

Rebuttal to KJV only claims

KJV ONLY Claims

1. God promised to preserve His words (Psa. 12:6-7; Mat. 24:35). There has to be a preserved copy of God's pure words somewhere. If it isn't the KJV, then what is it?

2. It has no copyright. The *text* of the KJV may be reproduced by anyone for there is no copyright forbidding it's duplication. This is not true with the modern perversions.

3. The KJV produces good fruit (Mat. 7:17-20). No modern translation can compare to the KJV when it comes to *producing good fruit*. For nearly four hundred years, God has used the preaching and teaching of the KJV to bring hundreds of millions to Christ. Laodicean Christians might favor the new versions, but the Holy Spirit doesn't.

4. The KJV was translated during the Philadelphia church period (Rev. 3:7-13). The modern versions begin to appear rather late on the scene as the lukewarm Laodicean period gets underway (Rev. 3:14-22), but the KJV was produced way back in 1611, just in time for the many great revivals (1700-1900). The Philadelphia church was the only church that did not receive a rebuke from the Lord Jesus Christ, and it was the only church that "kept" God's word (Rev. 3:8).

Rebuttal to Claims

1. Why assume it is the KJV? Psalm 12 and Matthew 24:35 by no stretch of the imagination proves the KJV, there is a huge gap in that chain of logic. Anyone could say "Psalms 12 says God will preserve His word, therefore I only read the RSV!" We have the Bible in the original languages of Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew, these are more "pure" than the KJV.

2. Not totally true! The King James Version in the UK has always technically been under the copyright of the British Monarch, currently Queen Elizabeth. There are other translations of the Bible that are public domain like the ASV, DRB etc. This claim however is meaningless.

3. Silly and hard to prove claim. Even Mormons [prefer the KJV](#). God can do anything He wants, in John 11 He spoke through the High Priest that wanted to kill Jesus. Modern translations are being used to draw people to Himself, since they are easier to understand. Do not tell the Holy Spirit He believes. The Laodicean church in Revelation was an actual church.

4. This claim seems to be likely Anglo-centric—forgetting there is a whole world outside of the English speaking countries. This claim also requires you assume there interpretation of Revelation 3 is accurate, whereas Jesus was addressing real churches during the time of St John the Revelator. This claim is only making assertions and not much real logic. I do believe SLAVERY existed during this so called "Philadelphia" church age, churches like the Baptists and Methodists fractured in part because of slavery.

Rebuttal to KJV only claims

5. The KJV translators were honest in their work. When the translators had to add certain words, largely due to idiom changes, they placed the added words in italics so we'd know the difference. This is not the case with many new translations.

6. All new translations compare themselves to the KJV. Isn't it strange that the new versions never compare themselves to one another? For some strange reason they all line up against one Book--the A.V. 1611. I wonder why? Try Matthew 12:26.

7. The KJV translators believed they were handling the very words of God (I Ths. 2:13). Just read the King James Dedicatory and compare it to the prefaces in the modern versions. Immediately, you will see a world of difference in the approach and attitude of the translators. Which group would YOU pick for translating a book?

8. The KJV is supported by far more evidence. Of over 5,300 pieces of manuscript evidence, ninety-five percent supports the King James Bible! The changes in the new versions are based on the remaining five percent of manuscripts, most of which are from Alexandria, Egypt. (There are only two lines of Bibles: *the Devil's line from Alexandria, and the Lord's line from Antioch.* We'll deal with this later.)

5. Do not most translators try to be honest?! Furthermore, how do we know for a fact the KJV translators were honest? They did have to follow rules given to them by an Anglican bishop. Many modern translations will list alternate ways of translating a passage like the NASB.

6. This does not really prove anything. Modern translations want to show how they are better than the KJV. The KJV is older and is familiar with older people that's why it is compared against. Matthew 12:26 proves nothing here.

7. So what I am sure the "translators" of the Jehovah Witness' "New World Translation" believed they too were "handling the very words of God" just as the KJV translators may have believed they were. The KJV Dedicatory is full of flowery and flattering language to King James.

8. There is next to no manuscript evidence for passages like 1 John 5:7. Translations like the NASB list variants in the text, so one can easily say its supported by more evidence than the KJV. KJV promoters like to push a mythological over simplified story of the "Antiochian line vs the Alexandrian line". The fact is the KJV takes some things from the Vulgate.

Rebuttal to KJV only claims

9. No one has ever proven that the KJV is not God's word. The 1611 should be considered innocent until proven guilty with a significant amount of genuine manuscript evidence.

10. The KJV exalts the Lord Jesus Christ. The true scriptures should testify of Jesus Christ (John 5:39). There is no book on this planet which exalts Christ higher than the King James Bible. In numerous places the new perversions attack the Deity of Christ, the Blood Atonement, the Resurrection, salvation by grace through faith, and the Second Coming. The true scriptures will *TESTIFY* of Jesus Christ, not *ATTACK* Him!

9. This claim made me laugh. Substitute KJV with just about any other bible translation. No one has ever proved the DRB is not God's word! No one has ever proved the Geneva Bible is not God's word! "Significant amount of genuine manuscript evidence" to them means only those manuscripts they determine are genuine based on their agreement with the KJV.

10. This too made me laugh. It's mostly an exaggeration of other bible translations. Also, this claim is Anglo-centric ignoring there are other languages besides English, and unwittingly suggests the KJV does a better job than the Scriptures in the original languages. Deny the Deity of Christ? What "new perversion" does that other than the NWT? I am pretty sure ALL new translations have the passages referring to the blood atonement and Resurrection! Name this translation that corrupts or omits Ephesians 2:8-9 about salvation by grace through faith! Name the bibles that try to deny the Second Coming.