


The Modern Versions – Origins and Influences



The 1881 committee that produced the Revised Version, the mother of the majority of today's modern versions, was unimpressed with the weight of the evidence supporting the Received Text, which had been used for English translations by William Tyndale, John Rogers, and Miles Coverdale, as well as later by the 1611 translators.

Comparison of the top 7 Popular Bible translations of Daniel 9 verses 4 and 27 to the KJV



This article lists the 8 top selling Bible translations in the USA. The KJV is ranked number 2. Do they all teach the same things about the prophecy of the 70th Week of Daniel? I consider the correct translation of Daniel 9:27 to be of utmost importance. Why? It's because most contemporary Protestant evangelicals believe the "he" of Daniel 9:27 is the Antichrist, a secular humanist who makes an Endtime treaty with the Jews who reconstruct a third temple of Solomon which the Antichrist defiles by placing the abomination of desolation. Does the King James version teach that?

King James Version (KJV)

4 and I prayed unto the Lord my God, and made my confession, and said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping **the covenant** and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments;

27 And he shall **confirm the covenant** with many for one week:

The wording of "the covenant" in verse 4 and verse 27 are identical. The King James translators believed the covenant of verse 4 is the same covenant of verse 27, i.e., God's covenant of grace to Abraham and those like Abraham who believe in the Word of God by faith. The "he" of verse 27 was interpreted by the early Protestants to be *Jesus Christ* who *confirmed*, not made, the Abrahamic covenant, God's covenant of grace to His people.

New International Version (NIV)

4 I prayed to the Lord my God and confessed:
"Lord, the great and awesome God, who keeps **his covenant** of love with those who love him and keep his commandments,

27 He will confirm **a covenant** with many for one 'seven.

Notice the difference? "A covenant" and "his covenant" are not necessarily the same thing according to the literal meaning of this translation.

New Living Translation (NLT)

4 I prayed to the Lord my God and confessed:

"O Lord, you are a great and awesome God! You always fulfill **your covenant** and keep your promises of unfailing love to those who love you and obey your commands.

27 The ruler will **make a treaty** with the people for a period of one set of seven.

NLT doesn't even use the word covenant! "Make a treaty" and "confirm the covenant" are two different things.

New King James Version (NKJV)

4 And I prayed to the Lord my God, and made confession, and said,
"O Lord, great and awesome God, who keeps **His covenant** and mercy
with those who love Him, and with those who keep His commandments,

27 Then he shall confirm **a covenant** with many for one week;

NKJV does not use the definite article "the" before covenant.

English Standard Version (ESV)

4 I prayed to the Lord my God and made confession, saying, "O Lord,
the great and awesome God, who **keeps covenant** and steadfast love
with those who love him and keep his commandments,

27 And he shall **make a strong covenant** with many for one week,

Make is not the same thing as confirm.

Holman Christian Standard Bible (HCSB)

4 I prayed to the Lord my God and confessed:

Ah, Lord—the great and awe-inspiring God who keeps **His gracious
covenant** with those who love Him and keep His commands—

27 He will **make** a firm covenant[a]
with many for one week,

[A] Or will enforce a covenant

Even the footnotes are wrong on the HCSB

New American Standard Bible (NASB)

4 I prayed to the Lord my God and confessed and said, "Alas, O
Lord, the great and awesome God, who keeps **His covenant** and
lovingkindness for those who love Him and keep His commandments,

27 And he will **make a firm covenant** with the many for one week,

Common English Bible (CEB)

4 As I prayed to the Lord my God, I made this confession:

Please, my Lord—you are the great and awesome God, the one who keeps **the covenant**, and truly faithful to all who love him and keep his commands:

27 For one week, he will **make a** strong covenant with many people.

I hope you see clearly that a good Bible translation is important! Do you have a problem with the KJV being authorized by a British monarch you don't like? If so, read the Geneva Bible of 1599! It gets Daniel 9:27 correct.

1599 Geneva Bible (GNV)

4 And I prayed unto the Lord my God, and made my confession, saying, Oh Lord God which art great and fearful, and keepest covenant and mercy toward them which love thee, and toward them that keep thy commandments,


27 And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week:

But unfortunately the Geneva Bible doesn't put the definite article before "covenant" in verse 4. This confirms in my mind that the KJV is superior to the GNV.

The false teaching of a future Endtime Antichrist making a covenant with the Jews to create a third temple of Solomon was cooked up around 1580 by a Jesuit priest named Francesco Ribera. He was commissioned by the Vatican to figure out a way to get Protestants' eyes off of the papacy as being the Antichrist. In order for this to work, the Devil had to distort Bible translations to say "make" rather than "confirm" and use different wording for covenant so nobody would associate the covenant with the one written in verse 4.


The Timeline of Daniel 9:24-27 Illustrated

Ten Shemitah cycles of forty-nine years, make up the 490-year prophecy. It starts with the Jewish captives being released from captivity, and it ends with the gentiles being released from their spiritual captivity.



This meme is courtesy of David Nikao Wilcoxson 70thweekofdaniel.com

[The Original 1611 KJV Bible vs the 1769 Edition](#)



What the original 1611 King James Bible looked like.

A friend on social media shared with me a YouTube entitled, "AV1611 The True Bible" by John Doerr. In it, Mr. Doerr says,

Throughout the 1800s you've got a number of attacks on Scripture. The most subtle would be the change of the authorized version of 1611 by a Vatican manuscript subscribing man named Benjamin Blayney who didn't know any Hebrew. And he chose incorrect words, and he was not part of a Christian committee.

Let's just say that KJV community is now indoctrinated to believe that this Blayney 1769 text is the same good old-fashioned text of that King James authorized and it's not.

From Wikipedia:

Benjamin Blayney (1728 – 20 September 1801) was an English divine (Anglican clergy) and Hebraist (A Hebraist is a specialist in Jewish, Hebrew and Hebraic studies), best known for his revision of the King James Version of the Bible.

Now we have an opposing view. John Doerr says Blayney didn't know any Hebrew, and Wikipedia says he was a specialist in Hebrew! I know we can't always go by what Wikipedia says because it is left leaning and of a secular worldview. But Mr. Doerr doesn't give us any primary source to back up his allegation that Blayney didn't know any Hebrew.

My dear brothers and sisters in Christ, should we be influenced by the opinion of one man? Should we not investigate and do our own research and fact check what we see and hear on social media? That's what I'm doing in this article. I compared the original 1611 KJV to the 1769 edition. Which is better? You decide.

I put in **bold** the differences in meaning between the two translations.

The original 1611 KJV text in this chart came from

<https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Bible-Books/1611-KJV-Books.php>

Verse	1611 KJV	1769 Edition KJV
John 3:16	For God so loued þe world, that he gaue his only begotten Sonne: that whosoever beleeueth in him, should not perish, but haue euerlasting life.	For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.
John 1:12	But as many as receiued him, to them gaue hee power to become the sonnes of God, euen to them that beleuee on his Name:	But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, <i>even</i> to them that believe on his name:
John 3:36	He that beleeueth on the Sonne, hath euerlasting life: and he that beleeueth not the Sonne, shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him.	He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

Romans 10:9,10	That if thou shalt confesse with thy mouth the Lord Iesus, and shalt beleue in thine heart, that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saued. For with the heart man beleueeth vnto righteousnesse, and with the mouth confession is made vnto saluation.	That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Iesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.
Deuteronomy 26:1	And it shall be when thou art come in vnto the land which the Lord giueth thee for an inheritance, and possessest it, and dwellest therein:	And it shall be, when thou art come in unto the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee for an inheritance, and possessest it, and dwellest therein;
Joshua 13:29	And Moses gaue inheritance vnto the halfe tribe of Manasseh: and this was the possession of the halfe tribe of Manasseh , by their families.	And Moses gave inheritance unto the half tribe of Manasseh: and this was the possession of the half tribe of the children of Manasseh by their families.
Isaiah 14:12	How art thou fallen from heauen, O Lucifer, sonne of the morning? how art thou cut downe to the ground, which didst weaken the nations?	How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!
Daniel 9:27	And hee shall confirme the couenant with many for one weeke: and in the midst of the weeke he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the ouerspreading of abominations hee shall make it desolate, euen vntill the consummation, & that determind, shalbe powred vpon the desolate.	And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the ouerspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determind shall be poured upon the desolate.
Ruth 3:15	Also he said, Bring the vaile that thou hast vpon thee, and holde it. And when she helde it, he measured sixe measures of barley, and laide it on her: and he went into the citie.	Also he said, Bring the vail that thou hast upon thee, and hold it. And when she held it, he measured six measures of barley, and laid it on her: and she went into the city.
Psalms 69:32	The humble shall see this, and be glad: and your heart shall liue that seeke good .	The humble shall see this, and be glad: and your heart shall live that seek God .
Jeremiah 49:1	Concerning the Ammonites, thus sayth the Lord; hath Israel no sonnes? Hath he no heire? Why then doth their king inherit God , and his people dwell in his cities?	Concerning the Ammonites, thus saith the LORD; Hath Israel no sons? hath he no heir? why then doth their king inherit Gad , and his people dwell in his cities?

<p>1 Corinthians 4:9</p>	<p>For I thinke that God hath set forth vs the Apostles last, as it were approved to death. For wee are made a spectacle vnto the world, and to Angels, and to men.</p>	<p>For I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed to death: for we are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men.</p>
----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

My opinion: The 1769 edition is better not only in spelling and the fact it uses italics for words that are not present in the original, but it corrects errors in the translation! Jeremiah 49:1 in the 1611 edition is obviously wrong! It should say Gad, not God!

And lo and behold, the 1599 Geneva Bible in every case of a difference in meaning between the 1611 and 1769 edition of the KJV of verses in the chart, agrees with the 1769 edition! That in my opinion shoots the biggest hole in Mr. Doerr's assertion that the 1769 edition is corrupt.

I worked as a translator/ proofread for 11 years. I don't believe any translation can be perfect. There's always something lost in translation. What we have today with the KJV is sufficient to lead any English speaker to the knowledge of salvation in Christ. If we could read the original Hebrew and Greek, we would know the meanings of the names of all the people! This is true in the Japanese language. I know Japanese and can tell you the meanings of the names just by the Chinese characters they use to write them. For example, Ichiro, the name of the famous Japanese baseball player means "first son". How many English speakers know that? There's no Japanese person who doesn't know that.

I use only the KJV 1769 edition on this website, but I am not a KJV onlyist! I also like the Geneva Bible and think some of the verses are even better than the KJV. KJV Onlyism claim that the KJV is the ONLY Word of God is very unreasonable in my opinion. What about people who don't read English? What about their Bibles? Are they devoid of the Word of God just because they can't understand the English KJV? That being said, I don't like modern translations simply because the New Testament is not translated from Textus Receptus but from corrupt manuscripts from Westcott and Hort. See [Reasons Why the King James Version is the Best English Translation of the Bible](#)

Can the 1769 edition of the KJV be improved? I know this sounds heretical to KJV only people, but I definitely think so. I would change Easter of Acts 12:4 to Passover, Jesus of Hebrews 4:8 to Joshua, and all 20 cases of the word "conversation" to conduct or behavior. Does that mean I am adding to, subtracting from, or changing the Word of God? I am merely improving a translation, correcting mistakes, and using words that mean today what the Holy Spirit meant in the original language text.

If you don't agree with this article and think I am missing something, please send me the references of Scripture you think are wrong in the 1769 edition and are correct in the 1611 edition, and I will add them to the chart.

The Geneva Bible Notes Explain Revelation 17 & 18



The Geneva Bible clearly points the finger at the Roman Catholic Church for being the woman and the whore of Revelation 17 and 18.

The Mystics, The Masons and Dallas Theological Seminary



Albert Pike

I was impressed by this article by James Whisler I found on

<https://historicist.info/articles/dts.htm> and thought to repost the first part of it. The website is in need of repair. There are broken links to images and other technical errors.

It must first be brought to the reader's attention that the mystery religions, including Freemasonry, have employed symbolism as a form of communication. The hidden understanding of symbols was a necessary part of the initiation into the mysteries. This has been going on for thousands of years and is still in existence today, with the common masses never catching on. The Masonic Master Reference Bible states "Freemasonry has been defined as a peculiar system of morality, veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbols."

The greatly honored 33rd degree Freemason and Luciferian Albert Pike wrote:

Masonry, like all the Religions, all the Mysteries, Hermeticism, and Alchemy, conceals its secrets from all except the Adepts and Sages, or the Elect, and uses false explanations and misinterpretations of its symbols to mislead those who deserve only to be misled; to conceal the Truth, which it calls light, and draw them away from it."

Dallas Theological Seminary (DTS) is no stranger to this symbolism. I contacted DTS about their logo and asked them what it symbolized. Their exact response is reproduced below:

The Dallas Seminary logo features a three part flame symbolizing the Father, Son and Holy Spirit illuminating the Scriptures which are shown in two parts indicating both Testaments. Thanks for the inquiry.

Keith Yates,
Creative Director, Dallas Seminary



Dallas Theological
Seminary Logo

I don't believe the Lord wants us symbolizing the Trinity in art. Acts 17:29 says "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think

that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device." In studying DTS, however, I have come to the conclusion that it means something far different. Bear in mind that Satan has a counterfeit trinity.

I believe and intend to prove that the flame represents the illumination of the ancient mystery religions for the initiates only and the books represent the ancient poisonous Alexandrian manuscripts, also written by initiates. All the modern bible versions are based on these manuscripts and without them, the dispensationalists could not teach their doctrines. I would hope that reader does not jump to any conclusions but lets the evidence speak for itself.

The three-fold flame, which is a symbol popular with the Luciferians and new agers today (symbolizing a false trinity), is attributed to the occultist and Rosicrucian Saint Germain who lived about three centuries ago.

"The Christ flame within the heart embodies the same qualities of love, wisdom, and power that manifest in the heart of the Almighty, in the heart of your I AM Presence, and in the heart of your Christ Self. Right within your own body temple are three fiery plumes of the Holy Spirit-pink, yellow, and blue pulsations of living flame. Thus the heavenly Trinity gains expression in the world of material form. And the energies of Father (blue), Son (yellow), and Holy Spirit (pink) are resplendent in the heart of man. Also corresponding with the trinity of body, mind, and soul, the threefold flame supplies man's needs for power to run the body (the faith and goodwill of the divine intent); wisdom to nourish the mind (illumination and the right use of the knowledge of the Law); and love to fulfill the destiny of the soul in conscious outer manifestation (a just and merciful compassion that is always rewarded by individual creative fulfillment)"

Now as far as the area they selected for their mystery school, the Dallas area is sacred to Freemasonry because of its location. It is near the 33rd parallel of the 33rd degree of latitude. The number 33 is revered by Masons. (Lucifer took 33% of the angels when he left heaven. There are 33 degrees of initiation in Scottish Rite Freemasonry. The number is integral to their sacred geometry.) The founding Scottish Rite Masonic temple in America is located in Charleston, South Carolina, which is on the 33rd degree of latitude. Initiates in the Mysteries believe they can harness spiritual energies and receive an occultic blessing on their labors by carrying them out on their sacred grounds. Is it any coincidence that Tim LaHaye set up his Pretrib Rapture Research Center in [Washington D.C., a city designed by Freemasons](#) with the streets forming Masonic symbols? LaHaye was located in a plaza, on a street named after Pierre Charles L'enfant, the Mason who designed the city. This street forms one leg of the Masonic compass, an area believed by the Luciferians to hold strong occultic energies. By another coincidence, LaHaye, moved his research center to the Dallas area. Wouldn't you agree that he is receiving some kind of spiritual blessing on the sales

of his latest books? Do you believe this blessing is from God?

Some might mistake it for a Christian symbol, but Masonic author Ray Denslow reveals its true meaning:

“The Cross and Crown may be said to be confined almost exclusively to the historical degrees in Masonry as exemplified in the various orders of knighthood of York and Scottish rites. In Gaul we find the cross to have been a solar symbol when it had equal arms and angles; to the Phoenicians, it was an instrument of sacrifice to their God, Baal; and to the Egyptians, the crux ansata was his symbol of eternal life.” (Ray V. Denslow, *Masonic Portraits*, Transactions of this Missouri Lodge of Research, vol. #29, p.7

Masonic authority Albert Pike also wrote of the meaning of the above symbol in his book *Morals and Dogma*, explaining that it has a sexual connotation to it as well. (Why is this symbol on a ‘Christian’ book cover ?).

Dealey Plaza, named after 33rd degree Freemason George Bannerman Dealey, was the site of the first Masonic Temple in Dallas; of course, the Dealeys were associated with it. George used his newspaper the Dallas Morning News, and his contacts within the paper industry to promote Scofield and his teachings and to screen out information that would embarrass the man. This is the standard operating procedure with the powermongers behind the scenes and happens every day. Luciferians place their people in key positions in the media and are then able to promote their men in key positions in politics and religion, which promote certain policies and doctrines in order to direct public opinion. Illuminist newspaper tycoon William Randolph Hearst used his resources to introduce 33rd degree Freemason Billy Graham to the world. Biographical researcher Canfield penned the following example in relation to Scofield’s death:

“On Sunday, November 27, 1921, the whole day was given over to memorial services for Scofield at the First Church in Dallas. The Dallas Morning News, the next day, devoted five columns on its page 7 to report the affair. Looking at the report of the day, one gets an impression that some tributes dripped with goeey syrup if they had any truth in them.”

One of Scofield’s students, Dr. W. Irving Carroll gave the eulogy at his funeral. In regards to Scofield’s work, he stated:

“He was the greatest Bible expositor of his generation and there have been none to equal him in clarity of thought nor brevity of thought of any generation. I am saying this, not in fulsome flattery of the man’s life, but simply in recognition of a great fact. I say again that no man ever had a deeper insight into the revealed truth of Scriptures nor a broader grasp.”



C.I. Scofield

But was Scofield the greatest bible expositor of his generation? Did he really know what he was talking about? Once again Canfield shines some light. In an analysis of a statement made by Scofield to the effect that Charles Finney and Charles Spurgeon preached the same doctrine, Canfield remarked "His assertion that Spurgeon and Finney preached the same message is incorrect. The views of the two men were so far apart that reconciliation is impossible. The statement is another suggestion that Scofield's knowledge was superficial and his expressed views suited to occasion and congregation." After reading Canfield's excellent biography about the man and finding out about all his scandals which his associates helped cover-up, I would be hard-pressed to say he was anything more than a confidence man employed to promote a false teaching.


Quite possibly the biggest momentum builder to the dispensationalist movement was the Scofield Reference Bible. It has even been suggested that dispensationalism might have died out if not for the timely introduction of this Reference Bible. In preparation for writing his bible, Scofield felt some strange need to travel to the British Isle for 'research'. What he was really doing was going to get instructions from the controversial scholars B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort. There is much evidence out there documenting how **these two Bible scholars were deeply involved into occultic societies and mystery religions** including Roman Catholicism. Scofield gratefully acknowledged the help of Hort and Westcott in the introduction of his 1909 Scofield Reference Bible. These two men are responsible for translating the corrupted Alexandrian manuscripts Sianaticus and Vaticanus into the Revised Version of the Bible in 1881.

Scofield wanted to use the Revised Version for his reference Bible but in the climate of the times, the KJV was much more popular and respected (oh the times they are a changing), so he knew his reference work would not sell as well if coupled with the RV. But **the King James Version is highly incompatible with the dispensationalist doctrines**. In order to correct this problem, he inserted footnotes in crucial areas where the KJV disagreed with

the RV and the Alexandrian manuscripts. Each footnote "corrected" the KJV text to comply with the corrupted manuscripts.

DTS has inherited his contempt for the KJV. A thorough examination of DTS shows that the only King James Bible they really tolerate is the one doctored up by Dr. Scofield. They have since come out with new Scofield Reference Bibles in NIV (1984), NASB (1988), and NKJV (1989). The DTS Doctrinal Statement, which all faculty must affirm to each year, contains all the basic elements of dispensationalism (a pretrib rapture, a separation between Israel and the Church, a seven-year tribulation, etc.). Consequently, every student attending is automatically taught these doctrines, as well as their contempt for the KJV. Therefore, a majority of the books and articles they produce will include these same heretical teachings.

Reasons Why the King James Version is the Best English Translation of the Bible



The King James New Testament, alone of all the English translations, is based on the Greek text known as the Textus Receptus, which is the Greek New Testament used during the spiritual awakenings of the Reformation period. Before the invention of printing, of course, the Scriptures were transmitted by hand copying and circulation. The generally acknowledged and accepted manuscripts were, of course, widely used and so wore out fairly quickly and had to be continuously recopied on fresh papers or parchments.

Great numbers were always current, however, and there was thus a continual self-checking process going on, securing the text against any significant accumulation of copyists' errors. It was from this source that the Greek New

Testament known as the Textus Receptus (“Received Text”) was compiled. The great majority of the surviving manuscripts agree with this so-called “Byzantine” text, as preserved through the early centuries of Christianity by the Greek-speaking churches themselves.

When a manuscript was prepared, which either through carelessness or deliberate intent, contained significant errors or alterations, it naturally would tend to be discarded when its character was discovered. Unless it was deliberately discarded, however, it would tend to survive longer than others, for the very reason that it was not being used. This is probably the case with the so-called **Sinaitic and Vatican** manuscripts, also known as Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus / Codices B and Aleph, which were discovered in the 19th Century and which were older than any of the still-preserved manuscripts of the Received Text. It was *assumed* that because the Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus manuscripts were older than the manuscripts of the Byzantine text, they are therefore better and more accurate. This is not so! Though the manuscripts were older and appeared in better shape, it was because they were not used because of the many errors found in them!

Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus are both of dubious origin. It has been speculated by some scholars that one or both were produced by Eusebius of Caesarea on orders of Emperor Constantine. If this is true, then these manuscripts are linked to Eusebius’s teacher **Origen of Alexandria**, both known for interpreting Scripture allegorically as opposed to literally. Scholars have designated these manuscripts as Alexandrian, linking them with **Alexandria, Egypt, the region responsible for early heresies such as Gnosticism and Arianism** (the doctrine of the denial of the Trinity). Both are dated in the mid to late fourth century.

These manuscripts contain an **amazing number of obvious and careless mistakes and probably even some deliberate alterations**. Nevertheless, because of *their antiquity*, they were accepted by the scholars Westcott, Hort, Nestle and others as the basis for their Greek New Testaments, which were published in the 19th Century and which have in turn served as the basis for **all the subsequent modern English translations!!!** In other words, if you read any translation of the Bible in modern English, you are reading a translation based on a *corrupt* manuscript!


Thus there is good reason to believe that the King James Version is still the most accurate and reliable translation we have. In view of the other considerations noted above, there is certainly as yet no good reason to replace it with some ephemeral modern translation.

More reasons why the KJV is superior to all modern English translations

1. It had the most spiritual translators, real believing translators, and therefore the most spiritual and correct translation.
2. It’s the best known, the most widespread, and the most recognizable.—And if you quote it, most people will recognize it and know you’re quoting them the Bible.

3. It has been time-tested for nearly 400 years, and if you accept what it says and obey it, it works!
4. It was written at the time the English language was spoken and used in its most perfect form.
5. The English of the King James Version isn't nearly as hard to follow as its critics say. In fact, it is in general written in a much simpler vocabulary, with a higher percentage of one and two-syllable words, than almost any of the modern translations. The King James Version, in fact, is almost universally acknowledged as the greatest of all masterpieces of English literature.
6. It is no longer copyrighted, meaning anybody can reprint it, copy it, or publish it and they don't have to pay a copyright fee.
7. The King James Version was not just the work of one man, but the work of a very large conference of the best men of God in England, and every problem was worked out by God's inspiration and the majority opinion.
8. The translators decided not to add footnotes and explanatory notes, preferring to let the Word speak for itself.

[The King James Version compared to the Geneva Bible](#)



The Geneva Bible preceded the King James translation by 51 years. It was the primary Bible of 16th century Protestantism and was the Bible used by William Shakespeare, Oliver Cromwell, John Knox, John Donne, and John Bunyan, author of Pilgrim's Progress. It was the first Bible ever that included chapter and verse numbers! All subsequent Bibles followed suit.

In this post I am not saying I think the Geneva Bible translation is better than the KJV. I just think it's interesting to compare the two translations.

I have been using the King James version of the Bible for my own personal Bible studies for the past 40 years. It's only in the past year or so I learned about the Geneva Bible, the Bible of the Protestant Reformers before the KJV was translated. Some people have attacked the KJV saying it was based on the Roman Catholic Vultage and / or changed according to the whims of King James of England. I was therefore intrigued to see what the Geneva Bible has

to say. Using my Google Android Tablet PC I found a Bible app in which I downloaded the Geneva Bible and started to read from the Gospel of Matthew. It's been absolutely fascinating! The spellings are different but still understandable. In words in modern English that contain the letter V, the letter U is often substituted. Example: "lives" = "liues". Different words are sometimes used in the Geneva Bible which, in my opinion, seem to make the meaning of some verses clearer than the KJV!

This list is by no means comprehensive. I am comparing only the changes I personally find interesting. And I hope to disprove the notion that KJV is doctrinally different from the Geneva Bible. I have not found a significant difference in wording in the Geneva Bible that conflicts in doctrine with the KJV.

Verse	KJV	Geneva
Matthew 4:17:	From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.	From that time Iesus began to preach, and to say, Amende your liues: for the kingdome of heauen is at hand. (So far, this is my favorite difference!)
Matthew 5:44	But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;	But I say vnto you, Loue your enemies: blesse them that curse you: doe good to them that hate you, and pray for them which hurt you, and persecute you,
Matthew 5:47	And if ye salute your brethren only,	And if ye be friendly to your brethren onely,
Matthew 6:7	But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.	Also when ye pray, vse no vaine repetitions as the Heathen: for they thinke to be heard for their much babbling.
Matthew 6:24b	Ye cannot serve God and mammon.	Ye cannot serue God and riches.
Matthew 6:34	Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.	Care not then for the morowe: for the morowe shall care for it selfe: the day hath ynough with his owne griefe.
Matthew 16:22	Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee.	Then Peter tooke him aside, and began to rebuke him, saying, Master, pitie thy selfe: this shall not be vnto thee.

Matthew 16:24	¶Then said Jesus unto his disciples, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me."	Jesus then saide to his disciples, If any man will follow me, let him forsake himselfe: and take vp his crosse, and follow me.
Matthew 15:6	And honour not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition.	Though hee honour not his father, or his mother, shalbe free: thus haue ye made the commandment of God of no aucthoritie by your tradition.
Matthew 21:9b	Hosanna in the highest.	Hosanna thou which art in the highest heauens.
Matthew 11:28	Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest .	Come vnto me, all ye that are wearie and laden, and I will ease you .
Matthew 13:47	Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind :	Againe, the kingdom of heauen is like vnto a drawe net cast into the sea, that gathereth of all kindes of things .
Matthew 11:19	The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber , a friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children.	The sonne of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Beholde a glutton and a drinker of wine , a friend vnto Publicanes and sinners: but wisdom is iustified of her children.
Matthew 26:49	And forthwith he came to Jesus, and said, Hail, master ; and kissed him.	And forthwith he came to Jesus, and sayd, God saue thee, Master , and kissed him.
Matthew 26:74	Then began he to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man. And immediately the cock crew.	Then began hee to curse himselfe , and to sweare, saying, I knowe not the man. And immediatly the cocke crewe.
John 1:12	But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:	But as many as receiued him, to them he gaue prerogatiue to be the sonnes of God, euen to them that beleue in his Name.
John 1:30	This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me: for he was before me .	This is he of whom I saide, After me commeth a man, which was before me: for he was better then I .

John 3:16	For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.	or God so loued the worlde, that hee hath giuen his onely begotten Sonne, that whosoeuer beleeueth in him, should not perish, but haue everlasting life.
John 3:36	He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.	Hee that beleeueth in the Sonne, hath everlasting life, and hee that obeyeth not the Sonne, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.
John 4:10	Jesus answered and said unto her, "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water .	Jesus answered and saide vnto her, If thou knewest that gift of God, and who it is that saieth to thee, Giue mee drinke, thou wouldest haue asked of him, and hee woulde haue giuen thee, water of life .
John 4:23	But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him.	But the houre commeth, and nowe is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit, and trueth: for the Father requireth euen such to worship him.
John 5:35	He was a burning and a shining light : and ye were willing for a season to reioice in his light.	He was a burning, and a shining candle : and ye would for a season haue reioyced in his light.
John 6:71	He spake of Judas Iscariot the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve.	Now he spake it of Iudas Iscariot the sonne of Simon: for hee it was that shoulde betraie him, though he was one of the twelue
John 7:4	For there is no man that doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly . If thou do these things, shew thyself to the world.	For there is no man that doeth any thing secretely, and hee himselve seeketh to be famous . If thou doest these things, shewe thy selfe to the worlde.
John 7:5	For neither did his brethren believe in him.	For as yet his brethren beleued not in him.
John 7:38	He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water .	Hee that beleeueth in mee, as saith the Scripture, out of his bellie shall flowe riuers of water of life .
John 8:50	And I seek not mine own glory : there is one that seeketh and iudgeth.	And I seeke not mine owne praise : but there is one that seeketh it, and iudgeth.

John 9:30	The man answered and said unto them, Why herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence he is, and yet he hath opened mine eyes.	The man answered, and sayde vnto them, Doutlesse , this is a marueilous thing, that ye know not whence he is, and yet he hath opened mine eyes.
John 11:12	Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well .	Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleepe, he shalbe safe .
John 11:13	Howbeit Jesus spake of his death: but they thought that he had spoken of taking of rest in sleep.	Howbeit, Iesus spake of his death: but they thought that he had spoken of the naturall sleepe.
John 11:35	Jesus wept.	And Iesus wept.
John 12:48	He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.	He that refuseth me, and receiueth not my wordes, hath one that iudgeth him: the worde that I haue spoken, it shall iudge him in the last day.
John 13:16	Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him	Verely, verely I say vnto you, The seruant is not greater then his master, neither the ambassadour greater then he that sent him.
John 13:17	If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.	If ye know these things, blessed are ye, if ye doe them.
John 14:2	In my Father's house are many mansions : if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.	In my Fathers house are many dwelling places : if it were not so, I would haue tolde you: I go to prepare a place for you.
John 14:18	I will not leave you comfortless : I will come to you.	I will not leaue you fatherles : but I will come to you.
John 14:23	Jesus answered and said unto him, "If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.	Iesus answered, and sayd vnto him, If any man loue me, he will keepe my worde, and my Father will loue him, and we wil come vnto him, and wil dwell with him.
John 14:27	Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid .	Peace I leaue with you: my peace I giue vnto you: not as the worlde giueth, giue I vnto you. Let not your heart be troubled, nor feare .

John 15:8	Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples.	Herein is my Father glorified, that ye beare much fruite, and be made my disciples.
John 15:13	Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.	Greater love then this hath no man, when any man bestoweth his life for his friendes.
John 16:2	They shall put you out of the synagogues : yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.	They shall excommunicate you : yea, the time shall come, that whosoever killeth you, will thinke that he doeth God service.
John 18:22	And when he had thus spoken, one of the officers which stood by struck Jesus with the palm of his hand , saying, Answerest thou the high priest so?	When he had spoken these thinges, one of the officers which stode by, smote Iesus with his rod , saying, Answerest thou the hie Priest so?
John 18:40	Then cried they all again, saying, Not this man, but Barabbas. Now Barabbas was a robber .	Then cried they all againe, saying, Not him, but Barabbas: nowe this Barabbas was a murtherer .
John 19:3	And said, Hail, King of the Jews! and they smote him with their hands .	And saide, Haile, King of the Iewes. And they smote him with their roddes .
John 20:28	And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God.	Then Thomas answered, and said vnto him, Thou art my Lord, and my God.
John 21:5	Then Jesus saith unto them, " Children , have ye any meat?" They answered him, No.	Iesus then said vnto them, Syr , haue ye any meate? They answered him, No.
Acts 2:25	For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved :	For Dauid sayeth concerning him, I beheld the Lord alwaies before me: for hee is at my right hand, that I should not be shaken .
Acts 2:27	Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell , neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.	Because thou wilt not leaue my soule in graue , neither wilt suffer thine Holy one to see corruption.

Acts 4:13	¶Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men , they marvelled; and they took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus.	Now when they sawe the boldnes of Peter and Iohn, and vnderstoode that they were vnlearned men and without knowledge , they marueiled, and knew them, that they had bin with Iesus:
Acts 4:16	Saying, What shall we do to these men? for that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all them that dwell in Jerusalem; and we cannot deny it.	Saying, What shall we doe to these men? for surely a manifest signe is done by them, and it is openly knowen to all them that dwell in Hierusalem: and we cannot denie it.
Acts 5:33	¶When they heard that, they were cut to the heart , and took counsel to slay them.	Now when they heard it, they brast for anger , and consulted to slay them.
Acts 5:39	But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.	But if it be of God, ye can not destroy it, lest ye be found euen fighters against God.
Acts 12:19	And when Herod had sought for him, and found him not, he examined the keepers, and commanded that they should be put to death . And he went down from Judæa to Cæsarea, and there abode.	And when Herod had sought for him, and found him not, he examined the keepers, and commanded them to be led to be punished . And he went downe from Iudea to Cesarea, and there abode.
Acts 13:10	And said, O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?	And sayde, O full of all subiltie and all mischiefe, the childe of the deuill, and enemie of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to peruert the straight waies of the Lord?
Acts 14:2	But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds evil affected against the brethren.	And the vnbeleeuing Iewes stirred vp, and corrupted the mindes of the Gentiles against the brethren.
Acts 15:20	But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood.	But that we send vnto them, that they abstaine themselues from filthinesse of idoles, and fornication, and that that is strangled, and from blood.
Acts 16:22	And the multitude rose up together against them: and the magistrates rent off their clothes, and commanded to beat them.	The people also rose vp together against them, and the gouernours rent their clothes, and commanded them to be beaten with roddes .

Acts 16:31	And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.	And they saide, Beleeue in the Lord Iesus Christ, and thou shalt be saued, and thine household.
Acts 17:6	And when they found them not, they drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also;	But when they found them not, they drew Iason and certaine brethren vnto the heads of the citie, crying, These are they which haue subuerted the state of the world , and here they are,
Acts 17:12	Therefore many of them believed; also of honourable women which were Greeks, and of men, not a few.	Therefore many of them beleeued, and of honest women, which were Grecians, and men not a fewe.
Acts 18:13	Saying, This fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law .	Saying, This fellow persuadeth me to worship God otherwise then the Lawe appointeth .
Acts 18:28	For he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publickly, shewing by the scriptures that Jesus was Christ.	For mightily hee confuted publickly the Iewes, with great vehemencie , shewing by the Scriptures, that Iesus was that Christ.
Acts 19:9	But when divers were hardened, and believed not , but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and separated the disciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus.	But when certaine were hardened, and disobeyed , speaking euill of the way of God before the multitude, hee departed from them, and separated the disciples, and disputed dayly in the schoole of one Tyrannus.
Acts 20:32	And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up , and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified.	And nowe brethren, I commend you to God, and to the worde of his grace, which is able to build further , and to giue you an inheritance, among all them, which are sanctified.
Romans 1:27	And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly , and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet.	And likewise also the men left the naturall vse of the woman, and burned in their lust one toward another, and man with man wrought filthinesse , and receiued in themselues such recompence of their errour, as was meete.
Romans 3:23	For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;	For there is no difference: for all haue sinned, and are deprived of the glorie of God,

Romans 8:22	For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.	For we knowe that euery creature groaneth with vs also , and trauaileth in paine together vnto this present.
Romans 8:28	And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose.	Also we knowe that all thinges worke together for the best vnto them that loue God, euen to them that are called of his purpose.
Romans 11:11	I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy .	I demaund then, Haue they stumbled, that they should fall? God forbid: but through their fall, saluation commeth vnto the Gentiles, to prouoke them to follow them .
Romans 12:1	I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service .	I Beseech you therefore brethren, by the mercies of God, that yee giue vp your bodies a liuing sacrifice, holy, acceptable vnto God, which is your reasonable seruing of God .
Romans 12:3	For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think ; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.	For I say through the grace that is giuen vnto me, to euery one that is among you, that no man presume to vnderstande aboue that which is meete to vnderstand , but that he vnderstande according to sobrietie, as God hath dealt to euery man the measure of faith.
Romans 13:13	Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying.	So that wee walke honestly, as in the day: not in gluttonie , and drunkennesse, neither in chambering and wantonnes, nor in strife and enuying.
Romans 14:1	Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations.	Him that is weake in the faith, receiue vnto you, but not for controuersies of disputations.
I Corinthians 2:14	But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.	But the naturall man perceiueth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishnesse vnto him: neither can hee knowe them, because they are spiritually discerned.

I Corinthians 4:1	Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.	Let a man so thinke of vs, as of the ministers of Christ, and disposers of the secrets of God:
I Corinthians 4:5	Therefore iudge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness , and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: and then shall every man have praise of God.	Therefore iudge nothing before the time, vntill the Lord come, who will lighten things that are hid in darknesse , and make the counsels of the hearts manifest: and then shall euery man haue praise of God.
I Corinthians 6:9	Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate , nor abusers of themselves with mankind ,	Knowe yee not that the vnrighteous shall not inherite the kingdome of God? Be not deceiued: neither fornicatours, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor wantons , nor buggerers ,
I Corinthians 6:16	What? know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? for two, saith he, shall be one flesh.	Doe ye not knowe, that he which coupleth himselfe with an harlot, is one body? for two, sayeth he, shalbe one flesh.
I Corinthians 10:13	There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape , that ye may be able to beare it.	There hath no tentation taken you, but such as appertaine to man: and God is faithfull, which will not suffer you to be tempted aboue that you be able, but wil euen giue the issue with the tentation , that ye may be able to beare it.
I Corinthians 12:3	Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed : and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.	Wherefore, I declare vnto you, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Iesus execrable : also no man can say that Iesus is the Lord, but by the holy Ghost.
I Corinthians 13:1	Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity , I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.	Though I speake with the tongues of men and Angels, and haue not loue , I am as sounding brasse, or a tinkling cymbal.

I Corinthians 13:4	Charity suffereth long, and is kind ; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up,	Loue suffreth long: it is bountifull : loue enuieth not: loue doeth not boast it selfe: it is not puffed vp:
I Corinthians 13:5	Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil;	It doeth no vncomely thing: it seeketh not her owne things: it is not prouoked to anger : it thinketh not euill:
I Corinthians 13:13	And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.	And nowe abideth faith, hope and loue, euen these three: but the chiefest of these is loue.
II Corinthians 2:11	Lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices .	Lest Satan should circumuent vs: for we are not ignorant of his enterprises .
II Corinthians 2:17	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.	For wee are not as many, which make marchandise of the woorde of God: but as of sinceritie, but as of God in ye sight of God speake we in Christ.
II Corinthians 3:1	Do we begin again to commend ourselves? or need we, as some others, epistles of commendation to you, or letters of commendation from you?	Doe we begin to praise our selues againe? or neede we as some other, epistles of recommendation vnto you, or letters of recommendation from you?
II Corinthians 4:2	But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty , not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.	But haue cast from vs ye clokes of shame , and walke not in craftines, neither handle we the worde of God deceitfully: but in declaration of the trueth we approve our selues to every mans conscience in the sight of God
II Corinthians 4:4	In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not , lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.	In whom the God of this world hath blinded the mindes, that is, of the infidels , that the light of the glorious Gospell of Christ, which is the image of God, should not shine vnto them.
II Corinthians 5:9	Wherefore we labour , that, whether present or absent , we may be accepted of him.	Wherefore also we couet , that both dwelling at home , and remouing from home , we may be acceptable to him.

II Corinthians 5:17	Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.	Therefore if any man be in Christ, let him be a new creature. Olde things are passed away: beholde, all things are become newe.
---------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Conclusion

Though this was an interesting study, I feel the need to move on to other subjects for now. And though I felt some of the translations of the Geneva Bible added more clarity to the verse, I cannot say it is an overall better translation than the King James Version. Here are two examples:

Verse	KJV	Geneva
Leviticus 18:6	None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness : I am the Lord	None shall come neere to any of ye kinred of his flesh to vncover her shame : I am the Lord.

For sure it's incorrect to call nakedness "shame". Adam and Eve were naked in the Garden and they were NOT ashamed!

Verse	KJV	Geneva
II Samuel 21:19	And there was again a battle in Gob with the Philistines, where Elhanan the son of Jaare-oregim, a Beth-lehemite, slew the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.	And there was yet another battel in Gob with the Philistims, where Elhanah the sonne of Iaare-oregim, a Bethlehemite slewe Goliath the Gittite: the staffe of whose speare was like a weauers beame.

So the Geneva Bible makes the same mistake as do many modern translations. Those who know the Bible even a little should know that Elhanan could not possibly have killed Goliath because David already killed him! And both the KJV and the Geneva Bible name the brother of Goliath that Elhanan killed as Lahmi in I Chronicles 20:5

Verse	KJV	Geneva
I Chronicles 20:5	And there was war again with the Philistines; and Elhanan the son of Jair slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, whose spear staff was like a weaver's beam.	And there was yet another battell with the Philistims: and Elhanan the sonne of Iair slewe Lahmi, the brother of Goliath the Gittite, whose spearestaffe was like a weauers beame.

Update to article

I first posted this article on Feb 23, 2014 and have a renewed interest in updating it since I regained possession of the Geneva Bible which [Dr. John G. Hartnett](#) gave me as a present. I sent it with other books from Japan to Guam in April 2018 but because the address I sent it to couldn't receive mail, it was sent back to Japan via the US mainland!

The Protestant Bible at the time of King James of England was the Geneva Bible. King James didn't like it because it included footnotes, some of which seemed to question his authority! He ordered a new translation of the English Bible, one that didn't include footnotes. He ordered the KJV to be translated purely for *political* reasons. Thus the footnotes Protestants used to read were no longer available after the KJV became popular. Protestants began to use the KJV more than the Geneva Bible from the middle of the 17th century. The Geneva Bible thus went out of print and remained out of print for centuries! It was finally reprinted by the Tolle Lege Press in January 2004.

I often wondered what evangelical Christianity today would be like if the King James Version was never translated. Some of the footnotes in the Geneva Bible contain correct interpretations of prophetic scripture that have been misinterpreted since the KJV, and especially so since the **Scotfield Bible** became popular. Scotfield included footnotes in his edition of the KJV, some of which misled the reader into false doctrine.

The greatest example of a mistranslated prophecy that I know of is Daniel 9:27.

And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

The footnotes of the Geneva Bible about the first part of Daniel 9:27 say:

By the preaching of the Gospel he confirmed his promise first to the Jews, and after to the Gentiles.

You see that the early Protestants considered Daniel 9:27 to be a messianic prophecy, not something fulfilled in the future by the Antichrist!

A fundamental Baptist preacher I met on Guam doesn't agree with the eschatology of the Protestant reformers as stated above. He believes that Bible prophecy should be interpreted with a dispensationalist view in mind. One noted preacher, Chuck Baldwin, doesn't agree with him! He thinks the commentaries of the early Protestant reformers such as Matthew Henry are of value. So do I.

For the record, though I mainly use the KJV, I do not think it's a perfect translation. No translation can be perfect! I worked as a professional translator from English to Japanese and am very familiar with the fact that cultural differences add to the difficulties involved in translating from one language to another. A translator can only hope to get the translation as close as possible to the meaning of the author. It's far easier to translate one European language to another European language than it is to translate a European language to an Asian language such as Japanese because European nations are closer in culture to each other than they are to Asian nations. Not only are the words different, but the way of expressing ideas is also

different! One has to be very familiar with both languages to do a good job. It's never 100% perfect.


I see no reason why archaic words in the KJV cannot be updated to modern English words. That said, I still think the old words thee, thou, thine, and ye are pretty cool because it expresses the second person in both singular and plural.

John 3:7 Marvel not that I said unto thee, (singular you) Ye (plural you) must be born again.

You by itself in older English is always plural.

Most European languages still use a singular and plural you. English dropped the singular you because it can sound offensive when used by an authoritarian person when speaking to someone under him.

[What John Nelson Darby Taught About Daniel 9 vs. Prominent Bible Commentators](#)



John Nelson Darby.

John Nelson Darby (18 November 1800 – 29 April 1882) was an Anglo-Irish Bible teacher, one of the influential figures among the original Plymouth Brethren and the founder of the Exclusive Brethren. He is considered to be the father of modern Dispensationalism and Futurism (“the Rapture” in the English vernacular). (Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Nelson_Darby)

The correct interpretation of Daniel chapter 9 and especially verse 27 is

extremely important because it is the 'linchpin' of all Bible prophecy and determines whether you have either a futurism interpretation or a historicist interpretation of Endtime Bible prophecy. This article proves from Darby's own words he had a futurism interpretation of Daniel 9:27 which was contrary to the standard historist interpretation of his contemporaries and those before him. In other words, Protestants before Darby did NOT interpret Daniel 9:27 the way he did. They held to the historist view. And what is the historist view of Daniel 9:27? It's a Messianic prophecy, a prophecy already fulfilled by Jesus Christ! It's *not* a futurist prophecy to be fulfilled by an Endtime Antichrist!



All Bible Scriptures quoted in this article are from the King James Version. All emphasis in *italics* or **bold** are mine.

Quotes from John Darby's Synopsis of Daniel 9 taken from christianity.com

The prince that shall come confirms a covenant with the mass of the Jews. (The form of the word many indicates the mass of the people). This is the first thing that characterises the week; **the Jews form an alliance with the head, at that day, of the people who had formerly overthrown their city and their sanctuary.** They form an **alliance** with the head of the Roman Empire.

Darby is referring to the covenant of Daniel 9:27. Notice how he refers to the covenant as an *alliance*? And Darby calls the "prince" of Daniel 9 the head of the Roman Empire though faithful men of God taught the prince is the Messiah. This is not reading what the Word says, but adding one's subjective thoughts to the Word.

But there remained one week yet unaccomplished with this faithless and perverse, but yet beloved, race, before their iniquity should be pardoned, and everlasting righteousness brought in, and the vision and the prophecy closed by their fulfilment. This week should be distinguished by a covenant which the prince or leader would make with the Jewish people (with the exception of the remnant), and then by the compulsory cessation of their worship through the intervention of this prince.

Again Darby uses the indefinite article for covenant though the popular Bible of his time, the KJV, uses the definite article, *the* covenant. And Darby does not clarify the "prince or leader" he is referring to is in fact Jesus Christ! He is referring to an unknown man in the future which most evangelicals today interpret as the Antichrist. That is why Darby is called the father of Futurism. My friends, this is not how Protestants used to interpret Daniel 9:27.

What the passage tells us is this: first, the prince, **the head that is of the Roman empire**, in the latter days makes a covenant referring to one whole week;

Darby again is referring to someone in the future, "in the latter days" and again says "a covenant". As you will see in this article, Protestants before him knew exactly what the covenant was and why the KJV version of the Bible in Daniel 9 uses the definite article, "the covenant", and not just in verse 27, but before it in verse 4! Darby does *not* make the connection of the covenant of verse 4 being the same as the covenant of verse 27! And why? It would prove his interpretation of a future prince making an alliance with the Jews to be false!

What John Calvin has to say:

Christ took upon him the character of a leader, or assumed the kingly office, when he promulgated the grace of God. This is the confirmation of the covenant of which the angel now speaks. As we have already stated, the legal expiation of other ritual ceremonies which God designed to confer on the fathers is contrasted with the blessings derived from Christ; and we now gather the same idea from the phrase, the confirmation of the covenant. We know how sure and stable was God's covenant under the law; he was from the beginning always truthful, and faithful, and consistent with himself. But as far as man was concerned, the covenant of the law was weak, as we learn from Jeremiah. (Jeremiah 31:31, 32.) I will enter into a new covenant with you, says he; not such as I made with your fathers, for they made it vain. We here observe the difference between the covenant which Christ sanctioned by his death and that of the Jewish law. Thus God's covenant is established with us, because we have been once reconciled by the death of Christ; and at the same time the effect of the Holy Spirit is added, because God inscribes the law upon our hearts; and thus his covenant is not engraven in stones, but in our hearts of flesh, according to the teaching of the Prophet Ezekiel. (Ezekiel 11:19.) Now, therefore, we understand why the angel says, Christ should confirm the covenant for one week, and why that week was placed last in order. In this week will he confirm the covenant with many.

You can see John Calvin believed the covenant had to do with the grace of God, not some Endtime treaty an Antichrist will make.

Geneva Bible Commentary

And he (a) shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: By the preaching of the Gospel he affirmed his promise, first to the Jews, and after to the Gentiles.

You can see the Geneva Bible says it is Christ who confirms the covenant, and it has to do with the preaching of the Gospel.

Matthew Henry

He is called Messiah (Dan. 9:25, 26), which signifies Christ-Anointed (John 1:41), because he received the unction both for himself and for all that are his. [5.] In order to all this the Messiah must be cut off, must die a violent death, and so be cut off from the land of the living, as was foretold, Isa. 53:8. Hence, when Paul preaches the death of Christ, he says that he preached nothing but what the prophet said should come, 26:22, 23. And thus it behoved Christ to suffer. He must be cut off, but not for himself—not for any sin of his own, but, as Caiaphas prophesied, he must die for the people, in our stead and for our good,—not for any advantage of his own (the glory he purchased for himself was no more than the glory he had before, John 17:4, 5); no; it was to atone for our sins, and to purchase life for us, that he was cut off. [6.] He must confirm the covenant with many. He shall introduce a new covenant between God and man, a covenant of grace, since it had become impossible for us to be saved by a covenant of innocence. This covenant he shall confirm by his doctrine and miracles, by his death and resurrection, by the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper, which are the seals of the New Testament, assuring us that God is willing to accept us upon gospel-terms. His death made his testament of force, and enabled us to claim what is bequeathed by it. He confirmed it to the many, to the common people; the poor were evangelized, when the rulers and Pharisees believed not on him. Or, he confirmed it with many, with the Gentile world. He causes all the peace-offerings to cease when he has made peace by the blood of his cross, and by it confirmed the covenant of peace and reconciliation.

Matthew Henry's comment about the Prince of the Covenant

It is here foretold that the people of the prince that shall come shall be the instruments of this destruction, that is, the Roman armies, belonging to a monarchy yet to come (**Christ is the prince that shall come**, and they are employed by him in this service; they are his armies, Matt. 22:7), or **the Gentiles (who, though now strangers, shall become the people of the Messiah) shall destroy the Jews.**

Notice that Matthew Henry puts the prophecy of Daniel 9:27 in the past while John Darby puts it in the future? John Darby is the author of *futurism*, which is interpreting Bible prophecies having a future fulfillment. Before Darby Protestant theologians interpreted Christ fulfilling Daniel 9:27. They didn't look at prophecy as God telling us the future, but as God showing how His

Word was fulfilled in the past which gives glory to God and verifies the Scriptures as the very Word of God! Did Jesus' disciples know when and how the Temple of Solomon was to be destroyed? I submit to you they did not. They only recognized the prophecy *after* it was fulfilled, not before.

Verily I say unto you, **This generation** shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.- Matthew 24:34

What generation was Jesus referring to? My generation? My children's generation? No! The generation of the people He was speaking to! His disciples of 30 A.D.! Most of them lived 40 more years and saw the fulfillment of the prophecies of Matthew 24.

Reading Darby is an exercise of my mental faculties. He is not nearly as clear as John Calvin or Matthew Henry. And his interpretation of prophecy is clearly an *eisegesis* which means "to lead into" – the interpreter injects his own ideas into the text, making it mean whatever he wants. Compare that to Matthew Henry and John Calvin and others who interpreted using *exegesis* which means "lead out of" or letting the Bible speak for itself without speculating. A good exegesis of what the covenant of Daniel 9:27 is found in verse 4 of the same chapter:


And I prayed unto the LORD my God, and made my confession, and said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping **the covenant** and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments; – Daniel 9:4

Where did Darby get his inspiration from? I highly suspect he was influenced by writings of a Jesuit priest for Darby's interpretation of Daniel 9 is what [Jesuit Ribera taught in 1585.](#)

Any comments about this article are appreciated. (As long as you agree with me. :))


The Timeline of Daniel 9:24-27 Illustrated

Ten Shemith cycles of forty-nine years, make up the 490-year prophecy. It starts with the Jewish captives being released from captivity, and it ends with the gentiles being released from their spiritual captivity.



This meme is courtesy of David Nikao Wilcoxson 70thweekofdaniel.com

Traditional Text Line of the Bible Compared to the Alexandrian Text Line



Popular modern English Bible translations such as ASV, RSV, NIV, ESV are based on corrupt manuscripts from the Roman Catholic Church!

Evidence that Textus Receptus IS the Earliest and Therefore the Most Reliable Greek Manuscript of the New Testament



This article is from pages 533 – 537 of a book scanned and sent to me in PDF format by my good friend, [Dr. John Gideon Hartnett](#), a professor at the University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia. It proves all modern translations of the New Testament have errors and omissions because they are not based on the Textus Receptus Greek manuscript. It also shows that the statement in the New International Version (NIV), about Mark 16:9-20 which says, “The earliest manuscripts and some other ancient witnesses do not have verses 9–20” is **false!**

There may be some errors in article for it was scanned from a book and converted to text with optical character recognition software (ORC). Any typos brought to my attention will be corrected as soon as I get word of them.

THE MUTILATION OF MARK 16:9-20 **FLOYD NOLEN JONES, Th.D., Ph.D.**

Most modern Bible versions have a footnote to the effect that “these verses are not in the oldest, best, most reliable Greek manuscripts”. In laymen’s terms this means that Mark 16:9-20 are not in the 4th century Greek manuscripts, *Vaticanus B* and *Sinaiticus Aleph* which were derived from Origen’s (AD 185-254) edited New Testament (a 12th century minuscule also omits the verses. These verses are the Great Commission spoken by our Lord as recorded by Mark. It is an apostolic commission delegating great power to the body of Christ that it may continue the ministry of the Lord Jesus.

Of the approximately 3,119 Greek manuscripts of the NT extant today, none is complete. The segment of text bearing Mark 16 has been lost from many, but over 1,800 contain the section and verses 9-20 are present in all but the 3 cited above. **The footnote is thus unveiled and laid bare as dishonest and**

deliberately misleading in intimating that these verses are not the Word of God. The external evidence is massive. Not only is the Greek manuscript attestation ratio over 600 to 1 in support of the verses (1,800 to 3 =99.99%) – all but one of the approximately 8,000 extant Latin mss, all but one of the approximately 1,000 Syriac versions as well as all the over 2,000 known Greek Lectionaries contain the verses. Mark 16:9-20 were cited by Church “Fathers” who lived 150 years or more *before Vaticanus B* or Sinaiticus Aleph were written: Papias (c.100), Justin Martyr (c.150), Irenaeus (c.180), Tertullian (c.195), and Hippolytus (c.200; see: John Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, London: John Murray Pub, 1883, pp.422-423).

Vaticanus B is an “uncial” manuscript. This means that all the letters are block capitalized; there are no spaces between the words, and there are no vowels. It is a codex (a book, not a scroll) of 759 leaves (10? by 10? inches) with three columns per page, each of which ranges from 40 to 44 lines per column. There are 16 to 18 letters on each line.

Vaticanus B adds to the Bible as it includes the Old Testament Apocrypha. Yet God said don't add. It contains the Epistle of Barnabas (part of the Apocalyptic books of New Testament times) which teaches that water baptism saves the soul, again adding to the Word of God. However, the Word of God has also been deleted as *Vaticanus B* does not include Genesis 1:1-46:28, Psalms 106-138, Matthew 16:2-3, Romans 16:24. The Lord also said not to subtract. It also lacks Paul's Pastoral Epistles (1st and 2nd Timothy, Titus and Philemon). In addition, the Book of Revelation as well as Hebrews 9:15-13:25 are missing. The latter teaches that the once for all sacrifice of Jesus ended the sacraments forever. There is also a conspicuous blank space where Mark 16:9-20 should be.

Erasmus was well aware of *Vaticanus B* and its variant readings in 1515 AD at which time he was preparing the New Testament Greek text. Because they read so differently from the vast majority of the approximately 200 mss he had already examined, Erasmus considered such readings spurious. For example, **Vaticanus B** leaves out “Mystery Babylon the Great”, “the seven heads that are the seven mountains upon which the harlot (the apostate religious system that began at Babel of which the Roman church is a part) sits”, and leaves out “the woman which is that great city which reigns over the kings of the earth” which has seven mountains. All of this may be found in Revelation 17.

Mark 16 of the Vatican MSS has 42 lines in its first column and has only five letters in the 31st line of the second column. Thus there is a blank space left at the end of verse 8 separating Mark from the Gospel of Luke. That it is the only blank column in the entire 759 leaf MSS should alert us that something is very wrong here.

Mark 16:9-20 contains 971 Greek letters. Were 18 letters placed on each line in the void, 967 letters would be placed within it; hence, a scribe need only work in 4 letters over the last 519 (??)lines. As the lines do not all equally end at the same place on their right margin, this would have been an easy task for any scribe. He certainly would not have placed a few scant letters on a single line in the following column to end Mark, leave the other 41 lines blank and then begin Luke at the top of the next column (a new book

was always begun at the top of a column). *Vaticanus* written on very expensive vellum made from antelope hide; thus, great effort would have been taken to avoid such waste.

As the void would faithfully accommodate verses 9-20, the scribe who prepared *Vaticanus* B obviously knew of both the existence of these verses as well as their precise content. The older MSS from which Codex B was copied must have infallibly contained the 12 verses. For whatever reason, the scribe was instructed to leave them out; he obeyed but left a blank in memorial. Never was silence more eloquent! By leaving a space for the omitted verses, *Vaticanus* B brings to our attention a witness more ancient than itself – the earlier scribe! (see: John W. Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to S. Mark*, Oxford and London: James ParkeR & Co. Pub, 1871, p. 165)

Also an uncial, *Codex Sinaiticus Aleph*, (the first letter in the Hebrew alphabet) has 346 leaves or 694 pages each measuring 13 by 15 inches. Made from the finest antelope hides, each page. has four columns with 48 lines per column, and there are 12 to 14 letters to a line. The first portion of *Sinaiticus* was discovered in 1844 by Constantine von Tischendorf in the burn pile at the monastery of St. Catharine at the foot of Mount Sinai at which time he procured but 43 leaves of a Greek Old Testament (i.e., a Septuagint). That which is now known as *Sinaiticus Aleph* II is the codex he brought from Mt. Sinai in 1859.

It is always stated that *Aleph* is a “complete” Greek New Testament, but it is not. It **adds**, for example, the Shepherd of Hermas and Barnabas to the NT. It **omits** John 5:4,8:1-11; Mat. 16:2-3; Rom. 16:24; Mark 16:9-20; 1 John 5:7; Acts 8:37 and about a dozen other verses.

The most significant fact regarding these fourth-century MSS is that in both *Vaticanus* B and *Sinaiticus Aleph*, John 1:18 reads that Jesus was the only begotten “God” instead of the only begotten “Son”. That is the original Arian heresy! The most widely used Greek text in Bible colleges and seminaries today is Eberhard Nestle’s Greek text. Nestle likewise reads... only begotten “God” which means that God had a little God named Jesus who is thus a lesser God than the Father. This means that at first there was big God and He *created* a little god. Thus, Jesus comes out to be a created being, a God with a little “g”, but at the incarnation a god was not begotten. Our Lord already was and always had been God. At the incarnation God begat a son who, in so far His deity is concerned, is *eternal* (Micah 5:2). This reading renders these MSS as untrustworthy and depraved! Yet these are the two manuscripts most venerated by text critics over the past century.

These critics have ignored the text in nearly all the extant Greek manuscripts and have taken about 90% of all the words for their so called “restored” New Testament from *Vaticanus* B. About 7% of the remaining 10% comes from *Sinaiticus Aleph*. What makes this all the more confounding is that these two uncials have over 3,000 significant differences between themselves in the four Gospels alone! That B and Aleph have come to so dominate the discipline of Textual Criticism is all the more bewildering when we consider that no less than Theodore Cressy Skeat (1907-2003), formerly of the British

Museum and coauthor of *Scribes and Correctors of Codex Sinaiticus*, London, Trustees of the British Museum Pub, 1938) believed that codex *Vaticanus* was a reject among the 50 copies that Eusebius prepared for the major churches throughout the Empire at the behest of Emperor Constantine (Bruce Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 3rd ed, Oxford Uni. press, 1992, pp. 47-48)

The resulting corrupt Greek text has replaced the traditional *Textus Receptus* Greek New Testament which the believing Church has always accepted as the inerrant God inspired word. Moreover, its readings have recently been verified as going back at least as far as AD 66. Indeed, until 1904 the Greek Church had guaranteed the Byzantine text of the *Textus Receptus*, but even it finally succumbed to the continual onslaught from so called modern scholarship. Although they still hold fast to the readings found only in the Byzantine manuscripts, the Greek Church has departed from its centuries held declaration that the *Textus Receptus* reflected precisely the NT it had hand copied all the way back to the time of the Apostles and has instead adopted a "majority Byzantine text" mindset. The result is, that even though nearly all are of a very minor nature, the 1904 (as well as their 1960 upgrade) text departs from the *Textus Receptus* almost 2,000 lines (their estimation).

Sinaiticus is not a bound codex. Thus, any given folio (a sheet of paper folded in half to form four pages) can easily be pulled free and later replaced. Tischendorf himself noted that the folio containing Mark 14:54 to 16:8 and Luke 1:1 to 1:56 had not been written by the scribe which he designated as "A". He said that *Sinaiticus* exhibited a different handwriting and ink on this leaf. Tischendorf goes on to add that scribe A wrote all of the New Testament in Aleph except six leaves plus part of a seventh) and that these six (which included Mark 16) were written by A's colleague, scribe D. He stated that D wrote part of the Old Testament and also acted as *diorthota* or corrector of the New Testament. Tischendorf also identified Scribe D as the man who years earlier had penned *Vaticanus* B and left out Mark 16:9-20 resulting in the third column being left blank! Dr. F.H.A. Scrivener, as well as Hort, likewise concluded that D was the scribe of *Vaticanus* (Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, 4th ed, Edward Miller ed, London: George Bell and Sons Pub, 1894, Vol. 2, p. 337, fn. 1).

But there is more. Tischendorf further observed that there is a change in spacing and size of the individual letters. This was done by scribe D in an attempt to place some words in the void left by his removal of verses 9-20 that scribe A had originally placed in the codex. This is seen in that the first three columns on page 228 have 14 Greek letters per line; however, the letters in the fourth column are somewhat wider such that each line has only 12 letters. Coming to page 229 of the folio, we find that the first column has but 11.6 letters to the line, the second column has only three and one third lines with a letter spacing of 10.7. Having accomplished his goal of placing some words in the heretofore blank second column, the situation returns to normal and third column, which begins with Luke 1:1, has 14.1 letters per line and the fourth column 13.9.

Taken together, these circumstances undeniably testify that the sheet is a forgery. For whatever reason, scribe D, who years before had left the blank column in *Vaticanus* B, simply slipped the folio out that scribe A originally

prepared, then rewrote and replaced it. He was obviously determined not to leave another column blank; a circumstance which for years he undoubtedly had to explain to various associates and authorities many times over. Thus, the blank column in B and Aleph are the work of a single scribe and thereby does not constitute the voice of two witnesses against the inclusion of Mark 16:9-20. The omission (or disappearance) is due to only one and the same person – the scribe who wrote B and then revised Aleph, or perhaps to an editor whose directions he acted. Furthermore, we have seen that the blank space Scribe D left in the *Vaticanus* B proves that he knew of the passage. As he is the copyist of that folio in Aleph, rather than being witnesses against the last twelve verses of Mark 16, both B and Aleph must be seen as actually bearing testimony to their existence in antiquity (see: John Burgon, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established*, Edward Miller ed, London: George Bell and Sons, 1896, pp. 298-301).

As to how and why verses 9-20 of Mark 16 came to be omitted in B and Aleph, we do not know with certainty – we were not there. Still, as already shown, we do know that the passage as well as its precise content was well known when these highly vaunted codices were prepared. However, a likely, logical explanation which is borne out by ecclesiastical usage does exist.

It is a historical fact that, at least as early as the 4th century, lessons from the NT were publicly read in the assemblies according to a definite scheme. Moreover, there is no sign of Mark 16:9-20 being omitted until the 4th century AD. Cyril at Jerusalem, Chrysostom at Constantinople and Antioch, and Augustine in North Africa all expressly bear witness that, at least by their time, a Lectionary was fully established in the churches throughout Christendom. The lections of portions of Scripture that were read aloud in public church services, very much like the responsive readings that are given in many of today's assemblies (see: Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to S. Mark, op. cit*, pp. 287-320.)

Just when the Lectionary first took the form of a separate book is not known, but before the Church started producing Lectionaries, the start and end of the lections were indicated by inserting the Greek word ἀρχή (beginning) and το τέλος (the end) in the margin. Often, the latter was placed within the text itself. These words were normally written in red ink so as to disassociate them from the actual Scriptures they were marking off. The twelve verses in dispute are found in every known copy of the Lectionary of the East, and they constitute one lection of the highest possible distinction. From the very first, Mark 16:9-20 has everywhere and by all branches of the Church been used for two of its greatest Festivals – Easter and the Ascension. To suppose a portion of Scripture singled out for such extraordinary honor by the Church universal is a spurious addition to the Gospel of Mark must be recognized as absolutely irrational.

There was an ancient Church-lection for Easter (and other occasions) which ended at the 8th verse of Mark 16, and the Ascension Day lection began at verse nine. Now Eusebius tells us that το τέλος (the end) is written in almost all the copies of the Gospel of Mark immediately after verse 8 (*Burgon, The Last Twelve Verses, op. cit*, p. 315). Thus, it must be seen as most reasonable that at some remote period an uninformed copyist penning Mark came

across “the end” after the final words of verse eight- εφοβουντο-γαρ (“for they were afraid”). Upon seeing εφοβουντο-γαρ το τελο the scribe could well have misunderstood the significance of the liturgical note “το τελο” even τελο) and concluded that it meant to bring Mark’s Gospel to an end there. Such would account for the mutilation of the last chapter of Mark. This would even be more likely should Mark 16:8 occasionally happen to fall at the bottom of the left hand page of a manuscript and the text leaf was damaged or missing (which is true of one of the codices at Moscow). Once the mistake was made, any copies would obviously spread the omission. Of course, it is well known today that το τελο (or τελο) indicates the close of an ecclesiastical lection and not the close of a book.


Writing around 325 AD, Eusebius certainly knew of the so called “long ending” of Mark 16. In a fragment of a lost work addressed “to Marinus” which was written at least two decades before Vaticanus B saw the light of day, Marinus asks Eusebius: “How is it that according to Matthew (28:1) the Saviour appears to have risen ‘in the end of the Sabbath;’ but, according to Mark, ‘early the first day of the week?’” Now this last citation is from Mark 16:9, thus the verse already existed. In his answer, Eusebius replied that someone who wished to get rid of the entire passage (i.e., Mark 16:9-20, fnj) would offer that “... it is not met with in *all* the copies of Mark’s Gospel”. Eusebius goes on to say that a man of such persuasion would add that they were not in “the accurate copies” – that the passage is “met with seldom” and that it was absent from “almost all” copies (Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to S. Mark, op. cit*, pp. 120-123). Here the issue is not whether or not Eusebius supports the verses, the point is he testifies that Mark 16:9-20 was clearly known and its validity debated in his day. Obviously, if the “long ending” existed in Eusebius’ day, how can the text critics insist that it was inserted *after* B and *Aleph* but *before* the time of Erasmus?

Finally, do we really believe that God would have the greatest story ever told end at verse 8: “And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulcher for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any to any man; for they were afraid”. Would God allow the good news of the Gospel of His Son to end with his disciples cringing in fear? Is it really logical or even reasonable that Mark would conclude his Gospel without any reference to the appearance of the risen Christ to His disciples? I think not! Our reader should feel a deep sense of righteous indignation upon learning of the unscrupulous manner in which these verses have been presented by nearly All Bible publishers. το τελο.

You can download a complete work about the Bible from Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones, [Which Version is the Bible](#) in PDF format by right clicking this link and click save link.

A better discourse on this subject can be found on [John Gideon Hartnett’s Revolution for Jesus website](#).

The True Meaning of the Word “Antichrist”



Vicar: (From Latin) vicarius, a *substitute*,
Anti: (From Greek) against, opposite, *instead of*,
Vicar of Christ = Anti Christ


Most people today think of the prefix “anti-” as meaning “against,” but in context of antichrist it actually means “in place of.” Early Christians understood this word to not mean someone who sought to *destroy* Christ but someone who sought to set himself up in *the place of Christ!*

Discerning the truth about John Todd



Views about Illuminati defector John Todd by Gerry Keloney.

KJV the Most Accurate English translation of the Bible



Modern English Bibles are translated from corrupt manuscripts.

The KJV teaches the Trinity



Yes, there is no word "trinity" found anywhere in the Bible. Instead the word, "Godhead" is used in the King James Version and a few other versions. It's interesting that the word "Godhead" appears **3 times** in the KJV! Significant, don't you think?

Acts 17:29 Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that **the Godhead** is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art

and man's device.

Romans 1:20 For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and **Godhead**; so that they are without excuse:

Colossians 2:9 For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the **Godhead** bodily.

Godhead is not found in most modern translations. Other words are substituted for Godhead. Examples.

- "divine being" – New International Version
- "Deity" – Revised Standard Version
- "the deity" – New Revised Standard Version
- "his nature" – Good News Translation
- "divine being" – English Standard Standard Translation
- "Divine Nature" – New King James Version
- "Divine Nature" – New American Standard Bible

Of the 7 examples, the translators of 4 of them didn't even want to capitalize the words referring to Godhead.

"Divine Nature" of the NKJV and the NASB is not the same meaning as Godhead! It's a meaning change. The NKJV people went further than their mission statement. They were supposed to only use modern words to replace archaic ones in the KJV. They weren't supposed to change the meaning.

Most of these translations also omit "**the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost**" in 1 John chapter 5.

1 John 5:7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

Instead, Why? Because the translators did not believe that Jesus was God!

Notice the article "the" precedes Father, Word and Holy Ghost? This is to denote they are unique!

the
/T̩hē/
Adjective

Used to refer to a person, place, or thing that is unique: "the Queen"; "the Mona Lisa"; "the Nile".

Jesus was THE Christ, not "a christ". He was The anointed one. Anybody else to claims to be Christ is a liar. There was only ONE CHRIST, and that was Jesus!

This post was inspired by listening to a talk from Pastor Mike Hoggard of <http://watchmanvideobroadcast.com/>

Did God really tell Abraham to Sacrifice Isaac?



The answer is NO! Not according to the 1611 King James version of the English Bible!

Genesis 22:2 And he said, Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and **offer** him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.

The KJV says only to “offer” Isaac as a sacrifice, not to actually *do* it. Abraham obeyed God and did exactly what He said, He offered Isaac *for* a burnt offering, *for* a sacrifice.

Genesis 22:9 And they came to the place which God had told him of; and Abraham built an altar there, and laid the wood in order, and bound Isaac his son, and *laid him on the altar upon the wood*.

Abraham apparently *thought*, meaning *assumed* God meant for him to kill his son also, but that is not exactly what God said. Rather than actually draw a knife on Isaac, He could have told God.

“OK Lord, I offered up Isaac as a sacrifice. Here he is lying tied up on the wood on the altar I made. Now what?”

But according to the New International Version, (NIV), the answer to the question in the title of this article is YES, God commanded Abraham to *sacrifice* Isaac.

Genesis 22:2 Then God said, “Take your son, your only son, whom you

love–Isaac–and go to the region of Moriah. **Sacrifice him** there as a burnt offering on a mountain I will show you.” New International Version (NIV)

The NIV is the only translation I found so far that actually says to do it, to sacrifice Isaac. The Good News Bible doesn't say that, not even the RSV says it.

Think this is splitting hairs? Isn't there a difference between merely offering something as a sacrifice, and actually sacrificing it? I think there is.

I'm writing this because the NIV has surpassed the KJV as the most popular English Bible though it is full of **errors!**

Examples of errors in the NIV

In Isaiah 14:12, the NIV omits the name Lucifer and refers to him as “morning star” which is a title the Book of Revelation attributes to Jesus Christ!

How you have fallen from heaven, morning star , son of the dawn! You have been cast down to the earth, you who once laid low the nations!	How art thou fallen from heaven, 0 Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Revelation 22:16 says that **Jesus** is the morning star!

Revelation 22:16 I **Jesus** have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and **morning star**. -KJV

The NIV advocates striking your body to hurt it.

1 Corinthians 9:27 No, I **strike a blow to my body and make it my slave** so that after I have preached to others, I myself will not be disqualified for the prize.

This is what some cloistered Roman Catholic monks do, and what some Islamic people do. They flagellate themselves thinking this will bring them righteousness. Martin Luther, before God's Word enlightened him about the Grace and Righteousness of Christ, used to also flagellate himself. But does the Bible really tell believers to do that? The same Scripture in the KJV doesn't say so!

1 Corinthians 9:27 But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others,

I myself should be a castaway. – KJV

I'm grateful to [Pastor Mike Hoggard](#) for pointing out the difference between the KJV and NIV in Genesis 22:2 and 1 Corinthians 9:27, and for teaching the importance of the KJV as the only trustworthy translation of God's Word in the English language.