

**Interesting Facts About
The 1611 King James Version of The Bible**
*Dedicated to those who erroneously and carnally
idolize that particular translation*

By Jack W. Langford
First Edition 1987, Final Edition 2003

INTRODUCTION

There are many ways the Devil uses to divide Christians so that our testimony before the world will be useless. Christ had prayed that believers might be one that the world might know that God the Father had sent Him (John 17:21). Many Christians are not at all conscious of how sickening division among Christians really is. As of late there comes yet another issue that Satan uses to bring confusion and division among Christians and that is over the subject of what translation of the Bible they should be using. This primarily effects believers in the United States because some have come to teach in obvious pride and arrogance that unless we use the very notable and worthy King James Version of the English Bible we will be deprived of spiritual correctness and possibly even salvation. This has been very divisive and ruinous to our true Christian testimony, in addition to being a damnable lie. When these certain brethren refuse to have fellowship with other true believers merely because these others may not exclusively use the King James Version, the Devil smiles and claps his hands in success. He has brought about division under the guise of preserving truth in translation of the Bible. However, perhaps the strongest arguments against this pernicious doctrine is from *the translators of the King James Bible themselves*. If anyone has a right to argue a case for the exclusive use of their own translation certainly they should. So then, we will look at a little history of that translation, and then find out what the translators, themselves, said. I think we will find it very significant and enlightening.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The first source of information comes from the original edition of the King James Version of the Bible itself. This has been produced by Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1982. It is a photographic reproduction of the actual first edition. See "*The Translators To The Reader*" section in the Introduction pages of the book.

I also used *General Biblical Introduction*, section on the King James Version. This was my Bible College text book by H.S. Miller, Word-Bearer Press, 1952. Another helpful book was *So Many Versions? 20th Century English Versions Of The Bible*, by Sakae Kubo and Walter F. Specht, Zondervan, Academic Books, 1983.

Three recent books that are packed with a wealth of helpful information are: *In The Beginning, The Story Of The King James Bible*, by Alister E. McGrath, Doubleday, 2001; *God's Secretaries, The Making Of The King James Bible*, by Adam Nicolson, Harper & Collins Publishers, 2003; and last but not least, *The Bible In English, Its History And Influence*, by David Daniell, Yale University Press, 2003.

THE FACTS OF THE CASE

No. 1 The King James Version was not a new, distinct or original translation. It was actually the 5th Revision of the original Tyndale Translation of 1525. Tyndale's translation was the first to be made in the English language of the whole Bible from the existing copies of the original Hebrew and Greek manuscripts. There followed a series of revisions of Tyndale's version. They were as follows: 1) The Matthew's Bible in 1537; 2) The Great Bible of 1539; 3) The Geneva Bible of 1560; 4) The Bishop's Bible of 1568 and finally, 5) The King James Version of 1611.

The King James translators explained that "*we never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better.*" They further believed that in the future there would follow and should follow many "*alterations and amendings of their translation,*" just as they had done with the past revisions of Tyndale's Version. The words in quotes are from the first edition of the Authorized or King James Version and will be referenced later in this paper. Many of their statements are absolutely devastating to this new teaching.

No. 2 There have been a great number of *editions* and *revisions* of the King James Version. Some of the most notable ones are as follows: 1) the 1613 edition made more than 400 changes; 2) the Revisions of 1615, 1629 and 1638 made numerous changes in typographical errors, spelling changes and actual translation changes; 3) there followed the Revisions of 1701, 1762 and 1769 which included changes in weights, measurements, coins, marginal notes, modernization of spelling, and many others; 4) after the further editions of 1806 and 1813 the American Bible Society later counted over 24,000 differences in the text and punctuation in just six of the editions alone; 5) the later editions by Oxford and Cambridge Universities normalized the format for most of our modern editions of the King James Version of the Bible.

Now, on behalf of those who affirm that the King James Version of the Bible is the only accurate and inspired translation, out of the many dozens of English translations that have been made, I would ask, "Which of the dozens of *Revisions* of the King James Version is the only accurate and inspired one that we should use today? Or, do you think that only the *first one* is the only Right One?" Perhaps one might answer that all of the Revisions are good and to be used. If that be the case, then it follows that all the English translations are also good and to be used. In fact, we shall see that this is exactly what the King James translators believed!!!

No. 3 No Christian who knows American history should doubt that the Puritans, who first brought the English Bible to American soil in 1630, were anything but sincere, dedicated, Christ honoring, Bible believing Christians of the highest order. However, **they would not dare use the new King James Version of the Bible and forbade its distribution among them.** Why was that?? Simply because they thought that the new King James Version was filled with too many words from apostate Church of England and Roman Catholic origin rather than words that the original inspired languages gave. Make no mistake about it, the Puritans were **serious** about their Christianity. When the inspired words from the Holy Spirit of God were altered to reflect the traditions of apostate Christendom, **they totally rejected it.** The Puritans desired genuine simplicity in worship instead of

ritualistic ceremonies. Most of them abolished any organization under clerical bishops and archbishops. They placed greater strictness in moral values and changes from mere religious traditional beliefs and practices that were filled with the aroma of paganism, such as Christmas and Easter. They would not build church buildings because the church of Jesus Christ was saved people not a religious building. They had "meeting houses" and Christ's congregation met inside the building.

In fact, that was one good example of why they rejected the King James Version of the Bible. The English word "Church" was not even a translation of the actual Greek word at all. It was an old anglicized form of the Greek word for "Lord"—*kurios*. In England they had come to call the physical sanctuaries "the Lord's (house)" or "Kurk." This evolved into "Kurch" or "Church." The actual Greek word *ek-klesia* meant a called-out company of people and should properly be translated "congregation" or "assembly." The confusion of mixing a physical religious building with the idea of Christ's Church has existed for a long time. Another example of why they would not use the King James Version was with the word "bishop." This was purely a clerical title and does not reflect the actual Biblical word for leader in the early congregation which was "overseer."

One final example of why they refused to use the King James Version was the unfortunate use of the word "Easter" (Acts 12:4). "Easter" is merely the Anglicized form of the old pagan "Asteroth," goddess of fertility and the sexual impulses. Everyone knows that "Easter" came right out of Eastern Paganism being baptized by Romanism into their "Christian Tradition." This pagan celebration is one of the filthiest blights on the truth of the resurrection of Christ that there is. It is absolutely sickening to see some of these King James advocates struggle to somehow defend the corrupt "Easter" translation, instead of being honest with themselves and the truth, and just admit that this rendering was a serious blunder. At the end of this study I have included a response to one who tries to justify the translation of *pascha* (Passover) by the word "Easter."

Now I would ask these modern debaters for the K.J.V. if they would relegate the Puritans to spiritual depravity and possibly not even being saved people!! Were the Christians and others like them, for the first hundred or more years of American history, condemned to horrible spiritual depravity because they rarely used the King James version of the Bible? Of course not. In fact, they were probably our finest Christians in walk and conduct in United States history. When the King James Translation finally began to be published and widely used in the United States, one could correct some of these faulty translations that are inherit within it, by simply comparing Scripture with Scripture, thank God.

No. 4 Amazing as it may seem to us, and yet it is a fact, the first editions of the King James Version of the Bible also contained within its text all the books of the Roman Catholic **Apocrypha**. In fact the British and Foreign Bible Societies did not omit the Apocrypha from their publications of the King James Version until 1827. Later in the United States the American Bible Society omitted the Apocrypha in all their editions. Now the Apocrypha is uninspired and mostly pure myth, with the exception of I and II Maccabees which was good history. Just imagine, that for some two hundred years the King James Version contained this uninspired material between its covers, as if it were part of the true Word of God. However, even the Church of England, which insisted that the Apocrypha should be included in the Bible, also issued a warning that no Doctrine should be based upon the Apocrypha.

The Apocrypha books included—I and II Esdras; Tobit; Judith; additional chapters to the book of Esther; The Wisdom of Solomon; The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus; Baruch; The Epistles of Jeremy; The Song of the Three Holy Children; The Prayer of Manasses; the books of I and II Maccabees and last, the additions to the book of Daniel which were The History of Susanna and The History of Bell and the Dragon.

Would any of the “K.J.V. only” debaters want to argue on behalf of the **Apocrypha** being included within the sacred text of the Word of God!? I would also like to hear why they might think the King James Version is the best English translation of this uninspired literature!

**Notes from the First 1611 Edition
of the Authorized Version Commonly called, The King James Version**

From "**THE TRANSLATORS TO THE READERS**"

Page 7, 2nd Par.

"... nay, we affirm and avow, that the very meanest [poorest] translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession...contains the Word of God, nay is the Word of God... No cause, therefore, why the word translated should be denied to be the word, or forbidden to be currant, notwithstanding that some imperfections and blemishes may be noted in the setting forth of it. For whatever was perfect under the sun, where Apostles or Apostle-like men, that is, men endued with an extraordinary measure of God's Spirit, and privileged with the privilege of infallibility, had not their hand?"

(The potency of the statement above is self-evident and needs no further comment.)

Page 8, 2nd Par.--Page 9, 1st Par.

"Yet before we end, we must answer a third cavil and objection of theirs against us, for altering and amending our translation so oft; wherein, truly, they deal hardly, and strangely with us. For to whomever was it imputed for a fault (by such as were wise), to go over that which he had done, and to amend it where he saw cause?... If we will be sons of the Truth, we must consider what it speaks, and trample upon our own credit, yes, and upon other men's too, if either be anyway an hindrance to it... But the difference that appears between our translations, and our often correcting them, is the thing that we are specifically charged with; let us see, therefore, whether they, themselves, be without fault this way, (if it be to be counted a fault, to correct) and whether they be fit men to throw stones at us:... so all the while that our adversaries do make so many and so various editions themselves, and do air so much about the worth and authority of them, they can, with no show of equity, challenge us for changing and correcting."

(Thus "changing and correcting" faults and errors in a translation, *even their own*, was viewed by the King James translators as a virtue not a vice.)

Page 9, 2nd Par.

"But it is high time to leave them, and to show in brief what we proposed to ourselves, and what course we held in this our perusal and survey of the Bible. Truly (good Christian reader), we

never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make a bad one a good one,... but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principle one, not justly to be excepted against; that has been our endeavor, that our mark."

(It is again clear from this statement that the translators never expected their revision to be considered faultless but rather a good improvement upon the older Translation.)

Page 9, 2nd Par.--Page 10, 1st Par.

"If you ask what they had before them, truly it was the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, the Greek text of the New... (also) consult(ed) (other) translators or commentators, Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian, Greek, or Latin... Spanish, French, Italian, or Dutch;... but having and using as great helps as were needful..."

(It is still helpful in careful areas of Bible study to use concordances to show the meaning of the original Greek or Hebrew words, and to even use other translations or commentators where such may be beneficial in determining the meaning of a certain passage.)

Page 10, 2nd Par.

"Some, peradventure, would have no variety of senses to be set in the margin, lest the authority of the Scriptures for the deciding of controversies, by that show of variety, should somewhat be shaken. But, we hold their judgment not to be so sound in this point... Now in such cases, does not a margin do well to admonish the reader to seek further, and not to conclude or dogmatize upon this or that peremptorily? ... Therefore, as Saint Augustine said, that variety of translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures: so diversity of signification and sense in the margin, where the text is not so clear, must needs do good, yes, is necessary, as we are persuaded."

(Again, it is clear from statements like this that the King James translators encouraged the use of other translations.)

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In studying the subject of the Divine inspiration and Divine preservation of the Word of God, especially from the perspective of what the Bible says about itself and exactly how it was used throughout its history, one will come to see its unique accuracy and yet its unusual elasticity. Our spiritual welfare is no more dependent upon the English King James Version of the Bible than was the welfare of the early Gentile churches dependent upon being able to read the original Hebrew manuscripts. As everyone should know, the existing translation of the Old Testament Scriptures that was read in the Gentile world was the Greek Septuagint. The Greek Septuagint was good in many places and horrible in others. This is no secret. All translators have spoken about it. In addition, almost all the quotations of the Hebrew Scriptures made by the writers of the Greek New Testament were taken from the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, the Septuagint. That is why there is sometimes a wide variance between the quotation and the actual statement in the Old Testament. In other words, God can and does preserve a truth in more than one form of words. It has been said, and is most certainly accurate, that John 3:16 can be stated in many different ways and all of them be

the truth. So it is with most all the Word of God. Even precise language can vary as long as the exact truth that the words convey remains the same. The very important doctrinal truths of the Bible are not dependent upon one single verse nor upon one form of words. The truths are normally interwoven throughout the pages of Scripture.

To illustrate this principle I will give you my experiences. When I am dealing with a member of the Watch Tower Society (so-called "Jehovah's Witnesses") I will use their own translation. There are several reasons for this and I will illustrate it by the use of the subject of the Deity of Christ which they reject. First, the truth of Christ's Deity permeates all the Scriptures and not just a few verses that they have tampered with and corrupted. In fact, and this may be hard for some of you to believe, the truth of Christ's Deity is stronger in certain verses of the Watchtower translation than it is in the King James Version—this is especially true in the Hebrew Scriptures or Old Testament. Secondly, when faced with the truth from their own translation which they highly respect, they cannot dodge the truth and are much more prone to accept it. This same principle is also true on the subject of the plan of salvation—their own translation is absolutely devastating to their doctrine. The gospel message is the same powerful dynamite of salvation in their Bible as it is in ours and I love to use it with them. In a similar manner, when I am dealing with a Roman Catholic person I try to always use their own translation of the Bible. Then they are not suspicious of your "Protestant" translation, which they are taught is dangerous. The Word of God from their own version has worked powerfully in the lives of many of them.

***"The Lord gave the Word:
great was the company of those that publish it"
Psalm 68:11 (KJV)***

*Notes On The “King James Only” Argument
About The Use Of “Easter” In Acts 12:4*

In his *The Answer Book*, author Samuel C. Gipp (I leave off his un-Biblical clerical title) endeavors to prove that the King James Version of the Bible is absolutely perfect and without error. In dealing with the obvious mistranslation in Acts 12:4 of the Greek word for Passover as “Easter,” Mr. Gipp makes the following argument in order to show that this is actually an accurate translation after all.

First, he admits that every time the Greek word *pascha* is used it is translated “Passover” except in this case of Acts 12:4. He also admits that the King James Translation is probably the only translation in existence today that does this. However, he then tries to prove that this actually vindicates the accuracy of the King James Bible over all others. The following is his reasoning.

1.) First, he indicates that in the Hebrew Scriptures the Passover is many times specifically said to be on the “evening of the 14th day” of the first month on the Jewish calendar. He then concludes, “No event following the 14th is ever referred to as the Passover.”

The Facts Are: Though it is true, that as originally given by Moses, the Passover was specifically said to take place on the evening concluding the 14th day of the first month. Yet it is totally false to conclude that this is the only way it is used. When the prophet Ezekiel, by divine inspiration, looked forward to the Messianic Kingdom and the New Temple on earth in that age, he clearly stated concerning the future observance of Passover—“In the first month, in the fourteenth day of the month, you shall observe the Passover, A FEAST OF SEVEN DAYS; unleavened bread shall be eaten” (Ezekiel 45:21). Thus in the later history of the nation of Israel, and specifically at the time of Christ, it was customary to speak of the whole Feast of seven days as “The Passover” (Luke 22:1). Mr. Gipp apparently forgot all about this.

2.) He then argues that “In the New Testament...the days of Unleavened Bread are NEVER referred to as the Passover.”

The Facts Are: As I have just mentioned, Luke 22:1 says, “Now the Feast of Unleavened Bread drew nigh, WHICH IS CALLED THE PASSOVER.” In addition, Luke is the human author of the book of Acts, and he uses the word “Passover” in chapter 12, in the same manner as he did in the Gospel. In Acts 12 it has reference to the whole Feast. These two facts Mr. Gipp totally ignores. Yet they totally destroy his whole argument.

3.) Then Mr. Gipp argues that “Herod was a pagan Roman who worshipped the ‘Queen of Heaven.’ He was not a Jew.” He reasons that Herod would use the designation of “Easter” (The Queen of Heaven) after which time he would have Peter killed. Since they were already in the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which Mr. Gipp thought was after the Passover, Herod would simply wait a little longer till after his pagan Easter to have Peter killed.

The Facts Are: First, though it is true that Herod was assigned his rule by the Romans, it is not true that he was a pagan Roman. He was not Roman at all, but an Idumean (Edomite) Jew. Most Bible Dictionaries will tell he was a Jew. Zondervan Bible Dictionary says, “Josephus (the contemporary

Jewish historian) looked upon Herod with admiration as the last great Jewish Monarch.” Herod was simply a vassal of Rome. Secondly, it was not Herod who used the designation “*pascha*,” that would be erroneously translated “Easter,” rather it was Luke the inspired writer of the book of Acts! Of course, neither Herod nor Luke would ever use the word “*pascha*” (Passover) to designate the pagan feast called “Easter.” It would have been considered the ultimate blasphemy to do so!

4.) Next, Mr. Gipp argues that “Peter was no longer considered a Jew. He had repudiated Judaism.” Therefore, “The Jews would have no reason to be upset by Herod’s actions.” (All of this is an example of the amazing type of argumentation the “King James Only” people will use to justify an unsupportable position.)

The Facts Are: There is not one iota of evidence that Peter was ever trying to repudiate his Jewishness or the Law of Moses. The Jewish believers continued to practice the Jewish religion right up through the close of the book of Acts. See Acts 21:20-25 as an example. The only change that came with the Jewish believers was that after Acts 10, and especially Acts 15, they were allowed to eat with their Gentile brethren. In the past this had been forbidden. It was not until the Book of Hebrews was written that the Jewish believer were told they were free from the Law system “Which was now ready to vanish away” (Heb. 8:13).

One can see from this type of argumentation that Mr. Gipp only sinks deeper into the quagmire of delusion every step he takes—all because he is carnally and divisively determined to prove a falsehood.

The Real Reason For “Easter” Being Used In The K.J.V.—

In the history of the making of the King James Bible we find the reason why most all the clerical words such as “bishop,” “church,” “ordain,” and “Easter” were used in that translation. It is explained clearest in the book *In The Beginning, The Story Of The King James Bible*, by Alister E. McGrath (Chapter Eight, 4th Paragraph and following). Here it is: Anglican Bishop Richard Bancroft was in charge of the translators. “Bancroft was determined to ensure that the translation process was judiciously guided, and limited the freedom of the translators. The translators were instructed to follow strict ‘rules of translation,’ drawn up by Bancroft and approved by (King) James, designed to minimize the risk of producing a Bible that might *give credibility to Puritanism...*” Rule number three, therefore stated: “The Old Ecclesiastical Words (were) to be kept, viz. the Word Church not to be translated Congregation, etc.” “Easter” was the ecclesiastical word that came to take the place of the word Passover in traditional Christendom and therefore, it was erroneously inserted into Acts 12:4 because this was after the early church had clearly been established and the Traditionalists wanted it there! So the King James Bible was tainted by “ecclesiastical language.” Thank God, an individual Bible student can overcome these errors by simply using his lexicon and/or carefully comparing Scripture with Scripture.

THE END