

**WE CHOOSE TO TRUST IN THE ONLY BIBLE WHOSE TRANSLATORS BELIEVED EVERY WORD OF THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT TO BE THE INFALLIBLE WORD OF GOD.**

**WE USE THE AUTHORIZED KING JAMES VERSION FOR THE FOLLOWING 6 REASONS:**

**Reason 1. The more ancient manuscripts and scrolls upon which the modern translations are ‘reportedly’ based were known to be inferior and corrupt.**

By comparing the Majority Textus Receptus manuscripts underlying the King James Version with the earlier dated Minority texts such as the Nestle Greek underlying all other versions, you will find thousands of words, phrases and whole verses, missing from these Minority texts that were faithfully recorded in the Textus Receptus. These same earlier dated Minority texts which are used as the basis for the NIV and other modern versions, are not a new discovery, but were rejected by the translators of the King James Version because the **minority texts were well known by the 15<sup>th</sup> century, to be corrupted manuscripts.**

**MANUSCRIPTS IN ALEXANDRIA WERE KNOWN TO BE CORRUPT BEFORE 200 AD:**

The oldest New Testament manuscript fragment is P52, which dates to about 125 AD. However, the earliest manuscripts that provide distinguishable readings date to about 200 AD (e.g. P46, P66). These manuscripts come from Egypt and are witnesses of the Alexandrian text-type. However, the antiquity of these manuscripts is no indication of reliability because a prominent church father in Alexandria testified that manuscripts were already corrupt by the third century. **Origen, the Alexandrian church father in the early third century, said:**

“...the differences among the manuscripts [of the Gospels] have become great, either through the negligence of some copyists or through the perverse audacity of others; they either neglect to check over what they have transcribed, or, in the process of checking, they lengthen or shorten, as they please.”

(Bruce Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (1991), pp. 151-152).

Origen is of course speaking of the manuscripts of his location, Alexandria, Egypt. By an Alexandrian Church father’s own admission, manuscripts in Alexandria by 200 AD were already corrupt. Irenaeus in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, though not in Alexandria, made a similar admission on the state of corruption among New Testament manuscripts. Daniel B. Wallace says, “Revelation was copied less often than any other book of the NT, and yet Irenaeus admits that it was already corrupted—within just a few decades of the writing of the Apocalypse” (Online article: Did the Original New Testament Manuscripts still exist in the Second Century?). **In other words, blindly preferring the “oldest” manuscripts does not ensure arriving at the correct readings.** For the antiquity of a manuscript to be of intrinsic value, that manuscript must be from before 200 AD when the corruptions were already evident. This is not the case with any extant Alexandrian manuscript.

The “oldest” extant manuscripts (those from before the 5<sup>th</sup> century) which NA/UBS scholars rely on as reliable are all from Egypt, the place where Origen observed the corruption of manuscripts:

- Codex Sinaiticus (Mount Sinai, Egypt)
- Codex Alexandrinus (Alexandria, Egypt)
- Codex Vaticanus (Alexandria, Egypt)
- Uncial 0220 (Cairo, Egypt)

- Uncial 0162 (Oxyrhynchus, Egypt)
- Uncial 0206 (Oxyrhynchus, Egypt)
- Amherst Papyri (Egypt)
- Bodmer papyri (Pabau, Egypt)
- Chester Beatty papyri (Fayum or Aphroditopolis, Egypt)
- Michigan papyri (Egypt)
- Oxyrhynchus papyri (Oxyrhynchus, Egypt)
- Rylands papyri (Egypt)
- Miscellaneous papyri
- P2 (Egypt), P4 (Coptos, Egypt) P6 (Egypt), P7 (Egypt), P8 (Egypt), P12 (Egypt), P14 (Mount Sinai, Egypt), P25 (Egypt), P33=58 (Egypt), P34 (Egypt), P35 (Egypt), P36 (Egypt), P40 (Egypt), P41 (Egypt), P43 (Egypt), P44 (Egypt), P48 (Egypt), P49 (Egypt), P50 (Egypt), P52 (Egypt), P53 (Egypt), P54 (Egypt), P55 (Egypt), P56 (Egypt), P57 (Egypt), P59 (Egypt), P60 (Egypt), P61 (Egypt), P62 (Egypt), P63 (Egypt), P64=67 (Coptos, Egypt), P65 (Egypt), P68 (Egypt), P76 (Egypt), P79 (Egypt), P80 (Egypt), P81 (Egypt), P82 (Egypt), P83 (Egypt), P84 (Egypt), P85 (Egypt), P86 (Egypt), P88 (Egypt), P89 (Egypt), P92 (Faiyum, Egypt)

**See full article at [www.KJVtoday.com](http://www.KJVtoday.com)**

**PRESENT DAY QUOTE:** *"I have not found even ONE improvement to the Textus Receptus Greek New Testament and the Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament Text. As a matter of fact, I believe that **THE SCRAPS OF ANCIENT MANUSCRIPTS AND SCROLLS DISCOVERED IN THE LAST 200 YEARS WERE DISCARDED by their original owners BECAUSE THEY WERE INFERIOR.** I believe that God's Word, and the Authority in the original languages is the Textus Receptus Greek New Testament and the Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament Text, and that God's Word and the*

*Authority for English speaking people is the King James or Authorized Version of 1611....If we do not preserve the KJV, New KJV and the Textus Receptus Greek New Testament and the Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament, they will eventually be eclipsed by the weakened and distorted "modernized" versions. We are told in Jude verse 3 to "Contend (struggle) for THE faith (articular noun, THE faith = THE Scriptures) once (once for all) delivered to the saints", and I believe that means the Textus Receptus Greek New Testament and the Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament. " Bob Jones, Bob Jones University*

- **Comparing the following texts within any version will reveal if that version is corrupt:**
- The definitive answer to determine with certainty that the Textus Receptus is not guilty of adding words, and that the Minority texts of the Nestle Greek are guilty of deleting them, is found in the pages of the Bible.

**ACCURACY TEST SCRIPTURE:** There is no argument, because God preserved a very simple test in our Bibles so that we can know for certain: Luke testifies in Acts 1:1-2,9 that in his former letter, the book of Luke 24:50-52, he had written about all that Jesus began to do and to preach until the time He was taken up to heaven. In the Textus Receptus you will find Luke's words that Jesus was taken up into heaven as they watched, preserved as he said they would be. Yet in all the Minority manuscripts including the Nestle Greek and other corrupted manuscripts underlying the popular Westcott-Hort versions, the words Luke TESTIFIED that he wrote in the book of Luke have either been deleted or footnoted that those words cannot be trusted, **indisputable proof that the modern versions all put man's opinion above the word of God.** Therefore the Minority manuscripts, and the Bible versions based on those texts, have proven themselves to be corrupt accursed manuscripts which cannot be trusted.

## Reason 2. MODERN VERSIONS CANNOT BE TESTED ACCORDING TO ACTS 17:11:

- There is no possible way to study and test the words you read in the NIV and other Westcott-Hort versions to find whether they come from a corrupt manuscript, or come from the reasoning of the modern translators, or may in fact be the true words of God, because the authors of these paraphrases **readily admit they have selected phrases they have reasoned amongst themselves to convey correct meaning by comparing many manuscripts; in many places they use many of their own words to express thoughts that are not at all in any manuscript, so any words you look up would be impossible to list from which manuscript each word has been taken, scattering names of codexes is meaningless when only an idea, but not specific words and phrasing comes from them - consequently there is no accountability!** This practice has added further corruption to the already corrupt and previously discarded minority manuscripts, (long ago discarded for their widely known unreliability).

Readers are forced to depend on the word of men who write and rewrite new 'Bible versions', rather than the word of God whose word does not change.

- **QUOTE FROM DEAN JOHN WILLIAM BURGON:** *"Two irresponsible scholars of the University of Cambridge"<sup>[51]</sup> Brooke Foss Westcott and Professor Fenton John Anthony Hort and their "invention" of the new Revised Greek Text that surfaced in 1881 based not on the Textus Receptus text but on what he saw as unreliable manuscripts from the Minority Text.*

*Scholars point to the basic Greek text of Westcott and Hort dated in 1881 is virtually identical with the basic Greek text of the present critical editions being used in the new translations. The simple*

**reason is that they are derived from the same basic, corrupt Greek manuscripts, namely "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) and a few others that followed them.**

*Many have noted that the Current Greek Texts omit approximately 200 verses from the Scriptures along with many amendments, and use it despite the similarity between it and the Westcott and Hort Text.” Dean John William Burgon*

**QUOTE FROM NIV TRANSLATORS:** *“Because thought patterns and syntax differ from language to language, accurate communication of the meaning of the biblical authors demands constant regard for varied contextual uses of words and idioms and for frequent modifications in sentence structures...The Masoretic Text tradition contains marginal notations that offer variant readings. These have sometimes been followed instead of the text itself. Because such instances involve variants within the Masoretic tradition, they have not been indicated in the textual notes.... The translators also consulted the more important early versions — The Greek Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, the Latin Vulgate, the Syriac Peshitta, the Aramaic Targums, and for the Psalms, the Juxta Hebraica of Jerome. Readings from these versions, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the scribal traditions were occasionally followed where the Masoretic Text seemed doubtful and where accepted principles of textual criticism showed that one or more of these textual witnesses appeared to provide the correct reading....*

**The Greek text used in translating the New Testament is an eclectic one, based on the latest editions of the Nestle-Aland/United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament. The committee has made its choices among the variant readings in accordance with widely accepted principles of New Testament textual criticism. Footnotes call attention to places where uncertainty remains....**

*The New Testament authors, writing in Greek, often quote the Old Testament from its ancient Greek version, the Septuagint. This is one reason why some of the Old Testament quotations in the NIV New Testament are not identical to the corresponding passages in the NIV Old Testament...*

**One of the shifts that creates particular challenges to writers and translators alike is the manner in which gender is presented.....**  
*Thus, for instance, the NIV (1984) rendering of 1 Corinthians 8:3, “But the man who loves God is known by God” becomes in this edition “But whoever loves God is known by God.” ..... Mark 16:9–20 and John 7:53–8:11, although long accorded virtually equal status with the rest of the Gospels in which they stand, **have a very questionable — and confused — standing in the textual history of the New Testament, as noted in the bracketed annotations with which they are set off. A different typeface has been chosen for these passages to indicate even more clearly their uncertain status**.....The committee has again been reminded that every human effort is flawed — including this revision of the NIV. **We trust, however, that many will find in it an improved representation of the Word of God....**”*

Committee on Bible Translation September 2010 Preface to NIV 2011

- **Reason 3. WESCOTT AND HORT WERE NOT BELIEVERS IN GOD’S INFALLIBILITY WHILE THE KJV BIBLE TRANSLATORS BELIEVED THEY HANDLED THE VERY WORD OF GOD:** The Prefatory and Dedicatory remarks in the Authorized King James Version expressed by the men who translated the manuscripts of the Received Text into the KJV, show that these highly educated but humble men, did not merely believe they were handling "God's message" or "reliable manuscripts" but they believed they were handling the very words of God Himself in order to translate God’s exact word from the original tongue into God’s exact word in English:

*“But amongst all our Joyes, there was no one that more filled our hearts, then the blessed continuance of the Preaching of GODS sacred word amongst us ...That out of the Originall sacred tongues, together with comparing of the labours, both in our owne and other forreigne Languages, of many worthy men who went before us, there should be one more exact Translation of the holy Scriptures into the English tongue.... But now what pietie without trueth? what trueth (what saving trueth) without the word of God? what word of God (whereof we may be sure) without the Scripture?”*

- **In sharp contrast, Wescott-Hort both stated in their biography that they did not believe any manuscript to be the infallible word of God.** Wescott further stated that he did not feel that his overwhelming rejection of the infallibility of scripture to ever be solved.
- **QUOTE: “I cannot see that my supposed view is a whit more 'startling' than Westcott's. But I now feel that I must say a word about more general principles. If you make a decided conviction of the absolute infallibility of the N. T. practically a sine qua non for co-operation, I fear I could not join you, even if you were willing to forget your fears about the origin of the Gospels.”** Hort., The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, Vol. I, p.420
- **“My dear Hort - I am very glad to have seen both your note and Lightfoot's - glad too that we have had such an opportunity of openly speaking. For I too "must disclaim setting forth infallibility" in the front of my convictions. All I hold is, that the more I learn, the more I am convinced that fresh doubts come from my own ignorance, and that at present I find the presumption in favor of the absolute truth - I reject the word infallibility - of Holy Scripture overwhelming. Of course I feel difficulties which at present I cannot solve, and which I never hope to solve.”** Westcott, The Life and Letters of Brook Foss Westcott, Vol. I, p.207

- **Reason 4. DURING THE SAME YEARS OF CREATING THEIR NEW BIBLE MANUSCRIPTS, WESCOTT & HORT WERE ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN RECRUITING BIBLE COLLEGE SCHOOLMATES INTO THEIR CLUB FOR SPIRITUALISM AND NECROMANCY WHICH WAS THE FORERUNNER OF THE PSYCHIC OCCULT MOVEMENT IN AMERICA.**
- **QUOTE:** **1858: Oct. 21st** - Hort: "The **principle literary work of these years was the revision of the Greek Text of the New Testament. All spare hours were devoted to it.**" The Life and Letters of Brook Foss Westcott, Vol.I, p.399
- **1861: Apr. 12th** - Hort to Westcott: "Also - but **this may be cowardice - I have a sort of craving that our text should be cast upon the world before we deal with matters likely to brand us with suspicion. I mean, a text, issued by men already known for what will undoubtedly be treated as dangerous heresy, will have great difficulties** in finding its way to regions which it might otherwise hope to reach, and whence it would not be easily banished by subsequent alarms." The Life and Letters of Brook Foss Westcott, Vol.I, p.445
- **QUOTE:** *"Once the elite had closed their minds to Biblical revelation, they almost immediately began to fall for every spiritual con game and fringe teaching around."* (30) **It appears that Wescott is principally responsible as one of the front men of the "Ghostly Guild", recruiting disillusioned with their faith into Spiritualism..**  
*. . Macaulay is horrified at the paper. . . During the vacation I distributed some eight or ten 'ghostly papers' . . I left a paper on my table the other evening when the Ray met here, and it excited some attention, but not I think much sympathy. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ was APPALLED to find such a spot of medieval darkness flecking light serene of Cambridge University in the nineteenth century. There were also grave smiles and civil questions; and finally several copies were carried off.*

(31) Although Hort referred to evangelical Christians as “dangerous” and “perverted”, “unsound”, and “confused” he was rabidly ‘evangelistic’ about his ‘necromancy’ as the bible calls it. Writing to C.H Chambers, Hort proselytizes: I sent you two ghostly papers; you can have more if you want them, but I find they go very fast and the 750 copies which we printed go by no means far enough. We are promised a large number of well-authenticated private stories, but they have not arrived yet.

Our most active members are however absent from Cambridge; to wit Westcott at Harrow and Gordon at Wells. . . . (32) Westcott’s son writes, “Westcott took a leading part in their proceedings and their inquiry circular was originally drawn up by him. He also received a number of communications in response.” Westcott’s “Ghostly Circular” reads in part: But there are many others who believe it is possible that the beings of the unseen world may manifest themselves to us. . . Many of the stories current in tradition or scattered up and down in books, may be exactly true. . . (33) The members apparently had their own ‘experiences’ and the circular was for eliciting “information beyond the limits of their own immediate circle.”

(34) Referring to ‘the foundations’ of the occult revival, another historian W.H. Salter, points to Westcott, Hort and Benson, their guild and circular. First mentioned should be made of spontaneous cases of haunts and the like. . . . [T]he founders of psychical research . . . The Cambridge ‘Ghost Society’ had collected them by circular. (35) Historians researching this period reveal that other ‘Ghostly Guild’ members became its ‘front men’. Benson and Westcott were not above stalking impressionable students to recruit members. Henry Sidgwick, a student of Westcott’s and a cousin of Benson’s “joined the Ghost Society before he took his degree in 1859; Westcott was then secretary [of the Ghostly Guild] and on his leaving Cambridge, Sidgwick appears to have succeeded him.”

41 The Founders of Psychical Research reports how the Ghostly Guild spurred Sidgwick's "interest in the phenomena of Spiritualism" and incited his active involvement with them. 42 Sidgwick was among a number whose disillusionment with Christianity was spawned during Westcott's tenure at Trinity College in Cambridge. Author of *The Fabians*, a history of communism and socialism in England, writes: **In this same period a group of young dons from Trinity College, Cambridge, were also turning to psychic research as a substitute for their lost evangelical faith...spiritism as a substitute for Orthodox Christian faith.**

43 Sidgwick himself explains, sounding much like an echo from one of Westcott's lectures. Recent historical and textual criticism had shown beyond doubt that most of the evidence for the New Testament miracles (not to mention the Old Testament) can not be unfairly described as remote and hearsay...[I]t is quite certainly far weaker than the evidence for, let us say, the miraculous events associated with modern Spiritualism. 44 *The Founders of Psychical Research* notes the reaction of Orthodox Christians to Westcott's 'crowd.' Christianity is about to die of self-inflicted wounds...It seemed to conservative Christians quite appalling that at a time when the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture was being undermined by Darwin and his allies, a group of those whose sacred duty should have been to shore it up again had conspired to hammer their wedge not under it, but into it. The reactions of the orthodox disgusted Sidgwick and those of his friends...He addressed a letter to *The Times* on the subject and was rather surprised that on the **20th February 1861** it was published. [It said in part] **'Mr. Westcott expresses it, they love their early faith, but they love the truth more.'** 45"

**Reason 5.** Why did the early churches of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries and all the Protestant Reformers of the 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries choose *Textus Receptus* in preference to the *Minority Texts*?

The answer is because of the following:

- **Textus Receptus** is based on the vast majority (over 95%) of the 5,300+ Greek manuscripts in existence. That is why it is also called the **Majority Text**.
- **Textus Receptus** is not mutilated with deletions, additions and amendments, as is the Minority Text.
- **Textus Receptus** agrees with the earliest versions of the Bible:  
**Peshitta** (AD150) **Old Latin Vulgate** (AD157), the **Italic Bible** (AD157) etc. These Bibles were produced some 200 years **before** the Minority Texts (like [Vatican](#) and [Sinai](#)) favored by the [Roman Catholic Church](#).
- **Textus Receptus** agrees with the vast majority of the 86,000+ citations from scripture **by the early church fathers**.
- **Textus Receptus** is untainted with Egyptian philosophy and unbelief.
- **Textus Receptus** strongly upholds the **fundamental doctrines** of the Christian faith: *the creation account in Genesis, the divinity of Jesus Christ, the virgin birth, the Saviour's miracles, his bodily resurrection, his literal return and the cleansing power of his blood!*
- **Textus Receptus was (and still is) the enemy of the Roman Catholic Church. This is an important fact to bear in mind**
- **QUOTE:** Prior to the 20th century, *all English Bibles* since Tyndale's first New Testament (1526) were based on the Textus Receptus. This includes: Miles Coverdale's Bible (1535), Matthew's Bible (1500-1555), The Great Bible (1539), The Geneva Version (1560), The Bishops' Bible (1568), and the King James Version (1611). [[STORY OF OUR ENGLISH BIBLE](#), by W. Scott]
- ***Ancient Versions*** followed the reading of the Textus Receptus. These versions include:

The Peshitta Version (AD 150), The Italic Bible (AD 157), The Waldensian (AD 120 & onwards), The Gallic Bible (Southern France) (AD177), The Gothic Bible (AD 330-350), The Old Syriac Bible (AD 400), The Armenian Bible (AD 400 There are 1244 copies of this version still in existence.), The Palestinian Syriac (AD 450), The French Bible of Oliveton (AD 1535), The Czech Bible (AD 1602), The Italian Bible of Diodati (AD 1606), The Greek Orthodox Bible (Used from Apostolic times to the present day by the Greek Orthodox Church). [[Bible Versions](#), D.B. Loughran]

- In his book **God Wrote Only One Bible**, Jasper J Ray pens the following testimony about **Textus Receptus**:

*"Wonder of wonders, in the midst of all the present confusion regarding manuscripts, we still have a Bible we can trust. **The writing of the word of God by inspiration is no greater miracle than the miracle of its preservation in the Textus Receptus. All criticism of this text from which was translated the King James Bible, is based upon an unproved hypothesis:***

*i.e. that there are older and more dependable copies of the original Bible manuscripts. No one in nineteen hundred years, has been able to prove that one jot or tittle has been inserted or taken out."*  
(Ref:D3)

- In his book **Final Authority**, William P Grady provides further interesting details about **Textus Receptus**, the Received Text:

*"For instance, over **5,000 Greek manuscripts** of the New Testament exist today ranging from small fragments containing two or three verses to nearly entire Bibles. Their ages vary from the second to the sixteenth century; the manuscripts are ending with the arrival of printing. By comparison, there exist only ten quality manuscripts of Caesar's Gallic War composed between 58-50BC... "Once again, the outstanding features of the **Received Text** is its high percentage of agreement among so many thousands of independent witnesses. This agreement is often placed at about 90 percent; **in other words, 90 percent of all existing manuscripts agree with one another so miraculously that they are able to form their own unique text...***

*If the critic of your King James Bible is correct in his rejection of the underlying **Textus Receptus**, then he is also under the greatest pressure to account for its existence.*

*To complain of fabrication is one thing, but to account for its universal prevalence is quite another. Whenever a large body of ancient documents are seen to be in agreement, this inexplicable harmony becomes their greatest evidence for legitimacy. Simple arithmetic confirms that the nearer a particular reading is to the original, the longer the time span will be for descendants to follow. The longer the family is, the older the original source must be."*  
(Ref: E1)

We believe that God has preserved His word for English speaking people in the King James Version translation of His Holy Word as He promised. As long as the Holy Bible is translated word for word from the Textus Receptus or word for word from the KJV into the native language of other countries then it can be said to be the very word of God.

Bibles translated from deviously corrupted and discarded manuscripts still contain some words of our Lord, however because so many words have been deleted and repeatedly changed according to the reasoning of fallible men, these modern paraphrases can mislead trusting people to receive false teaching about the nature of God and His instruction that is vital for life and salvation.

Some of our members who have difficulty with the unfamiliar old English word endings of the KJV, read from the KJVer, King James Version Easy Reader, which retains the word for word order and accuracy of the KJV replacing unfamiliar words and word endings with current word usage.

We do not recommend using the NKJV because in some places it follows the deletions and re-wording of the Westcott-Hort manuscript.