



**WHY
I CHOOSE
KJV**

**A Compact Guide to
the History and Origins
of Bible Translations**

By Chuck Smith

Why I Choose KJV

By Chuck Smith

Copyright © 2011

Published by The Word For Today

P.O. Box 8000, Costa Mesa, CA 92628

(800) 272-WORD (9673)

Web Site: www.twft.com

E-mail: info@twft.com

ISBN: 978-1-59751-101-8

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without the express written consent of The Word For Today Publishers.

Printed in the United States of America

The Foundation of the Word

Ever since the garden of Eden, Satan has been attacking the Word of God. Sometimes directly, sometimes very subtly.

In the garden of Eden it was a rather subtle attack. All Satan did was misquote God, leaving out a few words when he said to Eve, "Hath God said that you can eat of all the trees that are in the garden?" Yes, God said that, but the portion Satan left out changed the meaning entirely and really turned things around. God declared, "You may eat of all the trees of the garden *except* the tree that is in the midst of the garden, the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, and in the day that thou eateth thereof thou shalt surely die." Deleting just a word, verse, or a whole paragraph of Scripture can change the full truth of God's Word.

Satan has continued his assault on the Word of God to the present day. The Bible has been continually criticized in the name of scholarship as to what portions are really from the original text, what has been added to the original text, or what is perhaps deleted from the original text. Much doubt has been cast upon the King James Version of the Bible because of so-called older manuscripts that have been discovered, which claim that certain verses translated in the King James Version did not appear or had been deleted from these older manuscripts, namely the Sinaiticus.

Yet these same textual critics and scholars who tell us we can't accept the King James Version as truly divinely inspired of God are the same scholars who say we can't accept the entire Bible as being genuine, because the Old Testament is nothing more than a collection of stories taken from Hebrew mythology. In fact, these same critics doubt the Bible as being God's Word because they claim that the men who wrote it were influenced by their own understanding and limited knowledge of the sciences of their day, and were colored by their own personalities. These same scholars declare that Jesus was not born of a virgin because only two of the four gospels make mention of the virgin birth, and thus we don't need to accept that as true.

The fact that this scholarship, which has brazenly criticized many of the Scriptures in theological circles, is the same scholarship that has attacked the story of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the deity of Jesus Christ, and has even attacked the very existence of God.

Peter warns us in 2 Peter 2:1-3,

"But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who will privately bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned

words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now a long time lingers not, and their damnation slumbers not."

Peter points out that the damnable heresies would be by those who deny Jesus Christ. He continues in 2 Peter 3:15-16,

"...even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him has written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest [or twist], as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction."

Peter wrote this second epistle in AD 66, which means that they had already begun a collection of Paul's epistles to compile the books of the New Testament. So Peter refers to the fact that men were already beginning to twist the Scriptures even in his time. And such has been the case from that time until today.

Text Translations

There are two main schools of texts from the ancient manuscripts from which translations are made: the Textus Receptus, which means the Received or Accepted Text, and the Codex Sinaiticus. The Codex Sinaiticus was developed by two scholarly men, Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. However, their true spirituality and full Christian character and beliefs can certainly be challenged by many of the statements that they made.

In the nineteenth century, Westcott and Hort were on a committee chosen to produce an updated version of the King James Bible.

These two men highly influenced the rest of the committee to turn from using the Textus Receptus and to develop a new text using the Codex Sinaiticus (also known as the Codex Vaticanus), which was

originally translated from the Alexandrian manuscript back in the early church.

False Teachings in the Early Church

It is important to realize that in the early church there were false teachers. As Peter said, "even denying the Lord that bought them." Paul the apostle was constantly troubled by these false teachers who followed him around introducing weird, outlandish concepts about Jesus Christ to the new Christian fellowships he had established. Very early in the church, false teachers developed a heretical doctrine called Gnosticism, derived from the Greek word *ginosko*, which means "to know." These men who taught Gnosticism panned themselves off as having superior intelligence or greater knowledge, and spoke disparagingly of Paul and the disciples, because, after all, the disciples were for the most part simple fishermen.

These men mixed Greek philosophy and concepts with the revelation of God. Gnostics basically believed that all material was evil; therefore, God could not have created the material world. They thought that when God existed in the beginning, He sent out certain emanations, and from these emanations, other emanations or eons had developed.

From the eons there came more emanations, which then developed into new universes and new developments. And finally, after eons of eons, emanations evolved that were so far removed from God that they did not even know God. Thus, these emanations eventually created the physical, material universe. And because everything that is physical and material is evil, God could not have taken upon Himself a material form. So they concluded that Jesus Christ was not God in the flesh, for it would be impossible for God, who is totally pure, to become what is evil.

Gnosticism, Docetism and Arianism

One form of Gnosticism, known as Docetism, taught that Jesus

was actually a phantom. That He had the appearance of a man, but He wasn't really there. He was just an apparition and did not dwell in a body of flesh. They had interesting stories, such as when Jesus walked in the sand, He didn't leave any footprints.

This particular concept was already gaining momentum before the apostle John died. This is the reason John wrote in his first and second epistles that if any man declared that Jesus Christ did not come in the flesh, then that man is a deceiver and an antichrist (see 1 John 4:3, 2 John 1:7). John says, "That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life" (1 John 1:1)... "and the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father" (John 1:14). John had to emphasize the fact that Jesus did indeed have a body of flesh because the concept of Docetism was taking on many forms and ideas as a development of the Greek concepts of God mixed with Greek philosophy. This doctrine had a very influential impact on the early church and had gained many adherents because the Gnostics who propagated these concepts and ideas were brilliant men. And thus the early church had to deal with these early forms of false doctrine.

The Gnostics deliberately altered the Scriptures to meet their own views. In fact, about AD 156, one of the early church fathers, Irenaeus, said of the Gnostic, Marcion, "Wherefore also Marcion and his followers have betaken themselves to mutilating the Scriptures which they themselves have shortened." Irenaeus complained that these Gnostic teachers were actually cutting out Scripture passages, thereby mutilating the Scriptures.

In the early church, a Gnostic by the name of Arius taught a doctrine professing that God created Jesus for the special purpose of redemption, but that Jesus was not God. Arius denied the deity of Jesus Christ and claimed that Jesus really wasn't the Son of God, that He wasn't God manifested in the flesh. Arius, who was a brilliant man, began to gain many followers with this doctrine known as Arianism.

The Alexandrian Text

This system of Gnosticism and Arianism had its headquarters in the city of Alexandria, Egypt around AD 100. Now, about this time when John, the beloved disciple of Jesus, died, Justin Martyr was born. Justin Martyr became one of the early Gnostics. He had a disciple named Tatian who expanded his works and was a prolific writer in the Gnostic doctrine. Clement of Alexandria became a disciple of Tatian, who continued to further the doctrine. And one of Clement's pupils was none other than Origen. Interestingly enough, we read of Origen as being one of the early church fathers. But we rarely read of the fact that Origen was a Gnostic and that Gnosticism is constantly being promulgated in his teachings and writings. Another early church father, Eusebius, was greatly influenced by Origen, and together they doctored a copy of the Scriptures, which became known as the Codex Alexandrinus, or the Alexandrian manuscript, from which the Codex Sinaiticus is a copy.

During the reign of Constantine of the Roman Empire, Constantine wanted the Scriptures translated into the Latin language. At this time, the Textus Receptus was already translated into Latin; however, Constantine desired to counteract the Textus Receptus that had developed out of Antioch, because it had become a very powerful influence in the Roman world. Constantine was trying to marry the church and the state, adopting the pagan practices of the state into his religious beliefs. In order to achieve that, he hired the church to bring forth the Latin Vulgate, the Latin translation of the Scriptures from the Alexandrian manuscripts, which had been doctored for the mind of the philosopher in Greek philosophy and Gnosticism. And thus, you have a series of some of the oldest manuscripts, which are the Alexandrian, the Vaticanus, and the Sinaiticus manuscripts. But they all come from the Alexandrian school, which was heavily steeped in Gnosticism.

The Textus Receptus

The copies which came out of Antioch were known as the Textus

Receptus, or as the early church had said, the Accepted and Received Text—the text that was actually received in its entirety—not the mutilated, deleted text created by the Alexandrian philosophers. Paul the apostle considered his home church in Antioch, where he spent so much of his life ministering and teaching, so more copies of the Scriptures actually came from the church in Antioch than out of Alexandria.

The Textus Receptus was always accepted by the Greek, Eastern church. There were Latin translations that were called the Vulgate, which means the Approved Text. But after the church established by Constantine commissioned Jerome to translate a new Latin text using the Alexandrian Sinaiticus as his basis, then the church accepted his translation and called it the Latin Vulgate, or the Approved Text.

But high in the Alps in Northern Italy, true copies of the Scriptures from the Textus Receptus were faithfully preserved by a group of Christians known as the Waldenses. The true copies of the Textus Receptus also went into Scotland where they were kept faithfully and brought about a great revival. Unfortunately, St. Augustine damaged the church in England by forcing it to use the Codex Alexandrinus text rather than the Textus Receptus. However, though every endeavor was made to destroy it, God saw to it that the Textus Receptus was preserved.

Because the church had made a deliberate attempt to destroy all of the copies of the Textus Receptus, we don't have the ancient copies as old as the Codex Sinaiticus. The Church of Rome tried to wipe out the Textus Receptus in order that the altered text of the Latin Vulgate would be the only text approved by the church. In fact, Pope Gregory ordered a great library with some of the ancient Textus Receptus texts to be burned and these priceless manuscripts were destroyed. Yet God preserved it by giving birth to the Protestant Reformation. It was the Textus Receptus that inspired Martin Luther when he penned his German translation of the Bible. He relied solely upon the Textus Receptus, which is exactly as our King James Version Bible. Just as

Luther's translation, every verse is included in the King James—not one change was made. Satan was still attempting to alter the Word of God in order to hide the truth of God from men.

Copies of the Textus Receptus

The Textus Receptus originated from the church of Antioch, which was more or less started by Paul and pastored by Paul and Barnabas. ^{7 highlighters} In AD 165, the Syriac translation was generated from the Textus Receptus, and has become known as the Peshitta, which is exactly what the King James Version is today, as far as the Scriptures being accepted as legitimately belonging in the true original text. We still have the copies of the Peshitta, verifying that those Scriptures existed in the text earlier in history than the Codex Sinaiticus, which dates back to AD 420—255 years after this Syriac translation. Though scholars emphasize that the Codex Sinaiticus is the oldest text, and thus evidently the most accurate, that's not so. Conversely, the Textus Receptus is still accepted, and has been accepted from the beginning by the Eastern Greek church in the common Latin text. In fact, in 1516 when the great scholar Erasmus was moved to correct the Latin Vulgate, he published another translation using the Textus Receptus. This achievement was the first non-Latin Vulgate text of the Scripture to be translated in more than 1,000 years, and the first to come off a printing press.

^{6 highlighters} Today we have over 5,255 ancient manuscripts and eighty to ninety percent of them are in perfect agreement with the Textus Receptus. Only a few, which are traceable to Alexandria, come from the Codex Sinaiticus or Codex Vaticanus manuscripts.

What's the Difference?

You might ask, what difference does it make? If you have a Bible other than the King James Version, you might find it very interesting to see whether or not it has some of the deletions carried over from these other Alexandrian manuscripts, which is accepted as genuine. There are over 5,000 deletions, but for the sake of not boring you with

redundancy, let me just state a few.

Matthew 6:13 When Jesus gives us the Lord's Prayer, He declares, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." The Sinaiticus deletes the rest, "For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen." Because of its deletion in the Sinaiticus, scholars conclude it must have been added later. However, we find it existed in the Peshitta, the Syriac translation, which dates back to AD 165.

Matthew 18:11 "For the Son of Man has come to save that which is lost" is deleted. The mission of Jesus Christ is a pretty important Scripture to delete. No wonder those who didn't believe in the deity of Jesus or in His lordship would delete that Scripture from their text. Are you surprised to find it missing in some of your modern translations?

Matthew 23:14 "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation." These guys didn't want to be exposed so they deleted verse 14 entirely. They were saying these long prayers, yet devouring widows' houses. And that's still going on today.

Matthew 25:13 "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour..." The rest of the Scripture which states, "wherein the Son of Man is coming," is deleted in many of the texts. It's just a small deletion, but it's an important truth. They deleted the truth of the second coming of Jesus Christ!

Mark 1:1 "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God..." The words "Son of God" are deleted from the Alexandrian text. That's pretty important too, as we begin the gospel of Jesus Christ. But they deleted "the Son of God" because the truth was opposed to Gnosticism.

Mark 2:17 "When Jesus heard it, He said unto them, "They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." The words "to repentance" are deleted in these other translations—which means Jesus just came to call sinners, "Hi, all sinners!" This deletion of just two words can change the whole meaning of the text.

Mark 9:44 "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." This verse is deleted completely because they did not believe in eternal punishment.

Mark 11:26 "But if you do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses." This verse was deleted entirely.

Mark 16:9-20 All these verses are deleted. They end Mark's gospel with verse 8, "And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulcher; for they trembled and were amazed; neither said they anything to any man; for they were afraid." The Alexandrian text ends with Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome running off afraid. The whole appearance of Jesus after His resurrection is deleted, as well as Jesus' commission to go into all the world and preach the gospel, and His description of the signs that would follow.

Luke 2:33 "And Joseph and His mother marveled at those things which were spoken of Him." Instead of "Joseph and His mother marveled..." they translate it: "His father and His mother marveled..." implying that Joseph is Jesus' father, because they did not believe that Jesus was the Son of God.

Luke 4:4 "And Jesus answered him saying 'It is written that man shall not live by bread alone but by...God.'" They deleted the words "every word of." The entire verse should read, "And Jesus answered him saying 'It is written that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.'" They previously had cut out a lot of words that would condemn them, and so naturally they cut this one up too.

Luke 24:40 "And when He had thus spoken, He showed them His hands and His feet." They also deleted this verse completely.

John 3:15 "That whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." Their text reads, "That whosoever believeth in Him...may have eternal life." They omit "should not perish." They didn't believe in the punishment of the unrighteous dead.

Acts 2:30 "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." The words "according to the flesh, He would raise up Christ" are deleted—denying the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Romans 14:9 "For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that He might be Lord both of the dead and living." The words "and rose" are omitted, which makes a big difference. "For to this end Christ...died...and revived that He might be Lord of both the dead and the living." They kept the words "died and revived" but not "both died and rose." Leaving out the words "both" and "rose" denies the resurrection.

Ephesians 3:9 "And to make all [men] see what [is] the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." In this verse they deleted the words "by Jesus Christ" at the end of the verse. Again, just a small deletion but it's very important.

Ephesians 3:14 The Sinaiticus reads, "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father..." omitting the rest. The complete Scripture reads, "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

1 Peter 1:22 "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, [see that

ye] love one another with a pure heart fervently." Here they deleted the words "through the Spirit." It's just a small deletion, but if you leave it out you're in trouble. If you don't have the help of the Spirit in the purifying of your souls and the obeying of truth, you'll never make it. They delete the very source of power by which you can obey the truth.

1 Peter 4:1 "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise..." In this verse, they deleted the words "for us." They want you to believe that Jesus didn't suffer for you—He just suffered. Therefore, atonement is denied as well as the fact that He suffered "for us" in the flesh.

Revelation 11:17 "Saying, 'We give Thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because Thou hast taken to Thee Thy great power, and hast reigned.'" The words "and art to come" are deleted. Again, the coming again of the Lord is denied.

As I pointed out earlier, they didn't always delete whole sentences or whole Scriptures—sometimes it was just a word here or there. But as you look more closely, they are important words that teach the basic doctrines in the majority of the Scriptures. These Scriptures are just a sample of some of the 5,000 deletions, but they can change the whole gospel of Jesus Christ.

Philosophies of Men

How is it then that so many Bible scholars today accept the Westcott and Hort text? In the liberal theological circles, the arguments for Westcott and Hort have been swallowed hook, line, and sinker. If I were to make a new translation of the Bible, it would be my desire, because of my pride, to have these intellectual Bible scholars hail my translation as being one of the most accurate and correct according to the Greek and Hebrew. And since I wanted my work to be acclaimed scholarly, I would have to go to the Westcott and Hort text because I would want to be known as an intelligent person.

It would be the same if you were getting your doctorate in biology. If you wanted to be accepted in the field of biology, you'd have to ascribe to all of the stupidity of evolution, because it's the accepted theory in the schools of biology today. If you challenged the theory of evolution in a biology department, you would be looked upon as an idiot. But if you really tried to prove the evolutionary theories wrong, it would indeed become an extremely difficult task, if not impossible. So you don't bother trying, just so you can appear intellectual.

This same concept has pervaded the church and the Christian system so that we allow the translations from these men who are so-called intellectuals. Paul said, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the basic principles of the world, and not according to Christ" (Colossians 2:8). Beware of the vain philosophies of men. Paul could see that the Grecian philosophy was having an effect on the early church. He saw men pride themselves on their intellect as they discussed vain philosophies and speculations of philosophy. Paul warned against this because it was perverting the truth.

False Teaching Today

The church is still doing this today. It's called modernism. There are men who say that you cannot accept all Scripture as being divinely inspired—some verses are inspired and some of them are not. Unfortunately, modernists can't agree upon which Scriptures are which. Thus, this creates great confusion how to know what is and what isn't inspired.

If I should say to you, "Now folks, you can't really accept all of the Bible, because some of these Scriptures have been added by writers throughout the years, and not all of the Scriptures are really inspired of God. So let's go through the Bible and I'll tell you which Scriptures to mark as unbelievable because they aren't really inspired"—then the Word of God is no longer the authority because it's been challenged and questioned. What does that make me besides a fool? It makes me a self-proclaimed authority. I don't want to be in that position to tell you

what to believe and what not to believe.

I can tell you this: You can believe the King James Version in its entirety and you will never go wrong. The Word of God is our final authority for all of our faith and practice.

It's a sad and tragic thing to realize the Scriptures were guarded so preciously, costing the lives of thousands upon thousands to give us the Bible in its purest form. But rather than holding fast to the Word and thanking God for it, we've gone along with so-called intellectuals who tell us, "Oh, that wasn't in the original text," or "That wasn't in the Sinaiticus" as though they had the original correct text.

I don't believe this theory that is propounded that the original text was shortened and that copyists added their own little ideas. It's wrong. Rather, I believe the original text was longer and those in Alexandria took it upon themselves to shorten the text, deleting key words and altering the Scriptures to fit their doctrinal concepts of Gnosticism and Arianism.

And rather than additions made to the original text, I believe there were deletions to the original text. I believe I can prove this conviction as we consider Westcott and Hort's argument that the oldest text has to be the most correct text.

The Most Accurate Text

Westcott and Hort believed the Codex Sinaiticus was the oldest and most correct text because it dates back to AD 400. It's the oldest *whole* text, but we have many fragments of text that date back to the first and second centuries. To authenticate that there are earlier texts, one of the early church fathers, Irenaeus, quoted the final portion of Mark 16:9-20 in his commentary, which the Sinaiticus deleted. Irenaeus wrote this in AD 150–250 years before the Codex Sinaiticus was ever written! Now isn't it funny how he was able to quote from some guy that was going to add to the text some 100 years after the

Codex Sinaiticus? What clairvoyance! Another theologian, Hippolytus, had the same kind of clairvoyance. In the second century he also quoted from that latter portion of chapter 9 from Mark's gospel.

Unfortunately, men have been able to influence committees and impress the intelligentsia of the Christian faith that most translations have come from Westcott and Hort since the King James. And thus you'll find about 5,000 Scriptures in these translations deleted or you'll see an asterisk and a footnote that reveals they're not in the ancient manuscripts. I encourage you to disregard those footnotes when they refer to the ancient manuscripts, because they are referring *only* to the Codex Sinaiticus and Vaticanus from which Westcott and Hort took 99% of their text. I feel these are altered, doctored manuscripts out of Alexandria where the center of Gnosticism and the heresies of Arius found their roots and their promulgation.

Men of intelligence have bludgeoned more ignorant folk into a submission to their great intellects by saying, "Anyone with the least amount of common sense can see." So-called scholars all bow down to this sacred cow developed by Westcott and Hort and have a tendency to put down the scholarship of the King James. And if you really want to be noted as a biblical scholar, then you must go along with Westcott and Hort. Thus, practically everyone with a PhD will say, "What does that preacher know about it? Does he have a PhD?"

I may be classified as a poor fool, but at the cost of being considered a non-intellectual, I'm going to declare to you that I believe the Textus Receptus is more accurate to the true Scriptures that were penned by the apostles than the Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Alexandrian, or Westcott and Hort. And though it is intellectual suicide to challenge these fellows, I'm going to do it.

The King James Translators

The King James translators weren't a bunch of preachers who were pulled off the street from the various pulpits in England. They were forty-seven men who had knowledge of the original languages.

They worked in committees of six and each assigned a certain portion of Scripture, which they would translate and then trade their translations with one another for comparison and for comment. Finally, the translated Scriptures were considered one last time and then turned over to John Bois who did the final editing. He also continued to make corrections with the advice and counsel of those original forty-seven men. Thus the King James translation was created.

John Bois, the man who produced the final editorial, was born in 1560 and began to read Hebrew at the age of five years old. He was admitted to St. John's College, Cambridge, at the age of fourteen. He often studied Greek from four o'clock in the morning to eight o'clock at night. In fact, he had a class for students who wanted to study Greek every morning at four o'clock.

Another translator, Lancelot Andrewes, was a man of deep spirituality. He was knowledgeable in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic, in addition to fifteen modern languages. He is ranked as one of the rarest linguists in Christendom, and is also known for his diligent prayer life, sometimes spending five hours a day in prayer. Toward the end of his life, he gave himself continually to prayer without ceasing. When he was aged and dying, those who visited his room always found him praying. He was a deeply spiritual and godly man.

Those on the King James translating committee believed that the Bible was the inspired Word of God. They were all believers that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that salvation is given to us by believing in Him. They were all sound in their fundamental doctrinal beliefs.

Studying the Scriptures

Robert Dick Wilson was known to be one of the greatest scholars and linguists who had ever lived until his death in 1930. During his lifetime he mastered forty-five languages for the sole purpose of studying the Bible in practically every language written in his day. He

actually made a practice of reading the New Testament in nine different languages. He could recite the entire New Testament in Hebrew by memory without missing a syllable. He was also a professor at Princeton College until it became liberal at which time he, along with others, left and started the Westminster School.

One day after a heavy lecture in class, one of his students asked Dr. Wilson, "What do you think is the most profound thing you ever learned?" He took off his glasses and with a tear streaming down his cheek he said, "With all of my studies of the languages and with all of the learning I've attained as I gave my life to be a scholar, the most profound thing I've ever learned is that Jesus loves me this I know, for the Bible tells me so." Beautiful, spiritual, godly man.

When Robert Wilson was twenty-five years old, some of the modernists were challenging the Scriptures citing from Westcott and others. As he listened, Wilson decided to study the ancient languages for himself, rather than taking another man's word for it. As a result, he gave himself to studying all of the ancient languages. So when a challenge of the Scriptures was made—stating that the Syriac translated it a certain way—Wilson studied the Syriac so he could read it for himself. During his study, he made an interesting discovery. Oftentimes a scholar would declare a statement and then that scholar's statement would be accepted as a fact, as others would quote from them.

One scholar by the name of Burkhardt declared that the word *baca* should be translated as "mulberry tree" from Psalm 84:6, "As they pass through the Valley of Baca, they make it a spring; the rain also covers it with pools." Burkhardt had claimed he looked through all of the writings from the Hebrew scholars stating that *baca* really meant "mulberry tree." Soon others started quoting Burkhardt. Wilson thought, *What does passing through a valley of mulberry trees have to do with making it a well of water?* As Wilson researched this more, he found that there was a fountain from a spring up in the hills, and the people had made an underground aqueduct, covering it over so the

water would stay pure. *Baca* is the word for aqueduct. And thus it made sense, and all of the scholars who had been quoting Burkhardt were wrong. I'm reminded of what Jesus said in Luke 6:39, "Can the blind lead the blind? Shall they not both fall into the ditch?"

After forty-five years of research and study of the ancient languages, Dr. Wilson declared he was absolutely convinced that the Old Testament, as we have it in the King James, was written exactly as it was in the days of Jesus and exactly as it was written by the men who were inspired of God. Wilson was a man who was able to challenge the intellectuals because he had the credentials. No one would dare call him a fool. So this business of scholars saying, "Oh well, you know, that isn't intellectually sound" is not true. Men of tremendous intellect have dared to challenge the decisions that were made by Westcott and Hort concerning the text. And their decisions have not gone unchallenged by the intellectual community. However, the majority of the intellectual community has gone along with the writings of Westcott and Hort—without challenging it.

Authenticity of the Bible

In 1881 it was decided that the King James Bible should be revised so that the English could be updated, but with making as few changes as possible. That was the order given to the revision committee. However, they didn't quite follow the order because about 34,000 changes were made in the Revised Standard Bible, of which one notable scholar said, "One out of fifty may be necessary or good—the rest are worthless."

There were two men who had a tremendous influence upon the revision committee, forcing their opinions and dominating it, until their text—in which they had already created beforehand—became more or less the standard for the revision committee. They even passed out their text to the men beforehand on the sly saying, "Don't tell anybody that you have this." This text was known as the Westcott and Hort.

Westcott and Hort were able to inculcate the men on the revision committee and influence them with their own text, which they had already translated. Today, these two men have become the accepted intellectuals and their text has become the accepted text, which intellectuals say is without a doubt the most accurate text that we have. These two men are the ones who have told you which parts of the Bible are inspired and which are not inspired.

Here are some quotations of Westcott and Hort from their own writings.

Dr. Hort writes to Rev. Rowland Williams on October 21, 1858, "Further I agree with them (the authors of 'Essays and Reviews') in condemning many leading specific doctrines of the popular theology. Evangelicals seem to me perverted rather than untrue. There are, I fear, many more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, and especially the authority of the Bible."

Why? Because evangelicals believe the Bible was the authoritative Word of God. Hort did not.

Hort wrote to Rev. John Ellerton on April the 3, 1860, "But the book that has most engaged me is Darwin's *Origin of the Species*. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be a contemporary with. My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable. If so, it opens up a new period."

This is the same Dr. Hort who tells you which Scriptures are truly inspired and which are not according to his Westcott and Hort text which is accepted by our intellectual community today.

Westcott was writing to his fiancé in 1847 and declared, "After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a neighboring hill. Fortunately we found the door open, and it was very small with one kneeling place, and behind the screen was a life-sized Pietà. (This is a picture or

sculpture of the Virgin Mary holding the dead body of Jesus Christ.) Had I been alone, I could have knelt there for hours."

He writes again to Archbishop Benson on November 17, 1865, "I wish that I could see to what forgotten truth Mariology (the worship of Mary) bears witness."

Hort wrote to Westcott, "I am very far from pretending to understand completely the oft renewed vitality of Mariology."

Hort wrote to Westcott in 1865, "I have been persuaded for many years that Mary worship and Jesus worship have very much in common in their causes and results."

I stated earlier that the Roman Catholic Church has followed the Codex Vaticanus because Jerome was asked to translate from the Alexandrian manuscripts, which has become the standard texts for the Roman Catholic Church, while the Protestant Church and the Eastern Greek Church have always followed the Textus Receptus. Westcott and Hort both expressed a very strong position for Mary worship. And both men spoke of their belief in the priesthood. Their positions about their beliefs were forced into the Protestant circles and forced upon the King James revision committee of 1881.

Further Hort writes to Westcott, "But this last error can hardly be expelled till Protestants unlearn the crazy horror of the idea of priesthood."

Hort wrote to Dr. Lightfoot in 1867, "But you know I am a staunch sacerdotalist."

Hort wrote to Westcott on September 23, 1864, "I believe Coleridge (Samuel Taylor Coleridge) was quite right in saying that Christianity without a substantial church is vanity and disillusion. And I remember shocking you and Lightfoot not so long ago by expressing a belief that Protestantism is only parenthetical and temporary."

Westcott wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury on March 4, 1890, "No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give us a true literal history. I could never understand how anyone reading them with open eyes could think that they did."

Hort wrote to John Ellerton, "I am inclined to think that no such state as Eden ever existed and that Adam's fall in no degree differed from the fall of each of his descendants as Coleridge justly argues."

Neither of these men believed in the atoning work of Jesus Christ for our sins—which of course marks a person as being truly born again.

Prior to the revision committee, Westcott and Hort were meeting together to actually form the method in which they could force their ideas and opinions upon the King James revision committee. There was conspiracy and collusion by Westcott and Hort before the revision committee ever met.

As proof, Westcott wrote to Hort May 28, 1870, "The note came with the one from Ellicott this morning, though I think that convocation is not competent to initiate such a measure, yet I feel that as we three are together it would be wrong not to make the best of it, as Lightfoot says...There is some hope that alternative readings might find a place in the margin."

Well, they were much more successful than they had hoped to be. They got the alternative reading right in the text and they got the true readings in the margins—if there at all.

Westcott later wrote to Lightfoot on June 4, 1870, "Ought we not have a conference before the first meeting for the revision? There are many points in which it is important that we need to be agreed."

Westcott wrote to Hort, July 1, 1870, "The revision on the whole surprised me by the prospects of hope. I have suggested to Ellicott a plan of tabulating and circulating the emendations before our meeting, which may in the end prove valuable."

In other words he was writing, "Let's get some of these notes out to these other fellows before we ever meet."

And Hort wrote to Lightfoot, "It is, I think, difficult to measure the weight of acceptance won beforehand for the revision by the single fact of our welcoming a Unitarian (to the revision committee)."

Spiritually Discerned

Now these are the men of intelligence who have introduced to us the Westcott and Hort in which the revision, the Revised Standard, was taken, and from which every other translation since has emerged. Every modern English translation has come from the Westcott and Hort text. This is that text that had borrowed 95% from the Vaticanus, the Alexandrian, and the Sinaiticus Text—which came from Alexandria and the work of the Gnostics.

Men such as Martin Luther, Erasmus and others who translated the King James following the Textus Receptus were genuinely born-again, Spirit-directed men guided by the Holy Spirit. And I would have far greater confidence in following these men than I would men who are perhaps of superior intellect, who do not believe in the literal Word of God and the atoning work of Jesus Christ, but believe that the evolutionary theory was one of the greatest things to have come along. How can these men of natural minds be true guides to spiritual truths, when spiritual truth is spiritually discerned? I would much more quickly believe a Spirit-filled teacher with a sixth-grade education who doesn't know Greek from hen tracks than believe one of these supposedly scholarly doctors with ancient language degrees, who is not born-again and knows nothing of the Spirit. I believe the sixth-grade educated man would be a truer guide to spiritual truth because the

Spirit of God is in him. Jesus promised the Spirit, who will lead us into all truth, teaching us all things (John 14:26). But if someone doesn't believe or have the Spirit, how can they lead me into the truth of God?

1 Corinthians 2:14 says, "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know [them], because they are spiritually discerned."

CODEX VATICANUS (B) has been in the Vatican Library in Rome since 1481. It dates to approximately AD 340. The complete codex contains 759 leaves; 142 belonging to the New Testament.

CODEX SINAITICUS (ALEPH) was discovered on St. Catherine's Monastery by Constantin Tischendorf in 1844 and 1859 and apparently dates approximately AD 350. It contains the entire New Testament and a large portion of the Old Testament.

CODEX ALEXANDRINUS (A) is in the National Library of the British Museum. It is called Alexandrinus because it is believed to have come from Alexandria, Egypt, and "A" because it was the first important uncial to be used by textual biblical critics. It contains 733 leaves of the original 822, and dates back to AD 400 or a little later.

(Source: *The New Unger's Bible Dictionary*, Merrill F. Unger, 1988, Moody Press, p. 1145).

Recommendations for Further Study

I hope I have stirred your mind and challenged you to look further into the history and origins of biblical translations. And if you so desire, I would like to recommend a few books that may enlighten you.

- *WHICH BIBLE?* by DAVID OTIS FULLER
- *KING JAMES VERSION DEFENDED* by EDWARD F. HILLS

- *TRUE OR FALSE?* by DAVID OTIS FULLER
- *COUNTERFEIT OR GENUINE?* by DAVID OTIS FULLER
- *GOD WROTE ONLY ONE BIBLE* by JASPER JAMES RAY
- *THE REVISION REVISED* by DEAN JOHN WILLIAM BURGON

Taken from The Wisdom of the Ages Conference and The Foundation of the Word by Chuck Smith. [Click here for further information.](#)

Other ebooks by Chuck And Kay Smith:

[The Rapture Pamphlet](#)

[Chuck Smith Autobiography: A Memoir of Grace](#)

[Love: The More Excellent Way](#)

[Prayer: Our Glorious Privilege](#)

[Wisdom For Today](#)

[The Final Act](#)

[Revelation Commentary: What the World Is Coming To](#)

[Faith](#)

[Living Water](#)

[Calvary Chapel Distinctives](#)

[Why Grace Changes Everything](#)

[How Can A Man Be Born Again?](#)

[Pleasing God](#)

[Reflecting God](#)

[The Privilege](#)

