

# The King James Bible - A Defense of Its Divine Authority

*Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.*

Date: 20 March 2025

[ 0 : 00 ] Welcome tonight, we're on the King James Bible. It's a controversial subject for some and we're not on the extreme side of the issue, I don't think. I think we take a measured biblical and a reasonable view and a logical view. I've heard it put some churches are King James only, some churches are King James ugly, but we're not on that side. So we want to be King James and defending the Word of God, the divine authority of the Word of God. So you've got your notes there and for people online we can share those with you later, but follow along, there's lots of notes so we're just going to touch through the main points on each slide. And so the subject tonight is the King James Bible, a defence of its divine authority. 2 Timothy 3.16 tells us, all scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. Thinking about the Bible we believe, we do believe the Bible, we believe the Bible is the Word of God. It's given for us, it's profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. And the Bible that we believe matters, I put to you. As Bible believers, we hold that God's Word is perfect and it gives us the final authority for our doctrine and life. 1 Thessalonians, we see the church there received the Word of God with joy. They received the Word of God from Paul as he was preaching it and delivering it in letter form, not as man's Word but as God's Word, as it is in truth, the Word of God. And it works effectively in believers. And then 2 Thessalonians 3 verse 1, it says that we ought to believe God that his Word may have free course and be glorified. So we want to glorify the Word of God, to honour it, to lift it up and to publicise it. We pray for that, for the Word of God to go out to our nation and our community. So we hold to the King James Bible as the inspired Word of God. Here's why we trust the King James Bible and why it matters.

It's the foundation. The Bible is our foundation. And Psalm 11 3 says, if the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do? I put to you, I'd like to present the case that we can know for sure that we have the Word of God. And we have the sure Word of God preserved for us perfectly through God's providence, through God's promise. And it's that foundation really for us, isn't it? And supported by manuscript evidence, and it's proven by its doctrinal consistency.

So we're going to go through some points that show to us firm, logical, biblical, reasonable reasons why we can have an assurance about the Bible. What version is authoritative is a critical issue. It's an important issue. We want to know that we've got the right Bible, we've got the right words in front of us. And I believe we can have that assurance that we have a Bible that is sure and reliable. We can trust its teachings. They underpin our faith and doctrine. We have the Word of God preserved perfectly for us through God's promise. And in the English language, I put to you, that faithful translation, that sure Word of God is the King James Bible. Of course, in other languages, there's others that are equivalent to the King James Bible in lots of languages all across the world. The Bible warns us about Satan's attack on the Word of God. And he targets the Word of God to deceive and destroy. Right back in Genesis 3, the Bible's first question, Yea, hath God said. Satan attacked right from the beginning, questioning the Bible, casting doubt on the Bible. And he contradicted the Bible too. He said, you shall not surely die, Genesis 3, 4. He replaced God's Word with a lie. From the very beginning, Satan has shown his true colours, that he's attempted to corrupt God's Word. In Matthew 4 and Luke 4, when Christ was tempted, Satan misquoted Scripture.

And then we see in Matthew 13, the parable of the sower, the seed that the sower sowed was the Word of God. And Satan is pictured there as snatching it away. He doesn't want people to get the Word of God. And 2 Corinthians 11, we see that Satan offers another Jesus, another gospel, another spirit.

[ 4 : 49 ] So he's all about counterfeiting and causing this doubt and confusion. There's warnings about that. There's warnings about a corruption and a confusion. For example, we know when you get a whole lot of people together with multiple Bible versions, it's like a Bible of Bibles. And these modern versions, they can cause confusion, really. And there's an element of corruption. God warns against tampering with his Word. It's the last verses in your Bible there, Revelation 22, warns us about tampering with the Word of God. The Bible tells us God is not the author of confusion. He doesn't cause confusion. We know it's the devil who does. And God doesn't want confusion. He wants us to have a sure, clear Word of God. We can read it as a common Bible and know that it is the Word of God. And even in Paul's day, we see 2 Corinthians 2, verse 17, it talks about many who corrupt the Word of God. So even back in Paul's time, there's people that were deliberately trying to alter, corrupt, change, hinder, distort the Word of God. So if Satan has historically corrupted God's Word, right back from the garden with Eve, it's reasonable to consider, to suspect that he still continues to have that same modus operandi, isn't it? He wants to do that today, to distort

God's Word, potentially through modern translations, like he tricked Eve. So the Bible warns us about those who corrupt the Word of God. It's very important. One consideration is really that different Bibles say different things. You can't really marry them together. There's some that are quite contradictory. We cannot affirm multiple Bible versions as they contain contradictory statements.

For example, in Matthew 5, verse 22, the Lord says, Modern versions take out that phrase, without a cause, which changes the meaning really altogether.

We know our Lord was angry at times, but it was with a cause. It was a righteous cause, as you have that zeal for the Lord's house. And contradictory statements cannot both be true.

So either the King James is true here, or the other Bibles are true. You can't kind of have it both ways. So when they're contradictory, you've got to determine what's the right wording, what's the right version, what is the correct way to put it. Because different Bibles say different things. You've got to decide, well, which one is the one that I can trust in then? I put to you tonight that we need God's Word.

[ 7 : 41 ] We're in a spiritual battle. And the Bible talks about the Word of God as being the sword of the Spirit, Ephesians 6. You don't want to go into battle with a butter knife. You want a sword, a two-edged sword. Amen?

And the Bible, the Word of God, is pictured there as that strong sword. To grow, we need the perfect Word of God. 2 Timothy 3 talks about how we can be instructed by the Word of God. It's profitable for us that the man of God will be thoroughly furnished unto all good works. We uphold God's Word as a church as really the final authority. There is a final authority.

And it is what guides and makes our doctrine, our practice. It's the Word of God. And we've got a supernatural Bible as well as a supernatural Saviour. We can believe Him and we can believe His Word.

We reject doubt in God's Word. That's the enemy, to doubt God's Word. And it's kind of sad. And I've had times where I've used other versions and we're in the margins or the footnotes.

[ 8 : 50 ] It's casting doubt all the time, not in this manuscript or that. And it's kind of casting this idea, well, do we take it or leave it? Do we believe it or not believe it?

And it's casting doubt. Really, that's the enemy's work, to cast doubt. So we reject that. We know that we can trust what God has said. Faith comes by hearing His Word.

And we look in the Bible through the Word that Christ and His apostles, the people of God, they never question Scripture. That's Satan's tactics.

And so we ought to take an unapologetic stand on the Word of God, on the King James Bible. So we stand for that. So let's look at some reasons why we would consider that the King James Bible has a superiority.

Why it's really far and above the one that we should go to. We see that it has a superiority in its texts. So in the Old Testament, it used the traditional Masoretic text, which was long used through history through the Old Testament, rather than the abridged Masoretic text.

[ 10 : 05 ] In the New Testament, we use the Textus Receptus, or the Received Text. And so we're going to unpack all of that as we go. But the manuscripts of the King James Bible are what the Church has consistently used for almost 1900 years.

So ever since the early Church of whatever persuasion, it was the same text that was underpinning the Bibles and translations in different languages.

But in contrast, now you've got the modern versions that really have only relatively recently been discovered. Now they're underpinning the modern Bibles.

And it's like they've just thrown out all of the respected Church history that was always founded upon that text that underpins the King James Bible.

And for these modern versions, they're based really on a very few manuscripts. And there's a whole lot of controversy surrounding the people who discovered them, the places they were discovered, and really the actual text itself.

[11:15] There's a whole lot of question about really the corruption of that text. But the text of the King James Bible is sound. Another reason for the superiority of the King James Bible is it's got superior translators.

So the King James Bible translators, they were highly skilled, godly, multilingual scholars. They worked in teams. They were giants of their day, of learning, of piety, relying on the Holy Spirit, not just their intellect.

And their process had multiple reviews where the different teams reviewed its others' work to ensure fidelity, so faithfulness. In contrast, modern translators such as Westcott and Hort were themselves really unbelievers.

They were heretics who denied miracles, denied the inerrancy of the Word of God, and core doctrines. Many modern translators are liberal in their theology, even unsaved.

Even when a modern translation, we could call it as a good one, the problem is the faulty textual basis. So it's flawed. A third reason why we can know the superiority of the King James Bible is the techniques that the translators used.

[12:33] They used what's called verbal equivalence. So preserving the exact words of the Bible. Preserving the grammar as well. Whereas modern Bible versions use a whole lot of interpretation, more about a thought-for-thought translation, rather than an accurate translation.

And then we see it rings true on its theology as well. It preserves key doctrines like the deity of Christ, that doctrine of the virgin birth, of substitutionary atonement.

Whereas modern versions alter many verses that really cast doubt on essential doctrines. And then we see the King James Bible is superior as well because of its tone.

It's got this ring of authority about it. Thou shalt not carries with it that tone of authority, doesn't it?

It's got an authoritative tone because it is God's word. Literary scholars, even secular ones, look at the wording of Psalm 23 and the King James and call it the apex of the English language.

The highest and finest expression of English penned by the hand of men. And we know, really, the Bible tells us that it was holy men of God who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

[13:53] And the modern movement through modern versions tends to dumb down the English language in a way that's unnecessary and unhelpful. And really we're doing our children a great disservice by dumbing down our language instead of helping them to rise to that higher level of understanding.

And we see down through history, God signally blessed the King James Bible with revivals, with works of God down through history. And people are rediscovering really today the blessing of the old authorised version of the King James.

So we hold the King James to be superior to other translations, not merely as a preference that we just happen to like it, but because of some specific objective criteria.

So we're going to look at some of those reasons, these criteria. So literalness is a core criterion. In other words, we've got God's precise words.

It's not just as some person conjures up how to translate it, but it's literal, it's word for word.

Prioritising what God has said over human interpretation.

[15:00] Of course, we know the Bible says that it is not of human interpretation. And so it's literal. And when you look at different Bible translations, there's kind of a spectrum, as you see pictured here, this kind of translation spectrum.

Over here, you've got word for word. It's called formal equivalence. So in other words, what God said. There's the King James. That's where the King James sits.

Then in the middle, you've got dynamic equivalence, where it's meaning for meaning, a bit more subjective. And then right on the other end, you've got paraphrase.

So thought for thought. So in that middle two there, the dynamic equivalence, meaning for meaning, paraphrase is thought for thought. It's what the translators think God meant.

Whereas on the King James end, it's word for word. It's what God said. You know, thus saith the Lord. So we'd rather stick on that end, where it's word for word.

[16:01] Now, there's other Bible translations that are on that end too, like the New American Standard. But the problem is they're using the wrong text. So that's the problem. So there is this spectrum.

Of course, you've got the Message Bibles. You've got all kinds of very loose paraphrases now that totally change what God has said. And I think that's a problem that we ought to be very careful about because it's almost like it's trusting in the author's understanding, their interpretations, rather than divine authority.

It's a big difference. So moving on to the next point, is there's a completeness of the text as well. So the King James Bible retains those verses that some modern translations omit or they question.

For example, we know in Acts 8, 37, Philip is there witnessing to the eunuch, and the eunuch says, what hinders me from being baptised?

And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Now, modern versions, for example, like the ESV, and many others omit this.

[17:22] They put it in a footnote claiming some manuscripts add, implying it's a later addition. But the reality is that the majority of manuscripts before 1881 included it.

And other Bibles prior to 1881 retained it and included it. And it's the same with Mark 16, the last 12 verses of Mark.

The King James Bible includes those, and they're fundamental, talking about the resurrection, the commission, the ascension. And there's critical content there which the King James Bible retains. And these are long-accepted texts that are part of the Word of God. You could think of the woman caught in adultery too, John 8. These are important passages that have historically been held by the church as authoritative and included.

And there's lots of scholarly reasons why there's no doubt that these are true renditions and should be included. So in the King James Bible, you've got a completeness, whereas in the other Bibles, they're throwing these verses out.

[18:37] They're taking it away, which is a real problem. Another good reason to take heart that you have a faithful Bible is the precision of the translation.

Now, the King James provides clarity. Now, of course, we all know it takes a bit of getting ahead around the these and the thous and some would think, well, that's a bit hard. But there's reasons for it.

There's reasons for these personal pronouns. So the thou is like singular. The ye is plural. It distinguishes between the two. Whereas in everyday English language, you say you, which could mean singular, could mean plural.

Whereas the King James gives clarity. And those distinctions are lost in modern English. So modern English doesn't have that second person plural pronoun.

So, for example, in the southern USA, they say you all. You know that the you is a plural. And we don't have that. And in Spanish, apparently, there's one as well. Ustedes, which means plural you.

[19:42] But the Greek and Hebrew, they did distinguish. So it was clear from reading the Greek and the Hebrew, whether you're talking plural or singular you. And it does matter, for example, when the Lord's conversing with Nicodemus and talks about you must be born again.

It was ye. It wasn't just Nicodemus, you have to be born again. It's saying ye must be born again, talking to plural, multiple. And so there's importance there. It gives clarity.

The King James gives clarity about such things. So you could see, for example, to round up thus far, that it's literal. It is word for word. You don't have any doubt.

It's not subject to man's interpretation or understanding. It's complete. There's no missing verses. It's precise. You can tell the pronouns. It's very clear. There's a clarity.

And it's transparent, too, so it uses italics when there's understanding added. So it gives you the most direct access to God's word in English. And it's very thorough. It's got a precision.

[20:46] Let's look at some reasons why we can hold to the King James Bible, just sort of unpacking it a little more now. And one of the big reasons why we hold to the authority of the King

James Bible is that God has promised to preserve his word.

He's given a number of Bible verses that tell us that his word is going to be lasting and enduring forever. We see, for example, here's Psalm, forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven.

God's got the omnipotence to preserve his word. There's a timelessness to it, too. We see Psalm 12, verses 6 and 7, the words of the Lord are pure words. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord.

Thou shalt preserve them from this generation forever. Matthew 24, 35, Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away.

Further, Isaiah 40, verse 8, The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God shall stand forever. Matthew 5, 18, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law.

[ 21 : 56 ] And a jot and a tittle are like the most microscopic, the most minute marks of the alphabet that they used in the Hebrew. So it's like not even one tiny little thing is going to pass away.

It's all going to be steadfast. Not even the smallest stroke of a letter will pass away. Jeremiah 26 says, Diminish not a word. Not even a word ought to be diminished.

And 1 Peter 1 talks about how we're born again by the incorruptible seed, the word of God, which lives and abides forever. And the word of the Lord shall endure forever.

Again, lots of reasons, lots of promises of God that he's promised to give us a word that will be steadfast, that we can have assurance about. And I put to you that it does exist today in a tangible, perfect form.

Because God, not man, is the ultimate preserver by his spirit and Bible-believing churches. And God cannot lie. His word is preserved perfectly for us today.

[ 22 : 59 ] God's preserved his word through the Jews, the Old Testament, Manuscript Foundation, and then the Christians in Antioch. They're the two sources for the King James text. But then we see, in contradiction to God's promise, modern textual critics tell us, oh, the original text was lost for 1,500 years and recovered in the 19th century through these two manuscripts, basically.

We'll talk about those a little. Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. So there's these two manuscripts and that's what they really found everything on and they're called Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

One was found in the Vatican, one was found Mount Sinai. But really, older doesn't mean better.

And there's even questions whether these were valid or might be forgeries.

But nevertheless, the Bible's text, the King James Bible's text, which is called the Received Text or the Textus Receptus, was the standard text for centuries, hundreds and hundreds of years.

Modern omissions rely on these questionable editorial assumptions, not divine authority. God's promise, preservation. It's an important point.

[ 24 : 12 ] So when we tackle the Bible version issue, there's a number of presuppositions. So some kind of starting points that we make when we examine this kind of question.

So seven key beliefs that we could put to the matter. As Bible believers and really all Bible believers, whether they might disagree on the version issue, I would expect, would hold to that the Bible is sufficient.

It gives us everything that we need. It's profitable for all of those things we read about. It answers all the spiritual questions that we have. Independent of scholars or tradition, the Bible should be sufficient of itself to address what is true and what is not true.

Another principle is soul liberty. So every believer has got the liberty to come to their own scriptural understanding that the Holy Spirit can enable every believer.

It's not like some scholarly class or some clergy class that is above. Every believer has the liberty to come to their own mind as led by the Holy Spirit through the searching of the scriptures like Acts 17, 11.

[ 25 : 24 ] And all of the believers who know Jesus have got the anointing such that we don't need someone to teach us necessarily. If we have the Bible, then the Bible should be clear and accessible to ordinary people, not just scholars.

So some of these Bible scholars, these modern version propagators, they almost think, well, the scholars say this and they question really the believing people of history that have always stood for what we would still adhere to, the truth of the text of the Bible, the King James Bible.

Another principle that we ought to have mind of is the reality of the devil. As we talked about, Satan attacks God's word. It's his way. And so the version issue can really become a spiritual battle.

What is the Bible? What is the right rendition? What is the right reading? And the devil wants to cause doubt and confusion. He's real and we need to face that.

And another principle is the preeminence of faith. Faith comes by hearing the word of God. We've got to come to God believing that he is. We need to have faith in God's promises, not scholarship. [ 26 : 38 ] And so when we come to the word of God, we don't come disbelieving or doubting. We come believing it, trusting it, holding it sure and knowing that it's true, knowing by faith.

And really, it's almost a revelation to it that, yeah, it's very clear. Yeah, there's really no doubt that we can believe, believe the word of God, believe what he says. Another principle really is when we come to the word of God, we should have a trembling and really revere the word of God to hold it as holy and take it seriously and not have some idea we can tamper with it or redefine it or revise it with our own thinking.

We take it as read. We take it every word and we revere it. We honour it. We tremble before God's word. And when we come to the word of God, we're trusting in the Holy Spirit to guide us too because it's spiritually revealed.

The Bible talks about how the Holy Spirit reveals to us and opens our eyes, illuminates the Bible and it's really only regenerate believers that can rightly handle Scripture.

So all of these people, for example, at Westcott and Hort, as we'll talk about them, they were unbelievers effectively. They didn't actually believe the Bible and they're the ones that people go to as the authority.

[ 27 : 59 ] Really, they're unsaved critics of the word of God. They've got no place to be correcting it or changing it or becoming some scholarly authority over it. So all of these presuppositions, they reject modern textual criticism's naturalistic approach.

So they kind of throw out faith and they could try to treat the Bible like any other book, tearing it apart and machinating with it. This is the word of God and you don't toy with it or tamper it or trifle with it.

You tremble at it. Some biblical evidence now why we hold to the King James Bible. The Bible demonstrates that copies and translations, not just originals, are trustworthy and authoritative.

You know, the modern Bible critics would say, well, in the original version it was this or that.

Actually, that kind of idea is flawed because they can't definitely say what is the original rendition.

It's all clouded. Whereas, we can have an assurance and we can know that the Holy Scriptures are given to us.

[ 29 : 12 ] When Paul talked about Timothy knowing the Holy Scriptures, he wasn't talking about the originals because Timothy didn't have the originals. he had copies and they were given by inspiration of God.

It's the same when the Lord Jesus went to the synagogue and opened the scroll and spoke from Isaiah in Luke 4. He called it scripture. It wasn't an original copy.

It was a copy. It was a copy. And so, critics claim only originals were inspired. But the Bible itself tells us that copies are the authoritative word of God.

So long as it's an accurate copy, it's a faithful copy, then you can have confidence in it. And that's what we have in the Bible, the King James Bible. It's a translation based on preserved text, based on what the church has historically accepted as the true text.

So it fits the biblical pattern that there's an assurance there. It's trustworthy and authoritative, even though it's not the original. Of course, those originals, no one alive today has seen the original of the manuscript.

[ 30 : 16 ] There is no such thing available today. There's certainly copies that are quite close to the original manuscripts, but this idea that only the original manuscripts are inspired is really a flawed idea.

Looking at the actual text now, we know that the Greek text, during the apostolic era, the New Testament was completed under the Holy Spirit's guidance.

So God guided, provided the word, and it was penned by the human writers. It was received by the early church as God's word, like we read, even though there were attacks upon it, like we read before, some, many, seeking to corrupt the word of God.

So there was this early corruption, as it talks about in 2 Corinthians 2. There was heretics, even in the second and third centuries, especially in a place called Alexandria, Egypt.

In the second and third centuries, there's people like Clement and Origen, and there's good reason to believe that they actually mutilated texts, and they produced the Alexandrian manuscripts. [ 31 : 27 ] So in other words, the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus, which are favoured by modern versions. So right back in the apostolic era, there was this early corruption that seems to have occurred.

And down through history, you've got the traditional text. So right through from the 4th to the 10th centuries, the traditional text was the prevalent text.

And right through different languages as well, the Gothic, Slavonic, Bibles, it was preserved right through the Byzantine Empire until Erasmus printed it in 1516.

Right through the Dark Ages and Reformation, Rome tried to suppress vernacular Bibles. So in other words, Bibles in the language of the people. They just wanted Latin Bibles.

But despite that, believers like the Waldenses, they preserved the traditional text. So the remnant church, if you like, the historic, Protestant, biblically, Bible-based church, the church that really you could trace back to the apostolic church, they stuck with the same King James Bible text basis that we hold today.

[ 32 : 40 ] And so even though there was those dark ages where they tried to suppress it, it kept going. And in the Reformation then, it was printed and translated.

So Tyndale, of course Luther also, which is alike to the King James, the German Bible that Luther translated. So it reflects that God's preserved his word.

We see that down through history, even though there was attacks all along the way. As far as modern versions go, we could really have a critique about them.

Here's these two characters, Westcott and Hort. Basically, they relied on these two manuscripts, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. They claimed that they were the oldest and best.

They came from Alexandria, Egypt, really a hub of Gnostic heresy. So Gnosticism is this old belief system that secret knowledge is the key to salvation.

[ 33 : 37 ] And it's full of a whole lot of various false ideas. And these characters, Westcott and Hort, they denied miracles, creation, they denied the deity of Christ. So they were quite really unbelieving writers.

And these are the ones that all these modern versions basically found themselves upon the foundational work of these two men and basically these two false manuscripts.

When you look at the manuscript evidence, the statistical support, now some of these figures change now and again depending on what source that you read and depending on what time of history that you check the different, because the different manuscripts that they collect, obviously it fluctuates a little bit now and again.

But this is really a comparison. The total of the manuscripts, now on the right there you see the number of manuscripts that support the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus is 0.9%, so basically less than 1% according to these calculations here.

Whereas all the other manuscripts, 99.1%, they support the reading of the King James Bible. So it's like this 99 to 1%.

[ 34 : 57 ] This is the 99%, the King James Bible. The modern versions, so I know someone gave me one to demonstrate because a fellow in the church gave me this one which is the Layman's Parallel Bible, so you've got four Bible versions.

And so basically the King James is 99% of the manuscripts and all the other modern versions are only like 1% of the manuscripts as far as what they're based upon.

Really quite a telling statistic. So modern versions rely on this tiny, minority of evidence. It's quite amazing really isn't it, to think of that.

Another issue is, here's a picture, it's basically showing these two lines, these two lines of two streams of text. So you've got the King James Bible and then you've got really the other Bibles. It's quite evident that all the historic Bibles through different languages, different times and phases of the church history, it's all been founded on that majority text or the textus receptus, 99% of the manuscript evidence, whereas the modern Bibles are relatively, it's a relatively new idea and it's based on this real skerrick of manuscript support.

[ 36 : 26 ] And there's a whole lot of questions why, why would you even go that way? And as far as the modern versions and what they're based upon, people have analysed some of these doctrinal changes that come from these modern Bibles from this Sinaiticus and Vaticanus and there's a

whole lot of fundamental doctrines that they deny or muddy.

It's really quite a shocking thing. So some 356 doctrinal changes. And of course the Bible warns us very strongly about altering the Scriptures.

In Deuteronomy 4 it says, you shall not add unto the word. Don't diminish ought from it. Amos 8 talks about a coming famine of hearing the word of God.

No wonder if the Bible's not been made available that God's true word has gone missing. And then we see Matthew 4 verse 4, man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

It's interesting Luke 4 verse 4 has got the same words but in the modern versions they take out but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. It's quite ironic that they actually take that out.

[ 37 : 43 ] So man shall not live by bread alone. Full stop. That's what the modern versions say. They take out the fundamental part of that verse. Moving on we see that King James is based on the majority text.

The most reliable and extensive collection of manuscripts whereas the others rely on this minority, this 1% or something in the order of 1% of corrupted text.

So again we're looking at it as a geographical thing. It's quite interesting when you think about the geography of it. So the Textus Receptus line, or it's also called the Byzantine text, really comes from Antioch in Syria.

We see Syria is in the news today because really there's a lot of Christians getting killed in Syria at the moment. It was at Antioch that the believers were first called Christians. So it lends itself to make us have good reason to believe that the Textus Receptus was really fundamentally where the church began.

So it goes right back to those apostolic days. Whereas on the other side you've got the Alexandrian line, so the Vaticanus Sinaiticus comes from Egypt. Egypt.

[ 39 : 10 ] And of course the Bible talks about Egypt quite a lot as being a bad thing, as we'll touch on that. So Antioch, again, some 5,000 manuscripts, copied by Bible-believing Christians for evangelism.

That's the one, the pure, preserved line. And disciples were first called Christians at Antioch. And it's really a missionary base too. Acts 13 talks about Antioch being like a missionary base.

On the other side you've got the Alexandrian ones, the Egyptian, that came from Alexandria. And you've got the Septu again, the Vaticanus, the Sinaiticus, the Latin Vulgate.

This is a corrupt source. And what's really interesting is there's over 3,000 differences between them. So there's a handful of manuscripts that don't even agree with each other.

It's quite phenomenal. You think, well, if that was the accurate text line, then surely they would be consistent with one another. But no, they differ with each other. This handful of Bible manuscripts, the Alexandrian ones, over 3,000 differences between them.

[ 40 : 21 ] They can't even get it right between their own manuscripts. And it looks like that infidels, so really unbelieving false teachers like Origen, they were influenced by Greek philosophy.

And the Gnostic kind of thinking, they appear to have meddled with these texts from Alexandria.

And of course, the Bible talks about Egypt as being a house of bondage, Exodus 20, verse 2.

And even in Acts 6, Alexandria was linked with persecution. Acts 6, verse 9 specifically tells about Alexandria. So the Word of God as far as something from Egypt, from Alexandria, was a big question mark over, hey, why should we be having anything to do with that?

Because in contrast with Antioch, where the believers were first called Christians, which was the missionary base for the church. So it's like, if you had to choose between Alexandria and Antioch, it would be Antioch that you choose to preserve the Word of God, whereas the Alexandrian stream distorts it.

again, it's over 90%, some 99%, 95%, depending where you calculate it from, and it's very, very, very clear.

[ 41 : 40 ] And it's had a widespread use and preservation by the early church. So there's thousands and thousands of copies. So the early church, the early believers, the early Christians, loved this word such that they copied thousands and thousands of copies of it, whereas the other ones, just a handful.

Maybe they were doubtful that even the early church didn't want to copy those versions because there was a question mark about them even back then. And one of the arguments that those who attack the King James use is they say that the King James relies on late manuscripts. But there's many ancient manuscript witnesses to the King James text tradition. So we've got some listed here. The Syriac, there's the Vetus Latina, the Magdalene Papyrus, basically lots of other ancient manuscripts, and even some of the church fathers, you could see that they quoted what is the King James version, what is the King James text, they quoted them. So they're witnesses that show that there's an early support, there's corroboration in these ancient sources, even though maybe the manuscripts aren't necessarily as old. But that's, again, questionable. So as far as the modern versions, only a handful of manuscripts, they differ significantly from each other.

[ 43 : 12 ] And modern versions take out whole verses like we've talked about, they alter words. The NIV, apparently, someone's done a calculation, the New International Version, for example, has 62,709 fewer words.

So that's got to make you wonder, well, that's a lot of words that the NIV takes out. 62,500 odd words. So modern translations, they change some key verses that really are very important to us. For example, in Isaiah 7, 14, it tells us about the virgin birth, that Christ was born of a virgin. A virgin shall conceive. Whereas the Revised Standard Version says a young woman will conceive. Well, there's nothing miraculous about a young woman conceiving, but there is something miraculous about a virgin shall conceive. And then we see in Daniel 3, where they saw the fourth man in the fire, they referred to him as the Son of God in the King James.

Whereas in the newer versions, NIV, a son of the gods, kind of downplaying him. It's really a Christophany, an appearance of Christ in the Old Testament. And he was the Son of God.

[ 44 : 27 ] He appeared as the Son of God. Whereas the NIV, modern versions, downplay that, take that away. We see 1 Timothy 3, 16, that's a really good verse to describe how God was manifest in the flesh, that Christ was God, clothed in flesh, become flesh.

God was manifest in the flesh. Whereas the NIV and other Bibles downplay that. He appeared in a body. It doesn't say he was God, it just says he appeared in a body. So again, it's taking away from the deity of Christ.

That's a really fundamental verse. Here's another example, John 6, 47. And these are only some examples. I've got this leaflet that's called an eye opener.

And it gives you like a whole swag of them, hundreds of them, of really telling verses. But for example, John 6, 47, it says, He that believeth on me shall have everlasting life.

The modern versions take out on me. They just say, He that believes has everlasting life. So believes what? It's a very fuzzy thing to say, He who believes has everlasting life.

[ 45 : 33 ] Whereas Jesus says, He who believes on me, on me, has everlasting life, on Christ. So omitting Christ there is a real telling omission as well. 1 John 5, 7, it talks about that these three are one, talking about really the Trinity, the triune Godhead.

Modern versions take that out. They omit that as well. Even though there's good reasons, good historic reasons why we should include that and keep that.

There's a whole scholarly argument you can mount why 1 John 5, 7 is an appropriate reading. And then we see Romans 1, 16, I'm not ashamed of the gospel of Christ.

It's the power of God unto salvation. They take Christ out. It's like downplaying it. It's the gospel of Christ. That's what I'm not ashamed of. And they take Christ out, which is a fundamental thing to include, isn't it?

Then you see, for example, lots of other omissions like in your notes there as well. That take away from prayer, teaching about how we believe before baptism, calling Lucifer the morning star rather than it's Christ who is the morning star.

[ 46 : 47 ] And then also where it refers to sodomites as shrine prostitutes, downplaying this sin. Sodomites are sodomites. And the Bible says some very clear things about sodomites.

So we should not take that away. So consider the kind of source of corruption. Again, I know I'm repeating some of this. These two manuscripts is where it all really started.

The Sinaiticus was found in a trash can. It was full of errors and it included the Apocrypha. Then you've got the Vaticanus, owned by the Vatican.

Well, that says it all. It was owned by the Vatican as well. And it emits significant proportions. So big slabs of Genesis there, Revelation, and it includes non-canonical texts.

So books that are not actually received as authoritative Bible books. And again, both of these two, these Alexandrian manuscripts, they disagree with each other over 3,000 times in the Gospels alone.

[ 47 : 50 ] Multiple discrepancies that can't even agree with each other. So really shoddy, unreliable manuscripts. You can't trust them. So you can see there's a quantity and a consistency matter.

So as far as the overwhelming support, all the manuscripts were 90 odd percent, 95 percent, 99 percent attest to the King James Bible text.

And here's a quote from a professor, Dr. Dean John Burgon, he was a scholar of his day, and he says that all four these key modern manuscripts, so he's talking about Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and a couple of others, they differ essentially from 99 out of 100 of the whole body of extant manuscripts. So in other words, the ancient manuscripts still in existence today. It's like staring them in the face. And really the King James translators had access to some of those manuscripts anyway, and they chose not to pursue that, because they knew that that was not trustworthy.

Another aspect is doctrinal purity. As we've touched on some of these as well, modern Bible versions, they alter key words, core doctrines, but the Bible, the King James Bible, preserves them faithfully.

[ 49 : 11 ] So there's some examples of that in your notes there too. Colossians 1.14 is one that jumps out at me too. We have redemption through his blood. It talks about redemption through his blood.

In the modern versions, they take out through his blood. We have redemption. Full stop. No, we have redemption through his blood. That's important.

That's an important phrase there, isn't it? And again, as 1 John 5-7, there's lots of reasons why that should be in the Word of God. It was found in early Latin text.

So it's got that historic support. So even just changing one word or two, it can make a big difference. That's why we uphold the King James Bible.

We're not meaning to be causing argument or nitpicking, but because we want to have a sure word, that's the one that we have the confidence in. That's why we want to be having that standard for what we preach from, what we teach from, what we recommend and uphold.

[ 50 : 13 ] Of course amongst our numbers of us might have other Bible versions and numbers of us, including myself, might consider other Bible versions now and again. But as far as what is the authority, we've got the authority here in the King James Bible.

And it matters to us to have a perfect Bible, a Bible we can trust in, because it's needful for our spiritual growth and for doctrinal certainty as well. We know Bible verses like, man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word, every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

Every word of God is pure, he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. You shall not add unto the word, neither shall you diminish aught from it. It's important, every word matters.

And of course the Bible says that he's magnified his word above his name and there's a stern warning about taking away from the word of God, adding to it. God's word.

God's word was preserved in that majority text, but where was the Bible before 1611?

[ 51 : 29 ] Where was the Bible before the King James? And while we can know that God's word was preserved in that majority text, the 99% of the manuscripts in earlier translations too, it was there, obviously not in English until the King James put it clearly in the English, but we see that right through history.

It was always there. It was down through history in the remnant church, the faithful church, fulfilling Psalm 12 verse 7 that God will preserve his word. So critics cannot name a perfect Bible today.

If you were to ask them, okay, if you think the King James Bible is not perfect, then where is the perfect Bible? And they can't really tell you. They don't have one. They don't think there is one effectively.

Another objection is the King James Bible is hard to understand. Well, we know that even our Lord's plain words were something that the early disciples had to grapple with.

Understanding comes by the Spirit, as we know, 1 Corinthians 2 14. And it's not about simplifying the translation. It's about what's the authority? And of course the Bible says, Ecclesiastes 8 verse 4, where the word of a king is, there is power.

[ 52 : 42 ] There's an authority there in the Bible. And sure, it might be a little hard to understand when we're first getting our head around it, but there's lots of helps today, lots of Bible helps. We've got lots of resources that can help us to understand those isolated words that might be a bit unfamiliar.

And God helping us will come to understand them. And there's lots of material now, especially through the internet, where you can go searching for words and word meanings. So there's really no reason to hold that kind of objection.

Another objection is that, well, the King James has changed over time, so it wasn't perfect. So we know the 1611, then there's different versions up to 1769.

but those little changes were effectively typos, really minor printing errors. Because when they first printed the King James Bible, they had to put every little letter into blocks of print, you know, letter by letter, and a typesetter might have just missed one of the letters or got it round the wrong way. It was more like a manual typesetting printing error and an updating of spelling. So those modern versions of revise the meaning, but the King James editions were really just correcting little typos that were really man's errors in the printing process.

[ 54 : 05 ] The big difference between King James advocates and the modern textual critics is that the King James advocates focus on where the Bible is today. Yes, we have it. Whereas the textual critics focus on what the Bible was in the past to say, well, the original manuscripts, and we don't know where they are.

But we would believe that the Bible is infallible, it's true, and we can know that it exists, that God's preserved it, and we have it in our hands.

We can say, yes, we have the Word of God, God will help us to take it in and understand it, and of course there's always ways we can understand shades of meaning by different resources we use, but we have a Bible that is infallible of itself, and it does exist in a perfect form.

even though we don't have those original manuscripts that no one alive has ever seen. Modern Bible scholars effectively don't believe that God has preserved His words, yet He has declared that His Word will stand forever, like those Bible verses we read before.

Numbers of times, God says that He's going to preserve His Word, it's going to endure forever, not one jot or tittle is going to pass away. We can have an assurance that, yeah, there's an authority here that we can have confidence in.

[ 55 : 20 ] Another argument we could put is the doctrinal superiority of the King James Bible. When you really boil it down, it's chalk and cheese. And that's why, really, we know the Jehovah's Witnesses love the Westcott and Hort, the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus, because it diminishes Christ's deity.

The Unitarians, who deny the triune God, they love the Vaticanus and the Satanaticus, Sinaiticus, they love that, because it takes away from Christ's deity, from essential doctrines that are fundamental doctrines.

And so, for example, when they take away the doctrine of the resurrection in Mark 16, when they take away that faith comes before baptism, Acts 8.37, when you believe, then you can be baptized. Whereas you take all that out, okay, what's stopping me from being baptized? Well, yeah, just go ahead. No, it's actually when you believe, then you're baptized. And it makes it very clear, Acts 8.37.

And they take that out, which, again, it creates this doctrinal confusion. And it weakens doctrines, too. We see there, for example, that Christ's deity is taken. There's numbers of times, like, it's astonishing how many times it takes away the word Lord, or, you know, different things that refer to our Lord.

[ 56 : 44 ] They take away important words that refer to his lordship. And even, like, fasting, fasting and praying before helping someone who's demonised, it's taken out.

So there are lots of things there as we unpack a little more in the notes, as you see. So just as we come to wrap it up today, I hope I've given you some good reasons why, some good reasons why you can have confidence in the King James Bible.

And it's not about preference, it's not about tradition, it's not about being in some school of thought or other, because it aligns with what the Bible says about itself. That heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words, plural, shall not pass away.

So every word, we can have an assurance that not one word is going to pass away. We can have an assurance that we've got a Bible that's really got that pure, powerful, timeless, that spiritual impact.

It's the inspired, preserved word of God in the English language. And of course, there's others in other languages of the world today. It's got this superiority on all those fronts that we talked about. [ 57 : 52 ] Whereas critics who deny this, they rely on human reason, on their own bias or opinions. Whereas we have a consistent, authoritative and trustworthy Bible.

Where would you rather be? Now with the critics who've got no Bible that they can say is authoritative. Or those who hold to the King James, yeah, look, it's got some things we've got to wrap our head around, but we know that it's based on the right text.

It's been faithfully translated. It's got that authority, that stamp of God's authority on it. God says he's going to preserve his word. That's why we can have that assurance today that we have that foundation.

We've got an authoritative English Bible. And God's preserved it down through history. He's given us a Bible. It's got doctrinal integrity and fidelity. And the Bible is true.

It's infallible. It's inerrant. And upholding the King James Bible, now some would mock and scorn and scoff and really we are somewhere in the minority. Most churches don't really care about what Bible people use or what Bible the preacher uses.

[ 58 : 57 ] It's almost like, well, it's a non-issue. They don't care about the Bible. They don't care about whether there's actually a Bible that you can know, yeah, that's for sure the right words.

That's the right rendition. That's the right textual foundation. And so we are kind of in a minority, but we're not some crazy group that's kind of left field and just thinking something that's not reasonable. There's a reasonable position here. It's a scriptural position. We can scripturally argue it. We can reasonably, logically argue it based on biblical principles. And if we believe in the Bible that there's a preservation of it, that it's inspired, that there's infallibility, then logically there must be one Bible. There must be an assured provision of it for us today, in our language today, that we can have an assurance that it is reliable and trustworthy.

And it's not corrupted. So can I urge you, believers here tonight, that you do have a Bible you can trust in, the King James Bible, the authorised Bible.

[ 60 : 00 ] Stand on the King James Bible. It's God's perfect word. God will help you to understand it. I don't know if we all can still grapple with different things that are hard to understand. Just like in Bible days, there were things hard to be understood.

But we can trust in God's promise, his perfect word. And this is a sharp sword. This is not some butter knife that's got an authority of God behind it. I think it's not only authorised, it's got God's authority behind it.

And we can stand on it. It's that sharp sword for the spiritual battle that we're facing. And rather than the shallow kind of alternatives that really fall short, in this age of apostasy, there's a falling away. It's all the more reason why we need to have a Bible we can use against the devil. We can preach the truth of it. We can be assured of it. And God's used it in revivals, in salvations, in church history, through the times of blessing.

And he's still using it today to see people converted and want to the saviour. So we've got a pure, reliable and powerful word. So I commend it to you. Amen. Let's pray.

[ 61 : 10 ] Lord, we thank you that you do give us a Bible we got assurance in. Lord, as much as the world would doubt it, and even Christians would doubt it, Lord, we know that you promised to give us a word that will not pass away, that will endure forever.

Lord, we can have an assurance of it. And thank you, Lord, for that. Help us to learn it more, to live it more, to take it to heart, to commit it to our memory, and most of all, to commit it to our lives.

Lord, we pray for any yet to trust you, that they would know you today as saviour. Know that you've got a trustworthy word of God, that we can follow you and know your truth, and we can hear your word as you tell us that my sheep hear my voice, and they follow me.

Lord, we thank you for that in Jesus' name. Amen. And I know there's people get pretty hot-headed about it, who are against this kind of stand, and look, I respect that.

Not everyone's on the same page, but they're not even the same book. That's a problem. Yeah, that can be a problem. Yeah. Okay, the Bible in four words. Revelation, inspiration, preservation, and illumination.

[ 62 : 23 ] Revelation from God to man, God reveals his word to men. Inspiration, man to paper, writes the inspired word of God. That is what we read in Timothy of all scriptures given by inspiration, as we read in the very beginning.

Preservation, paper to paper translation, that is why it's important to read the right Bible. Illumination from paper to man's heart. Let the Holy Spirit illuminate to your heart what is right and what the Bible says.

So when you talk about the word of God, it takes all of the above in order for the Bible to mean anything. It takes revelation, God to man. It takes inspiration, man to paper.

It takes preservation from paper to paper and translation. It takes illumination of the Holy Spirit for man to understand and see what that has been written by God.

Revelation, inspiration, preservation and illumination. Amen.