

**DOCTRINE OF THE BIBLE**  
**The King James Bible Controversy**  
**Lesson #14**

---

In recent years the King James Version (KJV) of the Bible has had ardent followers who not only prefer the KJV but also condemn others who do not use it. They can be categorized from moderate to extreme King James Bible users. Those who fit into an extreme category are often very antagonistic, combative, and zealous in trying to convert people to the KJV. The KJV Bible is usually the emphasis of their ministry. They are quick to teach their disciples a tortured form of textual criticism in an effort to defend the exclusive use of the King James Bible. Some fanatical extremists, like Peter Ruckman of the Pensacola Institute<sup>1</sup>, resort to carnal and vicious name calling in an attempt to discredit those who would dare question the inspiration and perfection of the KJV Bible. Many of the arguments used by the KJV only camp are over simplified and are based on emotional presuppositions and straw man arguments which only sway the undiscerning and the uninformed. Often the KJV only camp attempts to show how modern translations have corrupted the Word of God, by which they mean the KJV. In this study we will look at the KJV only controversy and seek to understand why some people think the King James Version of the Bible is so important.

**I. DIFFERENT CAMPS OF KING JAMES BIBLE USERS**

There are several camps, degrees or categories of KJV readers. The chart below was constructed from information taken from *The King James Only Controversy* by James White and will explain the different degrees of King James Bible users.<sup>2</sup>

<b>Different Views</b>	<b>Explanation of Each View</b>
<b>1) I prefer the KJV</b>	This group thinks that out of all the translations available today the KJV is the best. They may think this because of accuracy, literary style, because they grew up reading it, etc. They would not have problems with other people using other versions of the Bible and they would not rule out that a better translation may be produced in English.
<b>2) The KJV is translated from the most reliable and accurate Bible</b>	Some believe that the Textus Receptus or Received Text used by the KJV translators is the most accurate or the only accurate ancient text. Some believe that because there are more copies of the ancient manuscripts from that text family that it proves God has preserved that text family (Byzantine) better than any other, hence it is the most accurate. It is often called the Majority text position. This group believes that the Greek Textus Receptus or Received Text has been miraculously and flawlessly preserved by God and remains completely inerrant in a second degree or level of inspiration. They do not believe that the KJV is inerrant or flawless but they do believe it is the best translation made so far from the most reliable Greek text. They might possibly conceive of a better translation being made as long as it was translated from the Textus Receptus.

---

<sup>1</sup>Peter Ruckman is the leader of an extreme King James only cult and school in Pensacola Florida.

<sup>2</sup>James White, *The King James Only Controversy*, pgs. 1-5.

Different Views	Explanation of Each View
<p><b>3) The KJV as an inspired translation</b></p>	<p>This view says that the KJV English translation of the Bible is inspired as well as the Textus Receptus from which it was translated. Both were preserved perfectly by God without error. They would argue that <b>The KJV Bible alone is the Word of God</b>. Therefore if you question the KJV and its integrity you are instantly accused and labeled as one who is undermining the authority of the Word of God.</p>
<p><b>4) The KJV as New Revelation from God.</b></p>	<p>This is the most radical position which says that God inspired the KJV translation team to perfectly communicate His Word. God re-inspired the Bible into English to compensate for errors that crept into the Hebrew and Greek texts. If the KJV disagrees with the original languages then the original languages are to be corrected to submit to the KJV. They refer to those who use other translations as Bible haters, heretics, and tools of Satan used to undermine and destroy the Word of God.</p>

**II. WHY USING THE KING JAMES BIBLE IS AN EMOTIONALLY CHARGED ISSUE**

The KJV only issue often produces high levels of emotional dialogs between proponents and adversaries. There are many reasons for this:

- A. The primary reason is that when someone comes to believe that a certain translation of the Bible (e.g. KJV) is the WORD OF GOD, to question that translation is to attack the very Word of God itself and the source of one's faith. Most of those who believe the KJV is the only reliable Bible see no distinction between the KJV and the Word of God. The two are indistinguishable. Therefore to hint that the KJV might have errors or to use another Bible translation in their minds is a direct attack on the authority of God's Word and something that undermines the doctrines of inspiration, revelation, preservation, and inerrancy. All would agree that these doctrines are worth zealously defending but only some agree that the KJV is perfect example of these doctrines
  
- B. Related to the reason above, many have been convinced that the ancient texts from which the KJV were translated are the perfectly preserved Word of God. They believe that the ancient manuscripts used to produce the KJV Bible (from the Byzantine family of ancient texts used by Greek scholar Erasmus in his Greek text) are the divinely preserved ancient texts. The reason the KJV translators used Erasmus' Greek text is that it was the first Greek Text on the market for the public and was the least expensive and for that reason became the most popular Greek text or the majority Greek text. It must be remembered that both Erasmus and the KJV translators never questioned the accuracy of the Byzantine manuscripts. Modern versions of the Bible rely not only on the Byzantine texts but also on the Alexandrian and Western texts, which most believe are more reliable. Since the KJV only camp believes by faith (not evidence) that the Byzantine text family is the divinely preserved text, they reject all the newer translations which also consult with and rely on the Western and Alexandrian text families.

### III. THE UNIQUENESS OF THE KING JAMES ONLY CONTROVERSY

You may wonder why there is so much debate about the KJV and if the KJV debate is unique in the history of Bible translations. The answer is a definitive, no. In fact there are several historical parallels.

- A. **The Septuagint:** The first parallel example is the acceptance of the LXX or Septuagint, the first Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament written about 250-150 BC. After Alexander the Great Hellenized (converted to Greek culture) the strongholds of Jewish population, Greek became the common language. Less people were speaking Hebrew so there was a need for a modern translation in the popular vernacular (Greek). The LXX was the answer to that need. By the time of Christ the LXX was the popular version of the Old Testament used by the masses of Jews. When the LXX was completed there were those who cried out, Why translate the Hebrew Scriptures into an inferior language when Hebrew is the original language which the Scriptures were written in and the Hebrew has worked just fine for 1500 years? The LXX, like most translations of the Bible, was viewed with scepticism and criticism by many at first, then widely accepted, and eventually defended as the best Greek translation of the Old Testament.
- B. **The Vulgate:** By the time of Jerome (AD 375), common Greek was being replaced by Latin which was becoming the academic language of that day. Jerome felt the need to translate both the Old and New Testaments from their original Hebrew and Greek languages into Latin, producing what is now referred to as Latin Vulgate. This caused a similar reaction to what we experience today in the KJV only debate, Why translate the Bible into Latin when the LXX Greek text has worked just fine for 500 years and the New Testament Greek text has worked just fine for 300 years? Those who were used to the Greek text of the LXX and New Testament had a hard time being convinced that there was a need for a Latin translation of the Bible. The LXX had become so trusted that some criticized Jerome for translating the Vulgate from the Hebrew rather than from the Greek of the LXX translation!
- C. **Erasmus Greek text:** The Latin Vulgate soon became the popular text of the day and was the popular translation for a thousand years! The printing press was invented and then a Catholic monk named Erasmus decided to produce a standard Greek text of the New Testament so that people could study the New Testament in its original language. This caused a stir because those who were used to the Latin Vulgate thought that Jerome's translation was just fine, after all, it had worked for a thousand years! Erasmus persevered and was successful in producing the first New Testament Greek text produced on the printing press in 1516 for public sale. Those committed to the Latin Vulgate criticized the Greek language as a vulgar language and couldn't imagine why anyone would want a Greek New Testament (even though it was the original language of the New Testament). What made matters worse is that Erasmus eventually wrote a parallel version with his Greek text and a new Latin translation.

- D. **King James Bible:** In like manner, many in the KJV only camp have a hard time understanding why people would want another translation of the Bible when the KJV has worked just fine for 400 years. And those who have written more recent translations of the Bible have given these reasons:
1. We don't speak Elizabethan English anymore and much of the vocabulary used in the KJV is no longer used today.
  2. The KJV is not a divine work but a human translation based on a limited number of ancient Greek manuscripts that were assumed to be the most accurate, but were not.
  3. Because the KJV, like all translations, contains errors, there is always a need for a better translation.
  4. Because the field of textual criticism is much more advanced now than when the KJV was translated, the ancient manuscripts we now have to draw from are far more numerous than what Erasmus or the KJV translators had in their time.
  5. Textual Criticism has discovered that, on the average, the Alexandrian Texts are older and more reliable than the Byzantine texts used by Erasmus and the KJV translators.
  6. There is nothing wrong with wanting a more accurate and more understandable translation of the Bible or wanting several good translations to compare with each other.
  7. As illustrated above, new translations are not necessarily bad just because they are new. Tradition is not the standard for accuracy but faithfulness to inspired Hebrew and Greek texts.<sup>3</sup>

#### IV. THE MOST ACCURATE HEBREW AND GREEK TEXTS

Identifying the most reliable ancient texts is another issue that fuels the KJV only controversy. Before you can trust a translation you first have to trust in the ancient text family which you are going to rely upon to make your translation from. When it comes to the Old Testament, the standard text for almost all translations is the Masoretic text. Because of this, the most reliable Hebrew text is agreed to by almost everyone. Yet, when it comes to the New Testament there is much controversy surrounding what ancient Greek manuscripts or families of manuscripts are the most reliable. The KJV was translated from what is often referred to as the Textus Receptus (TR), the Majority text *℣* or the Received Text. This particular text came from Erasmus' Greek text and Erasmus' Greek was mostly derived from what is called the Byzantine text family.

---

<sup>3</sup> For a lengthy discussion of historical parallels to the KJV only debate see, *The King James Only Controversy*, by James White, pgs. 9-51.

There are four main text families listed in the chart below and there are disagreements as to which text family or text type is the most accurate or reliable. Each text family derives its name from the general geographical location where that certain text type was popular. Each text type has peculiarities and different variants unique only to it.

<b>Major Text families</b>	
<p><b>Alexandrian Text type</b> - this Greek text is found in almost all of the oldest papyri and the great uncial manuscripts of Sinaiticus ( ) and Vaticanus (B).</p>	<p><b>Western Text type</b> - This text type is found in later Greek manuscripts and in translations into other languages especially Latin.</p>
<p><b>Byzantine Text type</b> - this text type is found in the vast majority of later (newer) uncial and miniscule manuscripts, hence the title majority text.</p>	<p><b>Caesarean Text type</b> - Some believe this to be a separate and fourth text family represented in manuscript <i>p</i>45 and family 1" type manuscripts.</p>

As might be expected, the KJV only camp believes that the Byzantine text type, which gave birth to Erasmus text and what is now referred to as the Textus Receptus, is the most accurate text family. Yet a brief historical survey of the origin of the Textus Receptus (TR) will show that quite the opposite is true.<sup>4</sup>

**V. THE ORIGIN OF THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS, MAJORITY, OR RECEIVED TEXT**

A. The story begins with Erasmus a Roman Catholic scholar who was in a hurry to produce the first Greek New Testament to be published on the open market after the invention of the printing press. Another multilingual version of the Bible was in the making by Diego Lopez de Zuniga called the *Complutensian Polyglot*, a parallel version of the Bible in Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and Latin. The market was ripe for a Greek New Testament and Erasmus wanted to be the first to produce one for public sale. In his haste he tried to collect as many old Greek manuscripts as he could find at Basle. Of course, old Greek manuscripts are not collected in haste since they are very rare and those who own them guard them with care. Erasmus was able to acquire one complete copy of the Gospels and one complete copy of Acts and the Epistles. Some parts of the manuscripts he did have in his possession were corrupted and so unintelligible and those portions Erasmus had to translate backwards from the Latin of the Latin Vulgate back into Greek. These reverse translation sections produced Greek readings found in no other ancient Greek texts, yet they are still perpetuated in the Textus Receptus and the KJV derived from it. Examples of weaknesses with the TR and explanations of its popularity are listed below.

---

<sup>4</sup>For further information on ancient texts, see Lessons #2 ancient writing, #3 ancient texts, #7 ancient text errors, and #9 textual criticism.

- B. Erasmus had a hard time finding a Greek text of the book of Revelation. He eventually was able to borrow a copy from his friend Reuchlin. The problem with Reuchlin's copy of Revelation is that the last page of the manuscript was missing. In order to solve this problem Erasmus translated the missing verses of Revelation from the Latin Vulgate back into Greek.
- C. Erasmus could not find a single complete Greek text of the New Testament anywhere. His manuscripts, which were not very old and which were from the less accurate Byzantine Text family were dated from around the 12<sup>th</sup> century, 1,100 years from the original autographs. Erasmus seemed unaware and unconcerned about which manuscripts he used as long as they were Greek.
- D. In Acts 9:6 Erasmus included in his Greek text the reading of the Latin Vulgate which was taken from Acts 22:10 and which no early Greek manuscript contains. But the Textus Receptus retained this unique reading and it appears in the KJV Bible today.
- E. Also in I John 5:7-8 is the famous Trinitarian text where the Latin (not the Greek) reads The Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, instead of The Spirit, the water, and the blood. Erasmus was attacked viciously because his Greek text left out one of the most explicit Trinitarian references in all the Bible. But Erasmus could not find any Greek manuscripts which contained the reading found in the Latin Vulgate, so he left it out. Under pressure from the church and scholarly community, he finally promised to include the Trinitarian reading in a following edition of his Greek text, if even one Greek manuscript could be produced which contained it. Right before the third edition of Erasmus Greek Text was published, a Greek text was produced that had the Trinitarian reading. Yet it was written by a Franciscan friar, in about 1520, for the express purpose of manipulating Erasmus Greek text. Erasmus agreed to keep his word and include it in his third and subsequent editions. It survives today in the TR and the KJV. Since the time of Erasmus, no Greek text written before the 14<sup>th</sup> century has been found to contain the Trinitarian reading. The earliest mention of it is from the 12<sup>th</sup> century where it appeared as a marginal note in the Gregorian text 88. The passage does not even appear in any texts of the Latin Vulgate written before 800 AD!
- F. Between the third and fourth editions of Erasmus Greek text he was able to compare his work with the then finished *Complutensian Polyglot* (parallel Bible) written by Zuniga. Erasmus realized the superiority of the manuscripts Zuniga used in his *Complutensian* Greek text and in the book of Revelation alone made changes in over ninety different verses.
- G. Even though the Greek text of the *Complutensian* was far superior to Erasmus so was its cost. Because Erasmus text hit the markets first and because it was much less expensive, it took over as the primary Greek text of the day in spite of its many flaws. Even Martin Luther used it in when writing his German translation. After Erasmus five initial revisions of his Greek text, it continued to undergo about thirty more revisions! Eventually, it is estimated that 300,000

copies had been printed! Thus it became known as the *Textus Receptus* , literally the received text because of its wide spread popularity and acceptance. Later, Erasmus text or the *Textus Receptus* became known as the majority text since it held the greatest place of dominance among Greek texts for hundreds of years. Many KJV only advocates believe that God intervened in the production and acceptance of Erasmus text and hence that is why, by His providence, it grew to have dominance over other Greek Texts. Hence, there is an assumption that the text with the most copies is the text that God approves of the most, or in some cases has re-inspired. Yet, as we have learned, Erasmus text underwent some thirty-five revisions before the KJV translators used it.

- H. Even if one believes that Erasmus Greek text was inspired and superior than any other, they still have to realize that it had a long rabbit trail of printings before being used by the King James translators. Erasmus Greek text was printed by Aldine press of Venice in 1518, by Ioannes Antonius de Nicolinis de Saboi in 1538, and by Robert Estienne, who is usually referred to by his Latin name Stephanus, who printed four editions of Erasmus Greek text from 1546-1551. Stephanus printings of Erasmus Greek text became the *Received* or standard Greek text in England. Stephanus later published a small pocket sized edition in 1553 and later Crispin, a French printer, published Erasmus text with only a few alterations. It was Crispin s text that was used by Protestants to translate the popular Geneva Bible into English. Finally Theodore de Beza published nine more editions of Erasmus text (1565-1604) following in the footsteps of Stephanus. It was Theodore Beza s text which was relied upon most heavily by the King James translators to produce the King James Bible of 1611. The advocates of the KJV only controversy believe that God had his hand in making Erasmus s text popular. They believe by faith that the reason for this was that it was more accurate or even the inspired Greek text. The title *received text* is often used with great authority as if God Himself spoke from heaven, *This is the Greek text which you are to receive!*
- I. The final step, which led to the glorifying of the *Textus Receptus* and its authoritative title *The Received Text* , came in yet another preface of another edition of Erasmus Greek text printed by Bonaventure and Abraham Elzevir in 1624 (after the King James Bible was translated). In their preface they referred to Erasmus text as **the text which is now received by all, in which we give nothing changed or corrupted.** Thus it was from a comment in the preface of Elzevir s Greek edition of Erasmus text that the phrase, *received by all* enshrined the *Textus Receptus* as the authoritative and received Greek text. Bruce Metzger commenting on this writes:

*So superstitious has been the reference accorded the Textus Receptus that in some cases attempts to criticize or amend it have been regarded as akin to sacrilege. Yet its textual basis is essentially a handful of late and haphazardly collected minuscule*

*manuscripts, and in a dozen passages its reading is supported by no known Greek witness.*<sup>5</sup>

- J. Thus the history of the Greek text which was relied upon so heavily to produce the KJV is a shaky one indeed. Nevertheless, the TR remained the standard Greek Text for 300 years. Many, who have criticized Erasmus Greek text through the years, have been vehemently attacked by those who have come to believe by faith, not evidence or reason, that Erasmus text is the divinely inspired and preserved text. It wasn't until 1831 that Karl Lachmann published a new Greek text which departed from the Textus Receptus, yet Lachmann's edition itself only consulted a few earlier Greek manuscripts. The first Greek text supported by the bulk of earlier Greek and more reliable manuscripts was printed in 1864 by Constantine von Tischendorf. Later Greek scholars Westcott and Hort published a similar Greek text in 1881 which has become the historical father of the Greek texts used to produce many of the more recent English translations today. You will discover among KJV only advocates that Wescott and Hort are loved about as much as the Beast and the false prophet of the book of Revelation. They are quick to point out the theological deficiencies of Wescott and Hort in an effort to discredit their Greek text and their monumental work in the field of textual criticism. Yet, when they do this, it often escapes their notice that Erasmus himself was a Roman Catholic monk, who believed all of the false teachings of the Roman Catholic church and believed in salvation by works and hence was not a believer.

## **VI. HOW THE KING JAMES VERSION COMPARES TO RECENT ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE**

Comparing the KJV to other Bible translations proves that they are different in a few instances and virtually identical in most instances. The KJV only camp may accuse modern translations of weakening the deity of Christ but in reality some verses in the modern translations are more supportive of the deity of Christ than the KJV. Some in the KJV only camp complain that the modern translations shorten the Bible but in some instances the modern translation have longer readings. There is often a presupposition among those who favor the KJV that the longer reading is always to be preferred. Hence, any reading which is shorter is seen as taking away from the Word of God. Comparing translations in reality proves nothing except to point out differences and similarities between translations. Comparisons of modern translations do not address the real core issues namely:

- A. Which Greek text is the most reliable text and why?
- B. Which Bible translation most accurately represents the most accurate Greek text?

---

<sup>5</sup>Bruce Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament, Its Transmission, Corruptions, and Restoration*, pg. 106.



These two questions and the issues which arise from them are the central root issues in the KJV only debate. When the KJV only camp presents their arguments for trusting in Erasmus Greek text, it becomes obvious that they are relying on three primary beliefs:

1. The assumption by faith that the Greek Texts that Erasmus used were the most accurate texts.
  2. The assumption by faith that God shows His approval of one Greek text over another by its popularity and the number of copies printed. Hence, we can assume that the most popular Greek text is the most accurate.
  3. The assumption by faith that the Textus Receptus or Received text or the KJV was inspired by God, is perfect and cannot be improved upon.
- C. Those who believe the modern literal translations are to be favored over the KJV tend to rely on:
1. The scientific methods of lower textual criticism that seek to employ the most objective means possible to discover the most reliable reading of the various Greek texts from all of the Greek text families.
  2. The belief that the popularity of a text does not indicate God's approval of it nor its superiority over other texts.
  3. The belief that only the original autographs were inspired and perfect and that all other translations are flawed and can be improved upon.
  4. The belief that language in culture changes and hence there will always be a need for new and better translations of the Bible that more accurately communicate the meaning of the most accurate Greek text in the modern day vernacular.

## **VII. A SAMPLING OF SHALLOW KING JAMES VERSION ONLY ARGUMENTS**

Most of the KJV only arguments are based on reactions to what they perceive to be attacks on THE BIBLE. Of course to them the KJV is equivalent to the Word of God, therefore to question the KJV is to question the authority of the Word of God. One finds that most of the KJV only arguments do nothing to prove the superiority of Erasmus text or the Textus Receptus but are attempts to discredit men who have worked at bringing us the modern Greek texts used in modern translations. Guilt by association is a favored technique of ridicule. Yet, they never get around to explaining how the older more reliable Greek manuscripts should be discarded in favor of the Greek texts used by Erasmus. The KJV only camp fails to explain what criteria should be used for evaluating variants in ancient Greek texts. The reason for this is that they have come to believe by faith in the divine preservation of only one Greek text family. Therefore how to sort through textual variants is a mute point since they trust one Greek text has no

variants. Yet even if they believe Erasmus text is flawless, they don't attempt to explain how it could be flawless since it underwent so many revisions before being used by the KJV only translators. The bottom line is that they have placed their faith in tradition, not accuracy or evidence. They accuse those who disagree with their position of attacking the Bible and God's divine preservation of His Word. In their minds, if God has not preserved His Word in the KJV, then He has failed to preserve His Word. Yet, they fail to see the flawed reasoning of this since the KJV didn't exist for 1500 years after the books of the New Testament were written!

Below are some of the common KJV only arguments and brief responses to them. Be careful to note if the arguments of the KJV only camp deal with objective facts and/or emotional appeals and unsupportable presuppositions. Also notice how the KJV only camp likes to disprove straw man arguments, implying that their opponents believed in them, when they do not.

<b>KJV only Argument</b>	<b>Brief Response by non-KJV only camp</b>
So I have to know Hebrew and Greek to know what God's Word says?	We don't believe you have to know Hebrew and Greek to know what God's Word says. But we do believe that knowing Hebrew and Greek allows you to understand the Word of God more precisely as some nuances are lost in translation.
So the KJV which has been used by God for centuries is of no use now?	We don't believe that. The KJV is still an excellent translation. It is not as accurate as some of the modern translations and it is harder to understand for those who are not familiar with Elizabethan English.
So God has led His church astray by having them use an inferior translation of the Bible for 400 years?	We don't believe that. We do believe that well intentioned men have made errors in copying and translating the Bible through the centuries but those errors are usually very minor. We believe that God has used many translations for longer than the KJV and that God has preserved the meaning of His Word without error in the modern Greek and Hebrew texts.
So God has failed to preserve His Word because the KJV is not a perfect translation?	We do not believe that. We believe God has preserved His Word and that all of the doctrines that He desires us to know are preserved without error though there are small copyist errors in the ancient Hebrew and Greek texts. We believe that no translation is perfect but that God's truth has been perfectly preserved.
If you print alternate readings in the margins of Bibles, people will lose their faith in the Bible as the Word of God.	We disagree. Marginal variants have been common since the LXX. The faith of the saints in God's Word has not been destroyed by including marginal notes. Marginal notes only threaten those who blindly believe that either the Greek text used to translate the KJV or the text of the KJV itself has been miraculously preserved or inspired without error.
If the Textus Receptus or any other Greek text for that matter has copyist errors then we have lost the Word of God and can not know what it is.	We disagree. This is only true if all copyists made errors in the same place, which they did not. Yet, by comparing ancient Greek texts the original text can almost certainly be discovered and recovered. Yet, even in those small instances where uncertainty remains, no doctrine is lost.

<b>KJV only Argument</b>	<b>Brief Response by non-KJV only camp</b>
<p>We need to trust the Majority text, not a text produced by doctrinal modernist heretics like Westcott and Hort and others who have ecumenical relationships with Roman Catholics.</p>	<p>By that logic the Textus Receptus should not be trusted either because it was written by Erasmus, a Catholic monk. The accuracy of a text is not determined by the translator but by its accuracy and faithfulness to the best Greek manuscripts.</p>
<p>The methods of textual criticism used today corrupt the text and should be rejected along with the texts they produce.</p>	<p>Erasmus employed textual criticism when producing the TR as he compared the variants from the Greek Texts he had. If one rejects the work of textual criticism, then they must reject the work of Erasmus, who produced the TR which was used to produce the KJV.</p>
<p>The new translations of the Bible coming out today are attempts of Satan to corrupt and change the Word of God so that people can't know what God says.</p>	<p>This is true in some cases as there are some bad translations being produced today. But not all newer translations are bad. It could also be argued that the King James only people are being used by Satan to keep the church reading a Bible that is archaic, hard to understand, and inferior to newer translations. It could be argued that God has raised up men to write modern translations to correct the errors of the KJV.</p>
<p>How could a Greek text that is thousands of words shorter i.e., the Greek text used for newer translations, have the same meaning as the longer TR?</p>	<p>The thousands of words which do not appear in the older texts are words which do not change the meaning of a passage in its context nor the overall doctrine of the Bible. For instance, a newer translation might use the word He in reference to Jesus Christ mentioned in the near preceding context and yet the KJV might have the Lord Jesus Christ instead of He. They argue that the newer translations are trying to remove the deity of Christ but if you read the newer translations you discover that the text is talking about Jesus Christ, who is God. The KJV again misses the core issues believing that the longer later reading of a text should be accepted over the shorter earlier reading.</p>
<p>Because Westcott and Hort rejected verbal inspiration of the Bible, anyone, therefore, who agrees with any of their conclusions is guilty of attacking the inspiration of the Bible.</p>	<p>This is a non-sequitur (an illogical inference). You don't have to believe everything someone says to believe some of what someone says. Erasmus was a Roman Catholic who believed in purgatory, the worship of Mary, the inspiration of the Apocrypha, salvation by works, etc. But this does not mean that everyone who believes in the reliability of the Textus Receptus believes what Erasmus believed. These kinds of arguments are futile attempts at guilt by association.</p>

History has shown that men are reluctant to give up what has become the accepted Bible of their times. We can be thankful that the KJV is still a good and useful translation, even though it is not based on the best manuscript evidence. The many longer readings in the KJV do nothing to obscure the message of the gospel and in many cases add clarity to the meaning of the text. Yet for those who wish to have a Bible based on the most reliable Greek texts, they will have to conclude that the KJV, although very good, is not among the best English translations available today.