

# The KJV Version Bible - Part 2

by Chuck Smith

---

*The King James Version is a reliable and accurate translation of the Bible that has been widely accepted for centuries.*

**Duration:** 1:01:11

**Topics:** "KJV Version"

---

## Description

In this sermon, the speaker discusses the importance of recognizing the true word of God. He mentions examples of changes and deletions that have been made in various Bible translations, emphasizing the need to be cautious and discerning. The speaker references specific verses, such as 1 Timothy 3:16 and Zachariah 13:6, to highlight the significance of these alterations. He also recommends books by Dr. David Otis Fuller and Jasper Ray that provide evidence and insights from a different perspective. Overall, the sermon emphasizes the importance of staying true to the original and unaltered word of God.

---

## Transcript

In 2nd Corinthians, the 2nd chapter in the 17th verse, Paul said, For we are not as many which corrupt the word of God, but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ. So, Paul was talking about the fact that at his time, there were many at that time who were guilty of corrupting the word of God. Therefore, there began a corruption of the manuscripts very early in church history.

And inasmuch as there was a corrupting of the manuscripts very early in history, there is no reason to believe that the oldest manuscripts we have are the most accurate manuscripts. For the oldest manuscript we have is actually the Codex Sinaiticus, which is really on the surface an extremely poor manuscript. It's missing whole books out of the Bible.

It's missing whole chapters, many of the Psalms. Why is it that this one manuscript was so well preserved? Probably because it was so rotten that nobody wanted to read it. For those that were good were all worn out because they were read to death.

But this one was no doubt cast aside because it wasn't a good manuscript, and thus it was preserved. Others were all worn out because of youths. Men were guilty of corrupting the word of God, altering the scriptures, especially the Gnostics and the Docetists, who were an offshoot of Gnosticism.

And some of the early church fathers complain of their dealing with the scriptures by taking away the verses and butchering the text. Greek philosophy and Gnosticism were tremendous influences upon the early church and some of the early so-called church fathers were both affected by Gnosticism and by Greek philosophy. They headquartered in Alexandria, Egypt, and from Alexandria they made copies of the scriptures which they had altered to fit their own Gnostic beliefs.

It is from these copies of scriptures that the most ancient manuscripts have come, the Alexandrias, the Vaticanus, and the Sinaiticus. At the time of the King James translation, all of these manuscripts were found with the exception of the Sinaiticus. So the King James translators had all of the supposed errors or truths that were supposedly in the Vaticanus and Alexandrian manuscripts, they had them at their disposal.

Everything that was in the Sinaiticus, they already had at their disposal. So this idea of since the translation of King James, older manuscripts have been discovered, more accurate manuscripts, is false. Everything that was in Sinaiticus, they already had in other manuscripts.

But be it known that of the 5,556 manuscripts, between 80 and 90 percent, perhaps as much as 95 percent of them are in full agreement with the King James. It is only a small minority of manuscripts that are not in harmony with King James. These are those manuscripts that can all be traced back to Alexandria.

And thus, in as much as they are the oldest manuscripts, it does not necessarily make them the most accurate, but could indeed be the manuscripts that were butchered by the Gnostics. Now the general consensus is that during the period of time, writers added to the scriptures. That the original manuscripts were shorter, and that the copyists put in their own ideas as they went along, and thus the scriptures were added to.

But that same argument could be reversed, and you could say, with just equal accuracy, that the older manuscripts were actually longer, and that the manuscripts were then deleted from, rather than added to. Important scriptures, and it is amazing that most of the scriptures that are deleted are those that have to do with the deity of Jesus Christ, something that the Gnostics weren't ready to recognize. Or they had to do with philosophical issues.

For instance, in Matthew's Gospel, where the rich young ruler comes to Jesus and says to him, good master, what must I do to inherit eternal life? The Alexandrian-based manuscripts have Jesus answering them in Matthew's Gospel, why askest thou me concerning good? Rather than, why callest thou me good? In other words, they have Jesus introducing the man to a philosophical speculation. It's something that you would expect a Greek philosopher to say. Why do you ask me concerning good? Because they were looking for the summum bonum, the ultimate good.

But why would Matthew's Gospel have Jesus saying, why ask me concerning good? And yet, Mark's and Luke's Gospel would have him saying, why callest thou me good? Incidentally, there's only about 10 manuscripts that have it the other way. Why ask me concerning the good? And yet, the scholarly Westcott and Hort determined that 5,545 manuscripts were wrong and these 10 were right. And thus, they have written in their text, why askest me concerning good? Men of intelligence have long bamboozled we more ignorant folk with this whole intellectual kind of an aura and have actually bludgeoned us into a sort of submission to their great intellects by saying anyone with the least amount of common sense can see.

Well, I want to think that I've got the least amount of common sense, so I see it their way. It's true in evolution. You don't want to be considered a nincompoop when you go to college.

And so, people are going along with the evolutionary theory though it is lacking in real evidence and support. But it's the sacred cow to which the intellectuals bow and worship. And you dare not touch their sacred cow or you'll be considered stupid, non-intellectual.

Our pride doesn't want that. Now, within the scriptural realms, the intellectuals have formed a sacred cow. The text that was developed by Westcott and Hort and in the intellectual circles of our seminaries, they are all bowing to the Westcott and Hort sacred cow, their interpretation of which scriptures were genuine and original and which ones were added to and which verses were added, etc.

And they're all bowing to this sacred cow developed by Westcott and Hort. And they have a tendency of putting down the scholarship of King James. As though the King James scholars weren't really so scholarly.

And if you really want to be noted as a biblical scholar, then you go along with Westcott and Hort. Thus, practically everyone with his PhD will say, well, what does that preacher know about it? Does he have a PhD? And they hold up this whole intellectual gobbledygook junk to try to make people bow to their superior intellects. I'm always reminded of the king who decided to have a new suit.

And these tailors came in and fitted him for his new suit. And they raved concerning the new material and threads they were going to use. For they would be invisible to anyone but the intellectuals.

Only the wise people could see these materials. And so they went through their whole routine of sewing the coat and trying the coat on the king. And all of the king's men were just raving and oohing and awing, saying, my, it's beautiful.

Oh, what an excellent fit. And just, you know, going over the whole thing because they didn't want people to think they were dumb. They wanted people to think that they were intellectual.

And so finally they outfitted the king with his whole new suit. And all of the men around him were raving over the beauty of the suit and all, and just talking about how marvelous the suit was. And so the king decided to take a walk in his new suit.

And ere he got very far, some poor fool standing on the street cried out, the king is naked. Well, I might be classified as a poor fool, but I want to tell you something. There is much to be desired in the Westcott and Hork text, which is found in the King James.

The Textus Receptus from which King James came. And at the cost of being considered a non-intellectual, I am going to declare to you that I feel that the Textus Receptus is much closer to the truth and the true scriptures that were penned by the Apostles than Sinaiticus, Alexandrus, Vaticanus, or Westcott and Hork. Now, there are many manuscripts with which those who translated the Bible had at their disposal to work with, as I say, some 5,556 manuscripts that they compared.

And the vast majority were in agreement and were called the Received Text or the Textus Receptus. And though it is intellectual suicide to challenge these fellows, I'm going to do it tonight. First of all, I'd like to give you the credentials of some of the King James translators.

They weren't just a bunch of preachers they pulled together from the various pulpits in England or a bunch of guys they got off the street. Actually, there were 47 men, all of them with knowledge of the original languages that were gathered together for the translation. They worked in committees of six and they would be assigned a certain portion of scripture which they would translate and then they would trade their translations with each other for comparison and for comment.

And then finally brought back and considered again and then turned over to John Boyes who did the final editing, correcting with the advice and counsel of those men and thus the King James translation was created. But John Boyes, the man who made the final editorial, was born in 1560 and he began to read Hebrew when he was just five years old. He was admitted to St. John's College, Cambridge when he was 14 and he often studied Greek from four o'clock in the morning to eight o'clock at night.

In fact, he had a class for Greek for those students that would want to come in and just learn every morning at four o'clock and he spent his days in the study of the language. Lancelot Andres was a man of deep spirituality, another translator. He was knowledgeable in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldean, the Arabic plus 15 modern languages and he is ranked as one of the rarest linguists in Christendom.

But this man spent five hours a day in prayer and towards the end of his life gave himself continually to prayer without ceasing. As he was getting aged and dying, actually whenever they would go into the room, he was found in prayer. He was a man given to prayer five hours a day, a deeply spiritual man.

So much so that King James was never frivolous in front of him, though he was a frivolous man. He ordered no levity when Reverend Andres was there. Deep, spiritual, godly man.

And all of those on the King James Translating Committee believed that the Bible was the inspired Word of God. They were all of them believers that Jesus Christ was the Son of God and that salvation was given to us by believing in him. They were all sound in their fundamental doctrinal beliefs.

There is a man, more recently, Robert Dick Wilson, who died in 1930, who was one of the greatest scholars and linguists who has ever lived. During his lifetime, he mastered 45 languages for the sole purpose of studying the Bible in just about every language in which it was written in his day. He actually made a practice of reading the Greek New Testament in nine different languages, and he could recite the entire New Testament in Hebrew by memory without missing a syllable.

He wasn't any dummy. He was a professor at Princeton College until it went liberal. And then with Dr. Moffat and others, he pulled out to start the Westminster School.

Dr. Wilson, one day in class after a heavy lecture, one of the students said, what do you think is the most profound thing you've ever learned? And he took off his glasses and with a tear coming down his cheek, he said, in all of my studies of all of the languages and all of the learning as I've given 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 he was 25 years old, because of the challenge of the scriptures by some of the modernists, including Wes Cottenhort, Ellicott, Lightfoot, and these others, he decided that he wasn't going to take any man's word for it.

He was going to study it for himself, and thus he gave himself to the study of all of the ancient languages so that he wouldn't have to take anybody's word for someone saying, well, in the Syriac, it's this way. He studied Syriac so he could read it for himself. He wasn't going to take anybody's word for it.

And he said he made an interesting discovery that so often some scholar would make a statement and then the statement would be accepted for fact, because everyone would quote the one scholar. And in that scripture, the word Baca in Psalms and passing through the valley of Baca, there was a certain man who said Baca means mulberry trees, followed by the name of Burkhardt. And this he found in the Hebrew dictionary.

So he started looking through all of the writings and he found all of these Hebrew scholars saying, well, Baca really means mulberry trees. And they were all quoting Burkhardt. And he thought, what does passing through a valley of mulberry trees have to do with making it a well of water? So he said while he was traveling in the holy land, as he was passing through this valley, there was a fountain that was there.

And he said to the fellow, where did this fountain come from? He said, well, it's from a spring up in the hill. And he said they have made an aqueduct, but covered it over so that the water would stay pure. He said, it comes down through the Baca and Baca is the word for aqueduct.

And thus it made sense. And all of the scholars that had been quoting Burkhardt were wrong with all of their intelligence because he had made a guess which was totally wrong. But I am reminded of what Jesus said, if the blind lead the blind, they will both fall in the ditch.

Now, Dr. Wilson declared that after 45 years of research and study in all of the ancient languages, he was absolutely convinced that the Old Testament as we have it in the King James, the Meseratic text, was exactly as it was in the days of Jesus and exactly as it was written by the men who were inspired of God. Now, here was a man who was able to challenge the intellectuals because he had all of the credentials that he would need and no one dared call him a fool. So, this business of them saying, 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 them and they all say the suit looks beautiful. Now, in 1881, it was decided that the Bible should be revised.

The King James Version should be revised. Now, in the first decision, it was just that the English should be updated and make as few changes as possible. And that was the order given to the revision committee.

Just to sort of update the English language in it, keeping the changes just as few as possible, they didn't quite follow the order because they made about 34,000 changes in the revised Standard Bible, of which one notable scholar said one out of 50 is maybe necessary or good. The rest of them are worthless. From the beginning, two men had a tremendous influence upon the revision committee.

In fact, these two men forced their opinions upon the revision committee and finally dominated it until their text, the Westcott and Hort, which they had already created, became more or less the standard for the revision committee because they even passed it out to the men beforehand on the sly saying, don't tell anybody that you have this. And they were able to inculcate these men and influence them with their own text that they had already done. And these two men have become the accepted intellectuals and their text has become the accepted text, which the intellectuals say is no doubt the most accurate text that we have.

These two men are the ones who have told you which part of the Bible is inspired and which is not inspired. These are the men that the majority of the scholarship of today are following. You know, those theologians that told us God is dead and all, of course, you can get that out of Westcott and Hort.

You never get it out of King James. Let me tell you a little bit about Westcott and Hort. No, let them tell you a little bit about themselves.

Let me read some quotations that these men, from these men, from their own writings. Dr. Hort writes to Reverend Rowland Williams in October 21st, 1858. He said, 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, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority and especially the authority of the Bible. Why? Because the evangelicals believe that the Bible was the authoritative word of God.

Hort did not. Hort wrote to Reverend John Ellington in April 3rd, 1860. But the book which 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 Dr. Hort, who tells you which scriptures are really inspired of God and which are not in his Westcott and Hort text, which is accepted by our intellectual community. Westcott, the other side of the coin, was writing to his fiancée 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-size Pieta, that is, the Virgin and the dead Christ.

Had I been alone, I could have knelt there for hours. For he writes again to Archbishop Benson, in November 17, 1865, I wish I could see to what forgotten truth meriolatry bears witness. Hort wrote to Westcott, I am very far from pretending to understand completely the oft-renewed vitality of meriolatry or the worship of Mary.

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. Now, as I told you, the Roman Catholic Church, through the years, has followed the Vaticanus, because Jerome was asked to translate from the Alexandrian manuscripts, and it became the standard text for the Roman Catholic Church, whereas the Protestant Church and the Eastern Greek Church has always followed Textus Receptus, up until these two men, who both of them express a very strong meri worship, and both of them speak of their belief in the priesthood, came into the Protestant circles and forced their position upon the 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 in 1864, September 23rd, I believe Cooleridge was quite right in saying that Christianity without a substantial church is vanity and disillusion. And I remember shocking you and Lightfoot not long ago by expressing a belief that Protestantism is only parenthetical and temporary.

Westcott wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury on March 4th, 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. This is the man who tells you which scriptures really were inspired of God and which ones belong to the true text.

Hort wrote to John Ellerton, I am inclined to think that no such state as Eden, that is the popular notion of the Garden of Eden, ever existed and that Adam's fall in no degree differed from the fall of each of his descendants, as Coolidge justly argues. Neither of these men believed in the atoning work of Jesus Christ for our sins, which of course to us is what marks a person who is truly born again. Now, prior to the revision committees, these men started meeting together in committees to actually form the method by which they could force their ideas and opinions upon the committee.

So there was conspiracy and collusion by these men before the committee ever met. For proof, Westcott wrote to Hort, May 28th, 1870, your note came with one from Ellicott this morning. Though I think that convocation is not competent to initiate such a measure, yet I feel that we three are together and 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 hoped to be. They got the alternative readings right in the text and they got the true readings in the margin or if they are there at all.

Westcott later wrote to Lightfoot on June 4th, 1870, ought we not to have a conference before the first meeting for revision? There are many points on which it is important that we need to be agreed. Westcott wrote to Hort July 1st, 1870, the revision on the whole surprised me by the prospects of hope. I suggested to Ellicott a plan of tabulating and circulating the emendations before our meeting, which may in the end prove valuable.

In other words, let's get some of these notes out to these other fellows before we ever meet. And then Hort wrote to Lightfoot, it is, I think, difficult to measure the weight of acceptance that we have won beforehand for the revision by the single fact of our welcoming a Unitarian to the revision committee. Now, these are the men of intelligence who have introduced to us the Westcott and Hort text from which the revision, revised standard was taken and from which every other translation since has come.

Every modern English translation has come from the Westcott and Hort text, and this is that text which was borrowed 95 percent from the Vaticanus and the Alexandrian and the Sinaitic text, which came from Alexandria and the work of the Gnostics. Now, my Bible says that the natural man does not understand the things of the Spirit, neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned. It is obvious to me that those men who translated the King James and who followed the Texas Receptus, Martin Luther, Erasmus, and all these men were genuinely born-again, Spirit-directed men and men who were guided by the Holy Spirit.

And I would have far greater confidence in following these men than I would men who perhaps are of superior intellect. I don't think that that has been proved, who do not believe in the literal word of God, who do not believe in the atoning work of Jesus Christ, who do believe that the evolutionary theory was one of the greatest things to come along. How can these men, natural minds, be a true guide to spiritual truth when spiritual truth is spiritually discerned? Let me tell you something.

I would much quicker believe a Spirit-filled teacher with a sixth-grade education who doesn't know Greek from hen's tracks to one of these supposedly scholar doctors who has all of his degrees in his ancient languages who is not born-again and knows nothing of the Spirit. I believe that the uneducated sixth-grade man would be a truer guide to spiritual truth because of the Spirit of God working in him because Jesus promised that the Spirit would lead us into all truth. But if you don't believe or have the Spirit, how can he lead you into the truth of God? Now, it doesn't stand to reason in my own mind that God would hide the true text for 1,500 years from the Church, allowing them to follow what Hort called the vile textus receptus, showing his prejudices and presuppositions before he ever went to the revision committee.

And then suddenly to these men reveal for the Church now finally the hidden truths of God by their abbreviated deleted text that they fostered upon us as being the most intellectual of all. Let's take a look at a few of the changes that they saw fit to make. Matthew's gospel, chapter 19, we dealt with why callest thou me good, verses 16 and 7. Why askest thou me concerning good? Now, remember that Sinaiticus is a poor manuscript to say the best because of the fact that it's missing so many pages.

And the same with Vaticanus. The whole book of Genesis is out of the Vaticanus and so many other whole chapters of the Bible. But this particular statement of Christ, why callest thou me good, was quoted in 150 by Justin Martyr, 180 by Irenaeus, Hippolytus in the year 200, and that 230 years before Sinaiticus was ever written.

Now, how in the world could these men quote from a scripture that was deleted some 230 years later out of the text? I mean, it wasn't added to the text, according to Westcott and Hort, until after some 230 years. By what kind of foresight could they quote from the text and write upon it 230 years before some fellows took it upon themselves to add it, or actually 600 years as they would like to have you believe, from some of the earliest of the Textus Receptus. In John's Gospel, chapter 5, verse 3, the second part of the verse there, we have the story of the man who was there at the pool of Bethesda, and there were a great multitude of impotent folk of blind halt withered.

Now, in the Westcott and Hort, they just stopped right there, and a certain man was there which had an infirmity thirty-eight years. And when Jesus saw him lying there, he knew he had been there for a long time, and in that case he said to him, Will you be made whole? The impotent man answered him, Sir, I have no man when the water is troubled to put me in the pool, but while I am coming another steps down before me. Now, they delete the part beginning with waiting for the moving of the water, for an angel went down at a certain season into the pool and troubled the water.

Whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had. That part is deleted from the Westcott and Hort text, and even in my Schofield Bible, there is a nice little note that says the Sinaiticus manuscript omits waiting for the moving of the water, and all of verse 4. Thank you, Dr. Schofield. But why didn't you also put in your note, Dr. Schofield, that this scripture is found in all but ten of the ancient manuscripts, and that Chrysostom quotes from it in 345.

And he often, or he lived from 345 to 407, before Sinaiticus was ever written, he quoted from it and often made mention to this particular scripture. Tertullian quotes from it in the year 200, 230 years before Codex Sinaiticus. And there is all kinds of evidence to prove that that was in the original writing of John.

But they put it out because of the Sinaitic manuscript. Now, in Matthew's gospel, the 6th chapter, the 13th verse, beginning the latter portion, Thine is the kingdom, the power, the glory forever. This is found in all but ten of the Greek New Testament manuscripts, and again was quoted by the early church fathers long

before the Sinaiticus was ever copied.

Then you have the case of John, chapter 7, beginning with verse 53 and going into chapter 8, verse 11, where they were challenging Jesus, saying, Has a prophet really come out of Galilee? Search and look, for out of Galilee arises no prophet. And every man went to his own house. Now from this point, verse 53, on through to the 11th verse of chapter 8, they say is not in the Sinaiticus and some of the older texts from Alexandria, and so it has been deleted.

The story of the woman who was taken in adultery and brought to Jesus, where he said, He that is without sin, let him cast the first stone. Augustine, one of the early church fathers, said that the reason why some of the manuscripts deleted it is because the copyists felt that if they put it in, that it would encourage adultery. And so they felt that it was best to delete this story out of the text.

Now that was Augustine back in 400 or so that he declared this. So he recognized it as something that had been deleted from the text rather than a story that had been added by later writers. Of course, the last 12 verses of Mark's gospel are not in the Sinaiticus and thus, and some of the other manuscripts, and thus it is argued that they should not be there in Mark's gospel.

But notice how Mark's gospel would end without the last 12 verses. Chapter 16, let's just read it where they say it should end. And she went and told them that that had been with him as they mourned and wept.

And they, when they had heard that he was alive and had been seen of her, believed not. I beg your pardon, that isn't where they say it ends. The last 12 verses, they say, should be deleted.

So we have to come back a ways. They say it ends 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.

And thus ends the gospel of Mark. With them going out and they're afraid, not speaking to any man, just all afraid, don't know what's going on. Leaves the resurrection of Christ in doubt.

You think that Mark would leave the story there? All kinds of evidence to prove that the rest of Mark's gospel was there. The fact that it was quoted by Irenaeus and Hippolytus in the second and third century. Indisputable evidence that it was there in the original text.

There is a great British scholar by the name of Burgon who dared to challenge Westcott and Hort. And he has written a couple of papers, one on Mark's gospel and the other on this woman taken in adultery, showing and proving that they did belong in a part of the original text. Psalm 22.16, the last portion of that particular psalm, reads, They pierced his hands and his feet.

Westcott and Hort have it, they hacked off his hands and his feet. Oh, but wait a minute. That means that this wasn't prophetic of Jesus, because not a bone of him was to be broken.

But there is not one reason in the world to translate it, they hacked off his hands and his feet. But the Hebrew definitely says they pierced his hands and his feet. It seems to be a deliberate attempt to destroy the value of the prophetic utterance concerning Jesus Christ.

When this whole psalm is a prophecy of his crucifixion, beginning with, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? And referred to in the New Testament as a psalm that referred to the crucifixion for his sin. And they parted his garment and cast lots for his vesture as it was written by the prophet. And here it is in Psalm 22 where this was written, a whole psalm.

And yet they will destroy it by saying they hacked off his hands and his feet. Now we have a similar thing in Zachariah's prophecy where Ken Taylor in his living Bible, there in the 14th chapter of Zachariah, 13th chapter rather, in verse 7, or verse 6 rather. And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in your hands? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends.

Now this is a prophecy of the return again of Jesus Christ and how that Israel is going to recognize him at that point. The shepherd of Israel has been smitten. And the next verse says that.

Awake, O sword, against my shepherd and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts. Smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered. Again in the New Testament this is quoted as when Jesus was taken by the prisoners and the disciples scattered that it might be fulfilled.

It's quoted in the New Testament as a part of a true prophecy of Jesus Christ. But Taylor in his living Bible, if you have it there, you're probably horrified. What are these stripes or what are these slashes on your chest? Oh, I got these in a brawl.

That's blasphemous. To so twist the scriptures that are prophetic of Jesus being pierced for us. And when he returns again, they're questioning of him as they sorrow and mourn like a woman who has lost her only child.

As they receive him as their Messiah and realize their blindness, they say, What are the meaning of these wounds in your hands? And the gentle way by which he answers, These are wounds that I received in the house of my friends. Smite the shepherd, the sheep will be scattered. All a part of one prophecy of Jesus Christ who was smitten for us.

Another classic example is found in 1 Timothy 3.16. Now, unfortunately, there's about 5,000 of these and I don't have time to go through them all with you. But many times they're just subtle little changes and sometimes they're deletions of whole verses or whole chapters even, or parts of chapters. 1 Timothy 3.16, And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness.

God was manifest in the flesh. Some of you that have a NEB, how does it read in there? Afraid to admit that you have one tonight? Now, read that again now. He was manifested in the flesh rather than the word Theos is there in the text, which should read God was manifested in the flesh.

But in attempt to destroy the idea of the deity of Christ, Westcott and Hort have translated it and have put it in their text. He, taking out and taking the liberty to take out the Theos, which is definitely in the Alexandrian text. A deliberate perversion of the scripture by these so-called scholars.

They even went further than the Alexandrian text on this and took liberties of removing the Theos, which is in the Alexandrian text and just putting He was manifested in the flesh. And as I say, this is one of the 5,000 alterations and all that were made in the name of scholarship and passed off onto the church, which has brought the church into a state of liberalism. I do not know of a single revival that has taken place in any church that has followed the Westcott and Hort text, but it always leads to liberalism and in many cases to a denial of Jesus Christ.

Now, I hope that I have stirred your minds and challenged you to look further into this. And if you desire to look further into it, I would like to give you a few books that I feel that you'll find very enlightening indeed. Number one is Which Bible, which is compiled by Dr. David Otis Fuller, Creagle Press.

King James version defended by Edward Hills. I think it's the Eyeopener Press and it's up in Oregon. I can give you the address.

Truth or Faults, again by Dr. David Otis Fuller. And also his book Counterfeit or Genuine, which deals with this Bergen's treatise, the whole treatise on Mark 16 and John chapter 8 and gives just indisputable evidence that they do belong in the text. And then another book, God Wrote Only One Bible.

He gives you the 5,000 changes that have been made. And that fellow is named Jasper Ray. These are books that will give you some ideas and views from the other side of the picture.

And then you're free to make up your choice and decision. Now, I do believe that King James has a disadvantage in that some of the words that were used in King James are archaic and no longer in use. That a person who is not used to the King James language does have difficulty with the these and the thous and the old English that is used.

I do feel that it would be beneficial to have a modern day language Bible, but not one that goes to Westcott and Hart, but one that goes back to Textus Receptus. And a good modern day translation of Textus Receptus would be indeed a very welcomed addition to any library. There is an endeavor to do such a thing by Nelson Publishers.

And they have published now the New Testament. And I think they call it the New King James. And they are now working on the Old Testament.

There are areas where they perhaps could have done a better job, but yet they have done a very commendable job. It's important and it is beneficial to have it. It's surely more accurate than any of the other new translations that are out.

Any of the revised versions, Living Bible, Amplified, the NEB, any of those really have great difficulty. Good News for Modern Man. Twenty-two verses dealing with the blood of Jesus Christ have been deleted out of Good News for Modern Man.

It makes it not such good news when you take away the blood of Jesus Christ. There are some 200 critical scriptures that are really critical. And of them, in 198, the NEB follows Westcott and Hart instead of the Textus Receptus.

Very critical scriptures indeed to the true understanding. Now, shall we then have a burning ceremony? No. I believe that these translations do offer some value in giving shades of meaning and new understandings.

But by no means should you put aside the King James. And by no means should you use these new translations exclusively. Because there are very important biblical truths that you'll be missing out on if you follow these new translations completely.

I do believe that God had a hand in the compiling of the King James. Because these were godly men. And they were seeking to bring the word of God in the English language in a pure form to the people.

And they prayed and sought God for guidance. I do believe that Westcott and Hart is a part of Satan's diabolic plan to hide the truth from God's people. I know I'm going way out on a scholarly limb.

And there will be a bunch of PhDs with their saws coming in to cut the thing off. But that's all right. I won't go down because I'll be hanging on the King James version.

I trust that you will get in and do some more studying on your own. I think you'll find it extremely fascinating even as I have found it. And I have found that most men who will throw up strong cries about these things, you ask them, have you read Burgunds? Letters to Hortnall? Oh no, they haven't really examined all the evidence.

All they've heard is that it looks beautiful. Oh, it has a good fit. Well, anybody who's smart can see it.

And it takes we poor fools to say the King is naked. Shall we pray? Father, we thank you that you gave us the scriptures that holy men wrote as they were inspired of God. And we have confidence in you, Father, that having given us the scriptures, you were able to preserve them for us in accurate form so that we could have your word today, even as it was written then.

And thus we thank you for thy word, Lord, for it is a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path to guidance in thy truth. And Lord, help us that we would not be guilty of following cunningly devised fables or the vain philosophies of men that corrupt good thinking. Lord, help us to search the scriptures daily and study to show ourselves approved unto God, workmen that need not to be ashamed, rightly dividing your word of truth.

And so, Lord, guide us in all truth by your Holy Spirit. And we trust you to do it because you've promised that you would. Thank you, Lord.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

---

Audio: <https://sermonindex1.b-cdn.net/12/SID12066.mp3>

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/chuck-smith/the-kjv-version-bible-part-2/>

# *Grow in Your Walk with Christ*

---

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

**[www.sermonindex.net](http://www.sermonindex.net)**