

My Defense of the Preservation of the Bible in the KJV

The following is an excerpt of a letter in which I gave a defense of my belief that the word of God has been preserved in English in the King James Version.

[In this letter] I am going to do my best to refute the idea that my belief in regard to the preservation of the scriptures in the KJV is foolish, illogical, and anti-scholarly, because I intend to prove that my beliefs are wise, logical, scholarly, and most importantly, Biblical, not humanistic.

Before I get started, I want you to know that I am not ignorant concerning the translators of the KJV. I just recently read "The Men Behind the KJV" by Gustavas S. Paine, which gives the history of the translators and the translation process of the KJV. In it he gives what I thought was a very neutral account of the history, which included many of the things that you cited in your email. I realize that the translators were Anglicans and Puritans and that many of their beliefs concerning such things as baptism and the identity of the true church (which is neither the Catholic, Anglican, or any other of their protestant daughters) were false. I do not believe that the translators themselves were infallible, but rather that God used fallible and flawed men to preserve His word, just like he used fallible and flawed men to originally write it down. You believe that God used fallible and flawed men to make inspired copies, do you not? If God can use a dumb ass (2Pe 2:16) to deliver his word to men, He is certainly able to use Anglicans to do the same.

Neither am I ignorant concerning the underlying family of Greek and Hebrew manuscripts that the KJV and its predecessors were translated from, opposed to the families of manuscripts from which the modern English versions of the Bible published since 1881 are translated. I have read four scholarly books on the topic and have compared hundreds of verses between the KJV and the modern English versions. I have also seen comparisons a dozens of verses between the KJV and its English forerunners that are in agreement with each other, but in stark contrast to the renderings found in modern English versions. I am certainly not claiming to be an expert on the topic; I just mention this to show you that I have not come to the beliefs that I hold through blind faith.

As I begin my defense, you may well charge me with circular reasoning, and to an extent, you are correct. I endeavor to prove from an English translation of the scriptures that God has promised to preserve his word until the end of time, and this by necessity must be through both copies and translations. One could say that I am arguing from something that I cannot prove to be inspired and preserved, to prove that it is inspired and preserved, which is not true. I am arguing from a translation of the word of God to prove that God has promised to preserve his word throughout all time. After this point has been proven, then I intend to show in the remainder of the letter the evidence and proof that the book that I am arguing from is one of the books that fulfills God's promise of preservation. I do not read Greek or Hebrew so for me to try to go back to copies to the originals to see what God said about preserving His word would be useless, and it would take a lifetime

of studying those languages to understand them fluently enough to do so, not two years in a seminary. Someone might argue that such an ignoramus as I, not knowing Hebrew and Greek, could use a lexicon or a concordance such as Strong's to aid in reading the original languages. Problem: lexicons give the meanings of Hebrew and Greek word in English, as does Strong's concordance: therefore they are nothing less than translations of Hebrew and Greek; so either way you look at it, I would be using a translation to read the word of God. Even if I could read the original languages, I could not look at the original autographs because they have been gone for thousands of years, so all I could look at were copies. Therefore I would be in the very same boat, using copies to prove that copies are preserved and inspired. If it is foolish, illogical, and anti-scholarly to use copies and translations to prove that God said that He would preserve His word in copies and translations, then there is not a person on the face of the earth that has any logical or scholarly basis for believing that they have the preserved word of God, and if that be the case, our faith is vain.

Part 1: Proving that God promised to preserve His word

The following are the premises that I intend to base my arguments upon:

- 1) God inspired men to write down His word in the original languages of Hebrew and Greek which consists of the 66 books in the Bible.
- 2) Those words were infallibly written down without error by the prophets.
- 3) In His word, God promised to preserve His word forever.
- 4) All of the original autographs perished hundreds and thousands of years ago and no man living today has seen them.
- 5) God's word gives examples of inspired copies of scripture.
- 6) God's word gives examples of inspired translations of scripture.
- 7) God's word promised that it would be published in all nations and preached in all the world.
- 8) God's method of transmitting His word to all nations in the New Testament was not to make all nations learn Greek and Hebrew, but to translate the word of God into the languages of those nations.

If I can prove from the scripture that these points are true, then it is entirely logical, scholarly, and most especially, Biblical to believe that there are inspired, infallible, and perfectly preserved Bibles in other languages in addition to Greek and Hebrew. If this be the case, then if manuscript evidence, internal consistency, and evidence of fruit can be shown in the KJV, then it is entirely logical, scholarly, and Biblical to hold to the belief that the KJV is an inspired and preserved translation of the word of God that can be trusted and relied upon equally with the originals.

As you can probably see, this is going to be a long letter. I am not going to prove points 1 and 2 because I assume that we both understand them to be basic.

Point 3: In His word, God promised to preserve His word forever.

Let's first understand how highly God holds His own word and, that being the case, would not allow it to perish out of existence as so many Bible-denying, liberal, and humanistic "scholars" believe has happened. David said in Psalm 138:2, "I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy name for thy lovingkindness and for thy truth: for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name." While God holds his word in higher regard than His own name, "scholars" trample it under foot and thereby blaspheme both.

That being said, God has promised in multiple places in both Testaments that he would preserve his word. Consider the following passages:

"The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. 7) Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." (Psa 12:6-7)

"For the LORD is good; his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations." (Psa 100:5) c/w "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." (Joh 17:17)

"Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever:" (Isa 30:8)

"For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven." (Psa 119:89)

"Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them for ever." (Psa 119:152)

"Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever." (Psa 119:160)

"For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." (Mat 5:18)

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." (Mat 24:35)

These verses should suffice to prove that God has promised to preserve His word, unto all generations, forever, until heaven and earth pass, and even beyond that. Notice how none of these verses say, "Thou shalt preserve thy concepts, general ideas, and principles and none of them shall pass away", but rather God's WORDS, even down to the jot and tittle. Jesus so much believed that the COPIES of the Old Testament that he was reading were preserved down to the smallest words that he based an entire argument on the resurrection on one two-letter word "am" in Mat 22:32. Paul believed in such a perfectly preserved COPY of the law that he based his argument for Jesus being the only other person to whom the promise to Abraham was made, that he based his argument on one letter: the letter "s" in Gal 3:16. Point 3 (that God has promised to preserve His word) has been nailed down and vindicated by the word of God. Now, moving onto Point 4.

Point 4: All of the original autographs perished hundreds and thousands of years ago and no man living today has seen them.

In that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to prove a negative, I will leave it up to you to produce the original autographs of the scriptures. Until which time, Point 4 will be considered valid.

Point 5: God's word gives examples of inspired copies of scripture.

The Bible in some places outrightly states that some copies of the law were considered scripture and therefore were inspired of God, and in some other places, basic reasoning proves that there are inspired copies of scripture. The key to understanding this is 2Ti 3:16, which says, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." This verse is very plain, is it not? If something is called "scripture" in the Bible, then it is inspired by God. That is so simple, even a PhD could understand it, but for some reason many of them don't. Let's look at a few verses that talk about people having the scriptures:

"And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." (2Ti 3:15)

"And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures," (Act 17:2)

"And the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea: who coming thither went into the synagogue of the Jews. 11) These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so." (Act 17:10-11)

"And he arose and went: and, behold, a man of Ethiopia, an eunuch of great authority under Candace queen of the Ethiopians, who had the charge of all her treasure, and had come to Jerusalem for to worship,32) The place of the scripture which he read was this, He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth:" (Act 8:27,32)

I could go on, but this should suffice. If the only thing that was inspired of God were the original autographs, as some Bible deniers would have us believe, and the Bible says that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God", and that Paul, Timothy, the Ethiopian eunuch, the Bereans, and a whole host of other people were reading the scriptures, and the original autographs were stored in the ark of the covenant (Heb 9:4), does that then mean that all those people were checking the original autographs out of the ark of the covenant to read them??? Obviously not or they all would have been dead (1Sa 6:19). The very idea is so ludicrous and absurd that not even a "Doctor of Divinity" would come up with it. It is more than obvious that the scriptures all these people were reading were inspired copies, in that they were called "scripture" and "all scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2Ti 3:16).

If that is not enough proof that copies can be inspired and considered the law of God, then consider what the Bible says in Deu 17:18-19 concerning when a king would take the throne in Israel: "And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites: 19) And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the LORD his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them." The copy of the law that the king would make would be considered the "words of this law", equating them to the original.

Likewise in the days of Joshua, he made a copy of the entire law of Moses on stones and read it to all the congregation of Israel.

"And he wrote there upon the stones a copy of the law of Moses, which he wrote in the presence of the children of Israel. 33) And all Israel, and their elders, and officers, and their judges, stood on this side the ark and on that side before the priests the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the LORD, as well the stranger, as he that was born among them; half of them over against mount Gerizim, and half of them over against mount Ebal; as Moses the servant of the LORD had commanded before, that they should bless the people of Israel. 34) And afterward he read all the words of the law, the blessings and cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the law. 35) There was not a word of all that Moses commanded, which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel, with the women, and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them." (Jos 8:32-35)

Notice that every single WORD that Moses commanded was read by Joshua from the copy that he made. The copy that Joshua wrote was not just similar to the law of Moses, nor did it contain the basic thoughts, ideas, and concepts of the law of Moses, but rather it was "according to all that is written in the book of the law".

According - 1. Agreeing, corresponding to; matching.

Joshua's copy was matching, not just a close enough representation.

And lastly you have the "...proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah king of Judah copied out." (Pro 25:1) In this case, the "original" was a copy, if you will. Point 5 has been proven beyond a reasonable doubt. Moving on...

Point 6: God's word gives examples of inspired translations of scripture.

Not only does the Bible attest to the truth of inspired copies of itself, it does likewise to inspired translations of itself. Before I begin, let me ask the question: what would lead a Christian to believe that his God is not able to use men to perfectly translate His word from one language to another, or, if He is able, then why would a Christian not believe that He has? Is it possible that that idea is a doctrine of men and devils that is promoted in nearly every seminary across the land, for the express purpose of causing men to doubt

the word of God? These questions should be pondered by any professing Christian that does not believe that God has inspired and preserved his word in the English language (or other languages for that matter).

Let's look at some inspired translations of the word of God. In Acts 22:1-21, when Paul made his defense to the Jews, he did so in the Hebrew tongue (Act 21:40). Yet, his words that were spoken in Hebrew were recorded by Luke in Greek. Question: was the original autograph of the book of Acts that was penned by Luke the inspired word of God? Of course it was; even Bob Jones himself would agree with that. Paul spoke the words in Hebrew and the Holy Spirit, by the hand of Luke, translated the Hebrew into Greek. Modern scholars' opinions notwithstanding, here we have an inspired, infallible TRANSLATION of the word of God. "Let God be true, but every man a liar" (especially Bible-denying "scholars") (Rom 3:4).

How about the dozens, if not hundreds, of verses that are quoted from the Old Testament in the New Testament? Those are Hebrew passages of scripture that are translated into Greek by the Holy Spirit working through men. Right about now someone is going to object, "But the Old Testament that Jesus and the apostles quoted from was the Greek translation the Old Testament called the Septuagint; therefore they were not translating Hebrew into Greek." The first problem with that statement is that it is not true. Jesus read and referred to a Hebrew Old Testament, and he proved as much when he referred to the law as written with jots and tittles in Mat 5:18. Jots and tittles are specific to Hebrew, not Greek. Secondly, even if Jesus and the apostles were quoting from the Greek Septuagint, did they not say that they were quoting "scripture"? Of course they did, such as in Mat 21:42 when Jesus said "...Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner..." If Jesus is quoting the Septuagint and calling it "scripture" and "all scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2Ti 3:16), then guess what? -- the Greek Septuagint was an inspired translation of the Hebrew Old Testament. Logically you have inspired translation either way.

In Exodus 5:1-9, Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh and had a conversation with him concerning letting the children of Israel leave Egypt. Whether Moses knew Egyptian and that was the language of the conversation or Pharaoh spoke Egyptian and it was translated into Hebrew is really immaterial. All indications are that Pharaoh did not speak Hebrew and yet the conversation was recorded in the inspired original autograph of law of Moses in Hebrew; and that is once again an inspired translation. Many more examples could be cited, but these few have demonstrably proven that a translation can be inspired by God. And that wraps up Point 6.

Point 7: God's word promised that it would be published in all nations and preached in all the world.

With the coming of Christ and the writing of a New Testament, the middle wall of partition was broken down between Jew and Gentile and the gospel was commanded to be preached in all the world. Just before His ascension into glory, Jesus commissioned His disciples saying, "...All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. 19) Go ye

therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: 20) Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." (Mat 28:18-20) The commandment was very simple; the apostles were to teach all nations (not only those who spoke Greek) everything that Jesus commanded and to leave off nothing. Mark's gospel gets even more specific, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." (Mar 16:15) The gospel was to be preached to every creature throughout the whole world, which consisted of many different languages that the word of God would have to be translated into for it to be of any value to them whatsoever.

Interestingly, the Bible also declares as plainly as possible, that the apostles fulfilled Jesus' "great commission" to the letter, for Paul writes to the Colossians and tells them that the gospel "is come unto you, as it is in all the world; and bringeth forth fruit, as it doth also in you, since the day ye heard of it, and knew the grace of God in truth" (Col 1:6); and if that isn't enough, he says later on in the same chapter, "If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul am made a minister;" (Col 1:23).

There we have it so plainly that a seminary professor couldn't even gainsay it; the gospel was preached in all the world to every creature under heaven and they understood it and knew the grace of God in truth. Do you think for a minute that the entire world was made to learn Greek so that they could read and understand the word of God? To ask the question is to answer it.

There are numerous other verses that could be cited to show that the word of God was promised to be preached to all nations throughout the world, but the point has been well established.

Point 8: God's method of transmitting His word to all nations in the New Testament was not to make all nations learn Greek and Hebrew, but to translate the word of God into the languages of those nations.

In order for the word of God to be preached and taught to all nations, one of two things have to happen: either 1) all nations will have to be made to learn Greek and Hebrew so they can read and understand the word of God that is supposed by some to only be preserved and inspired in those original languages, or 2) the word of God has to be translated into those several languages in order for the people of those nations to be able to read or hear it with understanding.

Anyone that knows much about the Bible knows that God does NOT want the entire earth speaking one language, which is why the Lord confounded the language of the people of the earth at the tower of Babel in Gen 11:1-9. Since God changes not (Mal 3:6; Heb13:8), that rules out possibility number one, in that making all the nations of the earth all learn to speak Greek would bring us right back to Babel.

That leaves us with possibility number two: that the word of God would be translated into the vernacular of the various nations of the world, and lo and behold, this is not just merely a possibility, but it is exactly what happened in the beginning of the New Testament church on the day of Pentecost. On the day of Pentecost, the Jerusalem church was assembled together and there dwelling in Jerusalem were "Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven" (Act 2:5). Did you catch that? There were people there from every nation under heaven, not just Greek and Hebrew speaking ones. It was at that time that the Holy Ghost filled the church and they all spoke with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance (Act 2:1-4). The men were confounded, "because that every man heard them speak in his own language." (Act 2:6) Verses 8-11 go on to tell how these men from 16 different nations all heard "them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God" (Act 2:11). These men were not all made to learn Greek or Hebrew to hear and understand the word of God, but rather the word of God was translated into their own languages.

It is safe to say that the pattern set forth in the very beginning of the New Testament era has been established; that being that God's plan for the transmission of His word is through translation of it into the languages of the world.

Based upon the proof of these points: 3) God promised to preserve His word forever, 4) all the original autographs are no longer in existence, 5) God's word gives examples of inspired copies of scripture, 6) God's word gives examples of inspired translations of scripture, 7) God's word promised that it would be published in all nations and preached in all the world, and 8) God's method and example of transmitting His word to all nations in the N.T. was not to make all nations learn Greek and Hebrew, but to translate the word of God into the languages of those nations; therefore it is not at all foolish, illogical, or unscholarly to believe that God has preserved His word in an infallible and inspired translation in the English language, but rather is absolutely as wise, logical, and scholarly as anything can be because it is based on the promise and word of God Himself.

Part 2: Manuscript evidence

For the sake of time, I am going to keep this very simple. As you know, the KJV and all the English Bibles that were translated before it were translated from the Greek Textus Receptus, which is a printed Greek New Testament that was compiled from the vast majority (somewhere between 85% to 99%, depending on the source) of extant manuscripts of the N.T. As for the Old Testament, the KJV was translated from the Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text, which is the historic Hebrew text that had been handed down by the Masoretes for centuries. Modern English bibles translated since 1881 are translated from the Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament which is based largely upon two corrupt manuscripts: Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus (Aleph). The Old Testament of these modern bibles is translated from Kittel's Biblia Hebraica, the Dead Sea Scrolls, Samaritan Pentateuch, the Greek Septuagint, the Latin Vulgate, and others. Since the battle is focused largely on the New Testament, I will spend a few minutes looking at the

Greek manuscripts underlying the KJV vs. the manuscripts underlying the modern English versions.

Let's look at a comparison of the two Greek manuscripts that the Westcott-Hort text is largely based on compared to the Textus Receptus. The following quotes are from "New Age Bible Versions" by G.A. Riplinger.

Concerning Vaticanus (B):

"B [Vaticanus] agrees with the Textus Receptus only about 50% of the time. It differs from the Majority Greek in nearly 8000 places, amounting to about one change per verse. It omits several thousand key words from the Gospels, nearly 1000 complete sentences, and 500 clauses. It adds approximately 500 words, substitutes or modifies nearly 2000 and transposes word order in about 2000 places. It has nearly 600 readings that do not occur in any other manuscript. These affect almost 1000 words" (G.A. Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*, p. 551)

"B does not consider the following as part of the bible: Revelation, Phil., Titus, I and II Timothy, large parts of Samuel, Kings, Nehemiah, the Psalms, and Genesis. B omits crucial parts of Mark and Luke. In their place it adds apocryphal books such as Bel and the Dragon, Tobit, Judith, and the Epistle of Barnabas." (Ibid)

Concerning Sinaiticus (Aleph):

"Because of its blatant omissions and alterations, it lapsed into a wastebasket in a monastery, where it was 'discovered' by Constantine von Tischendorf in the mid-eighteen hundreds." (Ibid, p. 553)

"There are about 9000 changes in this text from that of the Majority and Traditional Text, amounting to one difference in every verse. It omits some 4000 words from the Gospels, adds 1000, repositions 2000 and alters another 1000. It has approximately 1500 readings that appear in no other manuscript; this affects nearly 3000 words. The following omissions are just a few examples.

- The end of Mark and John.
- Thirty-nine words from Joh 19:20, 21; twenty words from Joh 20:5-6; nineteen words from Mark 1:32-34; fourteen words from Mark 15:47.
- John 5:4, Mat 16:2-3, Rom 16:24, Mar 16:9-20, 1Jo 5:7, Act 8:37, Gen 23:19-24, 46, Num 5:27-7:20, 1Ch 9:27-19:27.
- Exodus, Joshua, I and II Samuel, I and II Kings, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and Judges.
- In Luke 8, for example, 19 out of 34 words are changed. In Matthew chapter one, 60 words are changed.
- It adds apocryphal books such as Bel and The Dragon, Tobit Judith, The Epistle of Barnabas, and The Shepherd of Hermas, among others" (Ibid, p. 552-553)

It would be one thing if these manuscripts were different from the Textus Receptus, but they agreed perfectly with each other, but such is not the case.

Aleph vs. B-

1. Metzger says that Sinaiticus and Vaticanus do not agree with the majority of manuscripts.
2. Not only do they disagree with the Majority of manuscripts, but they do not agree with each other. The 8000 changes in B and the 9000 changes in Aleph are not the same changes. When their changes are added together, they alter the Majority text in about 13,000 places. This is two changes for every verse. Together they omit 4000 words, add 2000, transpose 3500, and modify 2000.
3. They disagree with each other a dozen times on every page.
4. Colwell says they disagree 70% of the time and in almost every verse of the gospels. Burgon says, "It is easier to find two consecutive verses in which these manuscripts differ than two in which they agree." (G.A. Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*, p. 554)

Based on the corruption that has been shown in the Westcott-Hort manuscripts, it seems very logical and scholarly to conclude that God would not use that family of manuscripts to preserve His word. Since it has been before proved that God promised to preserve His word forever and His method of doing so involves translations, and the KJV was translated from a pure and preserved family of Greek manuscripts, then it is altogether logical to believe that the KJV is an inspired translation of the word of God. This could not be said of modern English bibles which are translated from corrupted manuscripts, which is very apparent when verses are compared between the KJV (and previous English versions) and the modern English versions.

Part 3: Internal consistency

The KJV is internally consistent and has never been proven to contain any errors or contradictions, although "scholars" have tried their best over the years to manufacture some. This cannot be said of many of the modern English bibles. Let's just briefly look at a couple of examples from the NIV (Non-Inspired Version) that prove it is not internally consistent because it contradicts itself.

In Gal 3:16, the NIV states, "The promises were spoken to Abraham and to his seed. The Scripture does not say "and to seeds," meaning many people, but "and to your seed,"^[E] meaning one person, who is Christ." (Gal 3:16). Paul is very clear here that the promise was to Abraham's singular seed, not seeds. A problem arises when you look at a couple of the places where God's promise to Abraham was made in the NIV.

³ Stay in this land for a while, and I will be with you and will bless you. For to you and your descendants I will give all these lands and will confirm the oath I swore to your father Abraham. ⁴ I will make your descendants as numerous as the stars in the sky and

will give them all these lands, and through your offspring ^[a] all nations on earth will be blessed,” (Gen 26:3-4, NIV)

¹⁴ Your descendants will be like the dust of the earth, and you will spread out to the west and to the east, to the north and to the south. All peoples on earth will be blessed through you and your offspring.” (Gen 28:14, NIV)

Notice in these two verses that it said “descendants”, plural. There is a break down in the internal consistency of the NIV; it can’t be “seed” one place and “descendents” in another. The KJV has no such contradiction. If that one wasn’t enough proof that the NIV internally contradicts itself, then the following example will be.

In Acts 13:17-20 Paul gives a brief history of the nation of Israel from the time that they were in Egypt until Samuel the prophet:

“The God of this people of Israel chose our fathers, and exalted the people when they dwelt as strangers in the land of Egypt, and with an high arm brought he them out of it. 18) And about the time of forty years suffered he their manners in the wilderness. 19) And when he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Chanaan, he divided their land to them by lot. 20) And after that he gave *unto them* judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years, until Samuel the prophet.” (Act 13:17-20, KJV)

Notice the chain of events in the KJV:

- 1) God brought them out of Egypt.
- 2) They spent 40 years in the wilderness.
- 3) God destroyed seven nations and gave them the land.
- 4) AFTER that, God gave them judges for 450 years until Samuel the prophet.

This is an accurate history from the time that Israel was in Egypt until Samuel the prophet, and the Old Testament bears that out precisely.

Now let’s take a look at what the NIV says:

¹⁷The God of the people of Israel chose our fathers; he made the people prosper during their stay in Egypt, with mighty power he led them out of that country, ¹⁸he endured their conduct^[a] for about forty years in the desert, ¹⁹he overthrew seven nations in Canaan and gave their land to his people as their inheritance. ²⁰All this took about 450 years. After this, God gave them judges until the time of Samuel the prophet.” (Act 13:17-20, NIV)

Notice the chain of events in the NIV:

- 1) God brought them out of Egypt.
- 2) They spent 40 years in the desert.
- 3) God overthrew seven nations and them the land.
- 4) All this took 450 years (the overthrowing of the nations in Canaan, or possibly the time beginning with their stay in Egypt and ending when they were given the land).

5) AFTER that God gave them judges until Samuel.

The NIV is saying one of two things: 1) the time that it took for the seven nations in Canaan to be overthrown and the land to be divided was 450 years, or 2) the time that they stayed in Egypt, wandered in the wilderness for 40 years, the seven nations in Canaan were overthrown, and the land was divided to them took 450 years. One thing is certain: the judges ruled AFTER the 450 years according to the NIV. This is an outright contradiction no matter how it is run.

A careful examination of Bible chronology will show that Israel spent 215 years in Egypt, 40 years wandering in the wilderness, and seven (7) years destroying the nations in the land of Canaan (*The Wonders of Bible Chronology* by Philip Mauro clearly proves these times). Therefore the total time from when Israel first entered Egypt until the judges ruled was 262 years (215+40+7=262), not 450 years. Either way you look at it, the NIV in Act 13:20 contradicts itself and can therefore be demonstrably shown to not be the infallible inspired word of God. The KJV has no such provable errors or contradictions in it, and therefore, based upon what has been proven thus far, it is logical, scholarly, and Biblical to believe that the KJV is an inspired translation of the word of God.

Part 4: Bearing fruit

Concerning false prophets, Jesus said that “Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? 17) Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit.” (Mat 7:16-17) The same principle is true with translations of the word of God. The fruit that the KJV has evidenced in the last nearly 400 years is unparalleled by any other English version in the history of the world. Despite all the ruthless attacks by “scholars” for more than 100 years, the KJV still stands strong and all other versions still compare themselves to it, but have never been able to supplant it. This evidence is more subjective than the others, but nonetheless it is still a powerful witness that the KJV is an inspired, infallible, and preserved translation of the word of God and therefore is the word of God.

Concerning previous English translations and non-English translations.

I do not hold, nor have I ever held, the position that the KJV is the only inspired Bible in the world today. I believe that there are likely inspired Bibles in other languages, although I have never done the research to find out which ones are. I do believe that some of the English Bibles that were translated prior to the KJV from the Greek Received Text and the Hebrew Masoretic text could very well be the inspired word of God just as is the KJV, although, once again I have not done the research to find out which ones are or could be. I have seen verses compared between the KJV and previous Bibles such as the Bishops, Geneva, Tyndale, Coverdale, Wycliffe, etc. that show that the earlier Bibles rendered those verses the same as the KJV, while the modern versions either totally omit them or make crucial changes to the text.

The Bible speaks of the word of the Lord being purified seven times (Psa 12:7). I think that it is altogether possible that if there are provable differences between the KJV and the previous versions to it, then those Bibles could have been steps in the purification of the word of God leading up to the crown jewel, the King James Bible. However none of this can be said of the modern English Bibles translated from the Westcott-Hort text. A corrupted text could be perfectly translated (which I don't believe that modern versions are), but the result would still be a corrupted text: garbage in equals garbage out.

Conclusion

Based upon all the evidence and reasoning in this paper, I hope that you can now see that my belief that the KJV is the inspired word of God is not at all foolish, illogical, or anti-scholarly. Most importantly, the belief that I hold concerning the inspiration of the KJV is in perfect agreement with what the word of God says of itself, that being that God has promised to preserve his word throughout all time, and by necessity that would have to be through translations or else the entire world would have to learn one language, which is most certainly contrary to God's declared will; all of which I proved in the first part of this letter.