Few can master Koine Greek. They risk becoming ‘Protestant popes,’ **“highminded”** 2 Timothy 3:4, like 33rd Degree Royal Arch Masons, i.e. only those taught ‘the (Greek) mysteries’ know what God ‘really’ said, *which violates the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9 and is lording it over the laity, “the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate”* Revelation 2:15.
6. Even the Greeks don’t understand ‘the Greek’! Bro. Brent Logan is a KJB Baptist missionary to Thessaloniki, Greece. He has said to this writer:

“The TR (Koine) Greek is not used in Greece. Modern Greek (Dimotiki) is several steps away from Koine. Some use the older Katharevousa Greek which is between Koine and Dimotiki, but this is still 19th century Greek. Most do not even understand Katharevousa. I have heard that there may be some Orthodox priests that chant the Koine as liturgy without knowing what it means but have never confirmed this. Any exception would prove the rule. Greek people today do not have nor understand Koine.”

Why should English-speaking believers be subject to a language for **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21 that not even Greeks understand? As Paul says of **“false brethren...who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage: To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour”** Galatians 2:4-5.

7. The expression “in the Greek” occurs only once in scripture, Revelation 9:11 (!) in relation to “Apollyon” and “the bottomless pit.” That is where ‘Greekiolatry’ comes from. The Lord Jesus Christ said **“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away”** Matthew 24:35. ‘The Greek’ is long gone **“But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it”** Deuteronomy 30:14.

The AV1611 is that word, **“the word of faith, which we preach”** Romans 10:8.

Amen.

AV1611, Pre-1611 Readings in Hebrews versus Jesuit, Post-1611 Cuts - Summary Table

	words retained, with variation		words cut out	NWT	words retained by named version(s)
--	-----------------------------------	--	---------------	-----	---------------------------------------

Hebrews Verses, 12 in Total	1385, 1395 Wycliffe	Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthew, Bishops', Geneva	1611 AV1611, 2011+ AV1611	JR, DR, RV, ASV	JB, NJB, NWT	NASV, NIVs, NKJV f.n., CEV, ESV, GNT, HCSB, NCV, NET, NLT, RSV, NRSV
1:3			<i>by himself</i>			
2:7			<i>and didst set him over the works of thy hands</i>		NWT	NASV
3:1			<i>Christ</i>			NKJV f.n.
3:6			<i>firm unto the end</i>		NWT	NASV
6:10			<i>labour of</i>			
7:21			<i>after the or- der of Mel- chisedec</i>			
10:30			<i>saith the Lord</i>			
10:34			<i>in heaven</i>			
11:11			<i>and was de- livered of a child</i>			
11:13			<i>and were persuaded of them</i>			
11:37			<i>were tempt- ed</i>		NWT	NASV
12:20			<i>or thrust through with a dart</i>			

Notes on Summary Table

1. The table shows that the pre-1611 16th century Bibles of the English Protestant Reformation are faithful precursors to the AV1611 Text, underlining *God's* approval of the AV1611 Text.
2. The table shows steady refinement of the verses from Wycliffe to the Bibles of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation to the AV1611, followed by apostasy. See *AV1611 Overview* www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ and *English Reformation to Last Days Apostasy* www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/version-comparison.php.

Summary Table – Key and Sources

1611 AV1611, 2011+ AV1611: www.e-sword.net/index.html

Pre-1611 Bibles:

1385, 1395 Wycliffe, Tyndale, Matthew, Coverdale, Great, Bishops', Geneva Bibles:

[www.biblesofthepast.com/Read/ File.htm](http://www.biblesofthepast.com/Read/File.htm) [thebiblecorner.com/englishbibles/index.html]

1582 JR Jesuit Rheims New Testament: [www.biblesofthepast.com/Read/ File.htm](http://www.biblesofthepast.com/Read/File.htm)
[\[www.hailandfire.com/1582RheimsTestament/index.shtml\]](http://www.hailandfire.com/1582RheimsTestament/index.shtml)

Post-1611 Bibles:

1749-1752 DR Douay-Rheims Bible Challoner's Revision, RV Revised Version, ASV American Standard Version: [www.biblesofthepast.com/Read/ File.htm](http://www.biblesofthepast.com/Read/File.htm)

JB Jerusalem Bible: www.unz.org/Pub/Bible-1966

NJB New Jerusalem Bible, NWT New World Translation: rockhay.tripod.com/worship/translat.htm

1978 NIV: hard copy

1984, 2011 NIVs: biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/, www.e-sword.net/index.html

www.biblegateway.com/versions/ was used for the following 11 post-1611 versions:

NASV New American Standard Version

RSV Revised Standard Version

NRSV New Revised Standard Version

CEV Contemporary English Version

ESV English Standard Version

GNT Good News Translation

HCSB Holman Christian Standard Bible

NCV New Century Version

NET New English Translation

NKJV New King James Version

NLT New Living Translation

The Manuscript Dichotomy – Bro. Al Cuppett’s Vision Vindicated


“Where there is no vision, the people perish: but he that keepeth the law, happy is he”

Proverbs 29:18, www.kivprophecy.com/Articles/BibleOrigins.pdf (Updated Chart)

Corrupt Manuscript Ascension – “Wild Vine”

Pure Manuscript Ascension


1604-1611, 7 Years



Al Cuppett alcuppett.wordpress.com/ Summary

(N.B. The former site with this material is now corrupt. The same information is on the above site)

Alexander B. Cuppett served as "Action Officer" with the Pentagon, Joint Chiefs of Staff (Department of Defense). While serving in official capacity, he was awarded both the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart. Cuppett also received the Secretary of Defense Civilian Service Medal upon his retirement in 1990 after 21 years of service in the United States Army. Mr. Cuppett gained notoriety for his public talks warning of the emergence of the New World Order in America and bringing attention to the alarming evidence that foreign troops and armaments were showing up in the USA. He was one of the first people to sound the alarm regarding the maintaining of Red and Blue Lists which would be used to round up people during a martial law scenario and bring attention to the construction of FEMA concentration camps. In the early 1990s Cuppett appeared on a speaking tour with the well-known TV program *The Prophecy Club* and gained fame with his talks on Black Ops and Bible prophecy, ultimately producing 2 video programs that were best sellers during that time period.



Al Cuppett US Army & Action Officer, the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Retired)

From Al Cuppett's website alcuppett.wordpress.com/2012/08/:

My advice: Get an old *Authorized King James Bible* and start praying to Jesus, because our time as free people is just about over. "*Am I therefore become your enemy because I tell you the truth?*" [Galatians 4:16]. (N.B. The site address has been changed)

Al Cuppett

More from Al Cuppett's website alcuppett.wordpress.com/page/5/, search for key words to find exact quote in situ: (N.B. The site address has been changed with format changes only to content)

Advice: Get yourself an old fashioned King James Bible [Authorized Version], permanently discarding all other bible versions, including the "numeric coded Greek and Hebrew" portions of the Strong's Exhaustive Concordance, and start fasting and praying. The Holy Ghost cannot manifest faith, hope, peace, joy, etc, in your spirit in a language you cannot understand. You're gonna need guidance; and that right early saint! **READ THE LAST PARAGRAPH IF YOU READ NOTHING ELSE!!**

And if these Greek "scholars" ever admitted God Almighty gave us a perfect "*Psalm 12:6-7*" (KJV-only) Bible these educated morons would have to get an honest job!!! However, most of such "learned" people happen to be pastors in pulpits who "fleece their sheep" weekly. Just read about "*polluted bread*" in Malachi 1, verses 6 to about 12. But, hey, what do I know, I'm just a Railway Mail Clerk's son? I'll bet the Jesuit infiltrators at **Lee College** and **Central Bible College** will do a slow burn when they read this paragraph. So be it! They got to dear Brother Swaggart back in 1988. Are they gonna get you too? *Or have they gotten to you already?*

"For ever, O Lord thy word is settled in heaven". Psm 119:89 – KJV ONLY. So, if the bible you're using doesn't match what's "for ever settled" in heaven, you have a Jesuitic counterfeit. Thus, the Holy Spirit is exponentially bound, and the resultant spiritual vacuum of holiness/heaven sent power has been filled by evil in our churches AND OUR LAND, since about 1970. Therefore, the New World Order has come in "like a flood". Hence, the foreign troops! Get back to the KJV, the old blood washed hymns, discarding forever praise and worship, since you must wash by the "water of the word" WHICH IS THE KJV BIBLE-ONLY, before entering into the holy throne room of God. LOOK—! Doing praise and worship with ANY sin in your heart is an abomination! Praise and worship without pure repentance beforehand is an ignorant or perverted attempt to APPEASE God! THINK! David Wilkerson preached the precepts just above in the italicized print, in 1988, not me. He also says the angels cast this kind of [UNCLEAN] praise back on the earth as judgment!!

Wilkerson and Cuppett are right. "*He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination*" Proverbs 28:9 with Proverbs 29:18 above. Be encouraged, though:



James White and the 'King James Only Controversy' so-called Summary Overview

The following note was sent some years ago to a former pastor of a church this writer attends about James White's book. The note was sent on May 21st 2007. No reply was ever received. Some updates in braces [] have been inserted.

Dear ****,

Since you kindly lent me the book of the above title [The KJO Controversy], I thought I should bring you up to date on my study of it over the past year.

Having read it, I decided for my own edification to carry out my own review of the book, also bringing together the work of various other authors who have answered some the issues that James White raised.

My review is a little over half-finished [it is now complete, see www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php *KJO Review Full Text – White's fraudulent claims against the 1611 Holy Bible refuted in detail!*], having reached the end of Chapter 6. I anticipate that, Lord willing and if the Lord doesn't come back in the meantime (I hope He will), I should have the review completed by early next year.

You were also kind enough to read my book on the subject, 'O *Biblios*,' wherein my stance on the matter of the Bible is expressed.

My researches into James White's thesis have, if anything, served to strengthen that stance.

It should also be said that James White hasn't changed his stance either, as you can see from his web site, aomin.org/kjvo.html. I haven't read his answers to his critics in detail but they appear to be mainly a repetition of the contents of his book. They may merit a closer study in the future but for now, I can only deal with one controversy at a time.

Although my review is not complete, I have nevertheless been able to identify six main postulates that, even if not expressed as such, James White puts forward in his book. I have attached a summary of them, together with my summary answers, for your interest. Let me know if you have any problem opening the attachment. [See ***The King James Only Controversy by James White – Overview***. That item follows this note.]

In addition, I have been able to form some conclusions about James White and his work, which I have listed below. Eventual completion of my review of his book will not change them - though it might add to them. I believe that they, together with the attached material, should be kept in mind by anyone who reads White's book and who may be swayed by the opinions of some of his more prominent supporters in this country, e.g.

homepage.ntlworld.com/malcolmbowden/KJVonly.htm Malcolm Bowden of the *Creation Science Movement*. [See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-7434.php *The 1611 Holy Bible versus Malcolm Bowden*.]

moriel.org/MorielArchive/index.php/discernment/ruckmanism/is-your-modern-translation-corrupt-2 Jacob Prasch of *Moriel Ministries*

My conclusions are as follows.

1. James White is a hireling. Although he recommends the purchase of “*multiple translations*,” p 7 of his book, he has a vested financial interest in persuading bible readers to buy the NASV, New American Standard Version, because he is (or was in the 1990s) a consultant to the NASV committee and “*has a financial relationship with the Lockman Foundation.*” See www.exorthodoxforchrist.com/riplinger.htm. [The site is no longer available. However, see en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James_White_%28theologian%29. The information is correct.] It is therefore easy to see why James White does not want bible readers to be ‘KJV-Only.’
2. James White is not missionary minded. Whatever he may profess to the contrary, James White is not mindful of the mission field. Certainly his book displays little or no such concern for distributing the scriptures world-wide. He betrays his lack of concern in his statement above with respect to the purchase of “*multiple translations.*” Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger, whom White attacks repeatedly in his book, exposes White’s inward-looking attitude for what it is in her book, *Which Bible is God’s Word?*, p 92-3 [2nd Edition 2007 p 116].

“It is scandalous for rich Americans to have ten versions of the bible, instead of just one. Four million dollars was invested in the New King James Version; subsequent to that; several million dollars was spent on advertising campaigns. Many tribes and peoples around the world have no King James Bible type bibles at all; the Albanian bible was destroyed during the communist regime. Many of the tribes in New Guinea do not have a bible in their language. But, these countries have no money to pay the publishers. The publishers are not interested in giving these people bibles; they are just interested in making bibles that can produce a profit for their operation.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s latest work, *In Awe of Thy Word*, which runs into almost 1,000 pages, demonstrates how particularly well-suited the AV1611 is for transmission into foreign languages and how it has long been esteemed by missionaries for that reason. All modern versions fall short of the AV1611 in this respect.

James White revels somewhat on his web site, www.bible.org/page.php?page_id=664, in Dr Mrs Riplinger’s designation of him as “*a rude, crude heretic.*” But she didn’t start out that way in her view of him, www.av1611.org/kjv/ripwhit5.html.

So if James White eventually acquired that designation from a gracious Christian lady like Sister Riplinger, you can rest assured, he earned it.

3. James White is his own final authority. Nowhere in his book does James White specify what is the word of God, consisting of the words of God, and the final authority in all matters of faith and practice, between two covers and where the members of the Body of Christ can find it [neither can any other ‘originals-onlyist’]. It is abundantly clear from his book that he doesn’t believe the AV1611 to be such. However, he betrays his own self-made approach to final authority in such statements as these, my underlining.

P 95. “*The NIV’s rendering of the term “flesh” in Paul’s epistles as “sinful nature”...is a bit too interpretive for my tastes.*”

P 160-1. “*Scripture [a selection of modern versions and excluding the AV1611] records Jesus’ call to take up the cross in three places, and this is sufficient.*”*

*One wonders if White has informed the Godhead of his conclusion in this respect and advised Them of the necessary amendments to the word that “*is settled in heaven*” Psalm 119:89.

Hopefully not, because, as it happens, White is wrong. Only Mark 10:21 as it stands unequivocally* in the AV1611 has the expression “*take up the cross.*” The other three

verses, Matthew 16:24, Mark 8:34, Luke 9:23 all refer to "his cross" not "the cross." As you will appreciate, there is a distinct difference.

*Although on this occasion, the NKJV appears to have overlooked the usual footnote that would eliminate the expression, in accordance with the Nestle Aland-United Bible Societies text underlying the NASV, NIV etc.

4. James White is economical with the truth. James White repeatedly accuses 'KJV-Onlyists' of being "*inconsistent*" pp 60, 71, 72, 88, 209, 230, 231, 233, 248, 249 and of adopting "*double standards*" pp 107, 162, 170, 173, 232, 236, 244. At the very least, this is a case of 'pots and kettles.'

For example, James White insists, p 38, that the AV1611 has added to the word of God by means of the phrase "*and the Lord Jesus Christ*" at the end of Colossians 1:2, even though the phrase has overwhelming attestation from a vast and varied body of sources, including Codex Aleph or Sinaiticus. See Moorman, *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!*, p 131. The phrase is in fact, one of the 'least disputable' of all the so-called 'disputed passages.'

Yet White also describes Codex Aleph as "*a great treasure*," p 33 - in spite of supposedly adding to the word of God in Colossians 1:2. What he neglects to tell the reader is the manner in which Aleph definitely does add to the word of God, by means of the New Testament apocryphal books, *The Shepherd of Hermas* and *The Epistle of Barnabas*.

Gail Riplinger reveals in her book *New Age Versions*, p 557ff, that these two books urge the reader to "*take the name of the beast, give up to the beast and form a one-world government*," along with other Satanic exhortations.

James White neglected to mention any of this in his book but such is his "*great treasure*." He is clearly being "*inconsistent*" and applying a "*double standard*."

(And it is therefore easy to see why White and his allies despise Gail Riplinger and her work in equal measure.)

5. James White leans heavily towards Rome and Watchtower. In spite of what James White would undoubtedly profess to the contrary, the departures from the AV1611 that White favours and which occur mostly in the NASV, NIV, also occur to a considerable extent in Catholic and Jehovah's Witnesses' bibles.

White levels criticisms at 237 passages of scripture as they stand in the AV1611, 250 verses in total, of which 24 verses are from the Old Testament. Of that selection, the NIV stands with the AV1611 in only 9 of the 237 passages, or in 4% of the total. However, it lines up *against* the AV1611 *with* the JR, DR, JB and NWT* in 28% of the passages, with the JB and NWT in 69% of the passages and with one or more of the JR, DR, JB, NWT in 89% of the passages that White mentions.

*DR - Douay-Rheims, Challoner's 1749 Revision, JR - Jesuit Rheims 1582 New Testament, from the web and probably a reproduction of the DR - it doesn't differ, JB - Jerusalem Bible, NWT - New World Translation

James White won't see himself as a Vatican-Watchtower slave but he is. Note also that in these last days of "*perilous times*" 2 Timothy 3:1, the modern so-called 'evangelical' versions are drifting further from the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible than even the known apostate versions. The time of faith being "*made shipwreck*" cannot be long delayed, 1 Timothy 1:20 - though I admit that is a personal view.

In sum, I do not regard either James White or his work as trustworthy, a summary view that I believe will be reinforced as the review progresses [It was]. For now, for what it's worth, I

am quite happy for you to display this note and the accompanying attachment on the church notice board and/or circulate them however you may choose to and I will be quite happy to respond to any questions that may arise therefrom. [That never happened.]

I apologise for the length of this note but I hope that some useful clarification has been provided with respect to the issues that James White's book raises. Thank you again for the loan of it.

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ, 2 Chronicles 14:11, [***“And Asa cried unto the LORD his God, and said, LORD, it is nothing with thee to help, whether with many, or with them that have no power: help us, O LORD our God; for we rest on thee, and in thy name we go against this multitude. O LORD, thou art our God; let not man prevail against thee.”***]

Alan

The King James Only Controversy by James White - Overview

The 'Whitewash' Conspiracy – re: The King James Only Controversy by James White

Summary

This book by James White, of Alpha and Omega Ministries, Phoenix, Arizona, attempts to show that believing the Authorised 1611 King James Bible to be the pure words of God and the final authority in all matters of faith and practice, is wrong, because:

- There is no 'conspiracy' behind the modern versions against the AV1611
- The Greek texts underlying the modern translations have not been corrupted
- Modern scholarship that compiled these texts is entirely trustworthy
- The AV1611 is the result of human effort and contains errors
- The modern translations often yield superior readings to the AV1611
- The modern translations do not attack the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

This review will show that White is wrong in all six of the above respects and that his book is an exercise in dissimulation from start to finish. Summary answers to White's essential postulates are as follows:

No Conspiracy?

John Burgon, Dean of Chichester and exhaustive researcher into the Text of the New Testament, pinpointed the satanic conspiracy against the holy scriptures as follows:

"Vanquished by THE WORD Incarnate, Satan next directed his subtle malice against the WORD written. Hence...the extraordinary fate which befell certain early transcripts of the Gospel...Corrupting influences...were actively at work throughout the first hundred and fifty years after the death of St John the Divine."

Uncorrupted Greek Texts?

Of the early Greek manuscripts that underlie the departures of the modern versions from the Authorised Version, Burgon, who collated them, said this:

"The five Old Uncials' (Aleph A B C D) falsify the Lord's Prayer as given by St. Luke in no less than forty-five words. But so little do they agree among themselves, that they throw themselves into six different combinations in their departures from the Traditional Text...and their grand point of union is no less than an omission of an article. Such is their eccentric tendency, that in respect of thirty-two out of the whole forty-five words they bear in turn solitary evidence."

Modern Scholarship Trustworthy?

The departures of the modern versions from the Authorised Version were orchestrated mainly by Cambridge academics Westcott and Hort. Of their 'scholarship,' Burgon stated:

"My contention is, - NOT that the Theory of Drs Westcott and Hort rests on an INSECURE foundation, but, that it rests on NO FOUNDATION AT ALL."

A Modern Scholar Speaks

Of White's remaining postulates, this is the verdict of Dr Frank Logsdon, principal scholar behind the NASV, New American Standard Version, match mate to the NIV:

"I must under God renounce every attachment to the New American Standard...you can say the Authorized Version is absolutely correct. How correct? 100% correct!"


Amen!

Citation in Contrast to the Highmindedness of James White and all other ‘Originals-Onlyists’:

“Lowliness of mind” Philippians 2:4 versus 2 Timothy 3:4 ***“Traitors, heady, highminded”***


The King James translators’ ***“lowliness of mind”*** Philippians 2:4 contrasts sharply with ***“Traitors, heady, highminded”*** 2 Timothy 3:4 amongst whom is James White ***“who loveth to have the preeminence among them”*** 3 John 9 as his book *The King James Only Controversy* readily shows.

Gail Riplinger has revealed the humility of the King James translators versus the arrogance of James White and his fellow travellers in the following extract from *The Riplinger Report Issue #11*:



The handwritten rules for the translation of the KJB (1604-1611) were published in a book entitled, *Manifold Greatness: The Making of the King James Bible*. It is published by the Bodleian Library of the University of Oxford in Great Britain (Helen Moore and Julian Reid, Eds., Oxford: Bodleian Library, p. 89).

Readers were in for a surprise. I had said in *In Awe of Thy Word* that Rule 11 called for the input of any man. I had read that in one of the VERY old documents I have. That rule recognizes the priesthood of all believers and in effect denounces any separate ‘superior’ class of ‘scholars’ or ‘linguists’...



However, as the years rolled on, the liberal ‘scholars’ of England had changed Rule 11, when they wrote their books on the history of the KJB. They pretended that the translators invited only “any learned man.” They added the word “learned” to rule 11!!!!

Lo and behold, when the ORIGINAL handwritten notes were resurrected for this 400th anniversary, and a photocopy printed in *Manifold Greatness*, they said, “any man”, just as I had said in *In Awe of Thy Word*. The scholars did not like the idea that just ANY believer could give his insights to the committee, so they changed it.

The priesthood of believers, following the Spirit of God, not the puffed up views of scholars, is the means by which God preserves his word. King James and the KJB translators knew this.

Don’t believe everything you read that was written by scholars. They uniformly copy each other, never bothering to look at the ‘original.’ Don’t believe everything you read criticizing KJB believers and their facts either.

Correcting the Greek with the King James English

Introduction

The issue of 'the Greek' so-called versus the English i.e. the AV1611 may be resolved simply. The 16th century Protestant Reformation saw the publication of editions of the Received Greek New Testament Text or Textus Receptus. One editor was Robert Stephanus, whom God also used to devise the verse divisions of the New Testament. See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ 'O Biblios' – *The Book* pp 12-13. This work uses Stephanus' 1550 Received Text Edition.

These editions drew from the majority of extant Greek New Testament manuscripts and bore witness to the true text of scripture of vernacular Bibles that reached back to apostolic times. They stood against Catholic bibles drawn from the corrupt Alexandrian manuscripts. These are few in number but they influenced Constantine, effectively the first pope, to found the Catholic Church "**O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness**" Acts 13:10.

See *The Bible Adopted by Constantine and the Pure Bible of the Waldenses* by Benjamin Wilkinson kjb.benabraham.com/html/our_authorized_bible_vindicated.html.

The 1611 Holy Bible is based upon the Received Text but principally upon the faithful pre-1611 English and vernacular foreign Bibles according to the AV1611 Title Page *being with the former translations diligently compared and revised by His Majesty's special command*. "**Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou?**" Ecclesiastes 8:4.

Rome attacked the AV1611 for 300 years and in the 19th century her destructive critics brought forth a series of Greek editions derived from Rome's mutilated Alexandrian manuscripts.

See kjb.benabraham.com/html/our_authorized_bible_vindicated.html *Three hundred year attack on the King James Bible* and www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ 'O Biblios' – *The Book* pp 116-118 on Rome's destructive critics and their texts. **Table 1** shows that the AV1611 English in agreement with Stephanus' Receptus corrects these corrupt Greek texts of which Nestle's is the best known.

Table 1 is based on *The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman Chapter 8 *Correcting the Greek with the English* and www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ 'O Biblios' – *The Book* pp 202-203 on the DR vs. the AV1611. **Red-shaded** verses are from Chapter 8.

Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W are Nestle (21st Edition), Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth respectively, Rome's 19th century destructive critics. Brackets mean that the editor doubts a reading. No brackets mean that he cut it out of the New Testament.

DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT are the 1749-1752 Douay-Rheims version, 1881 Westcott-Hort Revised Version, 1984, 2011 New International Versions, New King James Version footnotes, Jerusalem, New Jerusalem Bibles, 1984, 2013 New World Translations respectively. DR, RV, NIV etc. means that the DR, RV, 1984, 2011 NIV etc. cut out, dispute or alter the AV1611 reading listed.

Notes on Table 1

- Table 1** lists **71** verses of scripture. The AV1611 and Stephanus' Receptus agree in all **71** verses *against* what are rightly called *today's Vatican versions* both Greek and English.
- Table 1** then shows that the non-AV1611 sources *as a group* depart from the AV1611 but the pre-Nestle Greek sources do *not* agree in total. Moreover, Nestle's text that underlies the JB, NJB, NIVs, NWTs is not fixed. Gail Riplinger reports in *New Age Bible Versions* pp 494, 497 *Changes in...the Nestle's text...have been made over the years...In the recent Nestle's twenty-sixth edition (1979) the chameleon becomes a cobra with a whopping 712 changes in the Greek text...nearly 500 of these changes were 'white flags', retreating back to the pre-Westcott and Hort Textus Receptus readings...Much like Nestle's dramatic turn around, the UBS third edition was forced to make 500 changes from its second edition...The New International Version (NIV) followed the UBS first edition (1966), thereby missing hundreds of updates...*
- Stephanus' Receptus is *not* over the AV1611. See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *Seven purifications of the Textus Receptus*. The Textus Receptus now is AV1611 English *not* Greek.

Table 1 Correcting the Greek with the AV1611 English

Verse	Words Cut, Changed from the 1611, 2011+ AV1611s	Against the 1611, 2011+ AV1611s
Matt. 5:22	without a cause	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, (Tr, A)
Matt. 6:13	For thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Matt. 6:33	of God changed to: his or the	RV, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, (A)
Matt. 9:13	to repentance	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Matt. 16:3	O ye hypocrites	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
Matt. 20:22	and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A
Matt. 20:23	and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A
Matt. 23:8	even Christ	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Matt. 25:13	wherein the Son of man cometh	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A
Matt. 26:60	yet found they none	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, (L), T, Tr, A
Mark 1:2	the prophets changed to: Isaiah the prophet	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Mark 2:17	to repentance	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Mark 6:11	Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gormorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, (L), T, Tr, A
Mark 9:44	Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched	RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, T, (Tr)
Mark 9:46	Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched	RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, T, (Tr)
Mark 10:21	take up the cross	DR, RV, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, (L), T, Tr
Mark 11:10	in the name of the Lord	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Mark 13:14	spoken of by Daniel the prophet	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, (L), T, Tr, A
Luke 2:14	on earth peace, good will toward(s) men is changed to: on earth peace to men on whom his favour rests or towards men of good will	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
Luke 2:33	Joseph changed to: his father	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, T, Tr, A

Table 1 Correcting the Greek with the AV1611 English, Continued

Verse	Words Cut, Changed from the 1611, 2011+ AV1611s	Against the 1611, 2011+ AV1611s
Luke 2:43	Joseph and his mother changed to: his parents	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
Luke 4:8	Get thee behind me, Satan	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, (L), T, Tr, A
Luke 11:2, 4	Our, which art in heaven, Thy will be done, as in heaven so in earth, but deliver us from evil	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, T, Tr, A. L regards the fourth phrase as “doubtful.”
John 5:3, 4	waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had	RV, NIV, NKJV fn., NWT, Ne, (G), T, Tr, A
John 7:39	Holy	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, (Tr, A).
John 17:12	in the world	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
Acts 2:30	according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A
Acts 4:25	Added: by the Holy Spirit and our father, or similar	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
Acts 7:30	of the Lord	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
Acts 15:24	saying, Ye must be circumcised and keep the l(L)aw	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
Acts 16:7	Added: of Jesus	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A
Acts 16:31	Christ	DR, RV, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
Acts 17:26	blood	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, (A).
Acts 23:9	Let us not fight against God	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A,
Rom. 1:16	of Christ	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Rom. 8:1	but after the spirit	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Rom. 11:6	But if it be of works, then is it no longer grace: otherwise work is no more work	DR, RV, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, (A).
Rom. 13:9	thou shalt not bear false witness	RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Rom. 14:6	and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, (A).
1 Cor. 2:13	Holy	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
1 Cor. 6:20	and in your spirit, which are God’s	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
1 Cor. 10:28	for the earth is the Lord’s and the fulness thereof	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
1 Cor. 15:47	the Lord	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A

Table 1 Correcting the Greek with the AV1611 English, Continued


Verse	Words Cut, Changed from the 1611, 2011+ AV1611s	Against the 1611, 2011+ AV1611s
2 Cor. 4:10	the Lord	DR, RV, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Gal. 3:17	in Christ	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
Eph. 3:9	by Jesus Christ	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
1 Thess. 1:1	from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, (L), T, Tr, A
1 Tim. 3:16	God changed to: which, who, He, or He who	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
1 Tim. 6:5	from such withdraw thyself	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A, W
Heb. 1:3	by himself	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
Heb. 7:21	after the order of Melchisedec	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, T, Tr, A
Heb. 10:30	saith the Lord	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, T, Tr
Heb. 10:34	in heaven	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A, W
Heb. 11:11	was delivered of a child	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A
James 5:16	faults changed to sins	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr
1 Pet. 1:22	through the Spirit, pure	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A, W
1 Pet. 3:15	the Lord God changed to: Christ as Lord, or the Lord Christ	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A, W
1 Pet. 4:14	on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
2 Pet. 2:17	for ever	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
1 John 3:1	Added: and we are, or similar	DR (has "and should be"), RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
1 John 4:3	Christ is come in the flesh	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A
1 John 5:7, 8	in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth...in one	RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Rev. 1:11	I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Rev. 12:12	the inhabitants of	DR, RV, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Rev. 16:17	of heaven	DR, RV, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A, W
Rev. 20:12	God changed to: the throne, or his throne	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Rev. 21:24	of them which are saved	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn, JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, G, L, T, Tr, A, W
Rev. 22:14	do his commandments changed to: wash their robes	DR, RV, NIV, NKJV fn., JB, NJB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A

Table The 1611 Holy Bible versus Vatican Versions, Disputed New Testament Verses
 1984, 2011 NIVs, 1977, 1995 NASVs, NLT New Living Translation,
 1984, 2013 NWTs, JB, NJB Jerusalem, New Jerusalem Bibles

Verse	AV1611	NIVs	NASVs	Ne	NLT	NWTs	JB, NJB
Rom. 16:24	The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
1 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.	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT

Notes

1. The AV1611 has been compared with **6** generic modern versions for the **17** whole New Testament verses that critics of the AV1611 dispute.
2. **102** AV1611-modern version comparisons have therefore been tabulated. The modern versions show **100** of **102** possible departures from the AV1611. The JB, NJB include Mark 7:16, John 5:4 but wrongly read "*angel of the Lord*" in John 5:4. The NASVs brace [] words for omission.
3. Evangelicals, fundamentalists, the most prominent Greek editors, charismatics, cultists, papists are **98%** *against* the AV1611.
4. **8** of the **17** verses that critics dispute or almost half are direct statements *by the Lord Jesus Christ*; Matthew 17:21, 18:11, 23:14, Mark 7:16, 9:44, 46, 11:26, Luke 17:36.
5. These **8** verses address fasting in prayer, the purpose of the 1st Advent, "*greater damnation*" of posturing, plundering, bullying religious 'godfathers,' the importance of being "*swift to hear, slow to speak*" James 1:19, eternal torment in hell, the importance of forgiveness, the suddenness of the 2nd Advent *and the shape of planet earth by means of Luke 17:34-36*.
6. The other **9** verses address fulfilment of Biblical prophecy, *satanic* healing, "*confession...made unto salvation*" Romans 10:10, pastoral care, "*false witnesses*" Matthew 26:60, Acts 6:13, "*blindness in part...to Israel*" Romans 11:25, assurance of the Lord's grace and the Godhead.
7. *Birds of a feather* Matthew 13:32, Revelation 18:2, evangelicals, fundamentalists, Greek editors, charismatics, cultists, papists *cut those verses out*.
8. *Only* the AV1611 is "*light in the darkness*" Psalm 112:4 to fulfil Psalm 119:105 "*Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.*"



References

- 1 *Hazardous Materials, Greek & Hebrew Study Dangers*, by Gail Riplinger, A. V. Publications, 2008, Introduction
- 2 *Cleaning Up Hazardous Materials* by Kirk DiVietro, The Dean Burgon Society, 2010, pp 139-140
- 3 *The King James Version Defended* by Edward F. Hills, Chapter 8, standardbearers.net/uploads/The_King_James_Version_Defended_Dr_Edward_F_Hills.pdf
- 4 *The Big Picture* by David W. Norris, Authentic Word, 2004, pp 372, 384-385
- 5 *Hidden History of The English Scriptures* by Gail Riplinger, A. V. Publications, 2011
- 6 *In Awe of Thy Word* by Gail Riplinger, A. V. Publications, 2011, 2003, p 956