

## CHAPTER VI

### “KJV-ONLY” = NO GREEK & NO HEBREW

Gail Riplinger’s rejection of all Hebrew and Greek resources is an extension of the false teaching of Peter Ruckman that the King James Version is divinely inspired and therefore inerrant. Since Hebrew and Greek resources do not always agree with readings the KJV, Gail reasons that they are the works of mere men and are therefore flawed.

“Unlike today’s editors, the KJV translators’ final authorities were Bibles, not lexicons. They saw the KJV as the final ‘perfected’ and ‘finished’ English Bible...” (*Awe*, p. 31)

Since the KJV is *perfect*, Gail reasons, “God has not called readers to check His Holy Bible for errors.” (*In Awe of Thy Word*, p. 956)

To the contrary, the Translators of the 1611 King James Version were adamant that *no* translation, including their own, is divinely inspired, and they regarded *only* the Hebrew and Greek originals as directly inspired by God. To illustrate the fundamental principle of divinely inspired originals, they made an analogy between the inferiority of translations of the original Scriptures and the lower quality of the rebuilt Temple in comparison to the original Temple of Solomon:

#### AN ANSWER TO THE IMPUTATIONS OF OUR ADVERSARIES

“For whatever was perfect under the Sun, where Apostles or Apostolic men, that is, men endued with an extraordinary measure of God's spirit, and privileged with the privilege of infallibility, had not their hand?... So, by the story of Ezra, and the prophecy of Haggai it may be gathered, that the Temple built by Zerubbabel after the return from Babylon, was by no means to be compared to the former built by Solomon (for they that remembered the former, wept when they considered the latter) [Ezra 3:12] notwithstanding, might this latter either have been abhorred and forsaken by the Jews, or profaned by the Greeks? The like we are to think of Translations.” (“The Translators to the Reader”)

In Gail Riplinger’s logic, the use of concordances and lexicons to determine the meanings of words transfers the Bible’s authority to these resources. There is no middle ground in her false dilemma: “You’re either KJV-Only (no Hebrew or Greek) or against the Word of God.” In her inverted scheme of Biblical inspiration, referencing various Greek resources as a system of checks and balances to determine acceptable translations of Hebrew and Greek words and thereby the KJV’s accuracy, amounts to high treason, akin to using a modern version. Gail asserts that those who use Greek reference works as aids to Bible study give them more weight than Scripture itself – a false assumption and a false accusation. And the owner of a Strong’s Concordance will find him/herself in the same camp as the Mormons:

“The current practice of transferring the Holy Bible’s authority to ‘private’ interpretations in pagan Greek lexicons is proven to have no precedence in history.” (*Awe*, p. 37)

“Cults are characterized by the fact that, while recognizing the Bible as a noble book, they move its authority on to something else. It may be a guru, pope, or a false prophet; it may be another book, such as the Book of Mormon, or even *Strong’s Concordance*.” (Awe, p. 500)

“There are definite elements of choice, preference, and uncertainty involved in Greek scholarship, which prevent it from being the absolute authority.” (Awe, p. 504)

It is true that there are “definite elements of choice, preference, and uncertainty involved in Greek scholarship,” but there were also elements of choice, preference and uncertainty involved in the translation of the King James Version, as the Translators’ Preface attests:

REASONS MOVING US TO SET DIVERSITY OF SENSES IN THE MARGIN, WHERE THERE IS GREAT PROBABILITY FOR EACH

“...doth not a margin do well to admonish the Reader to seek further, and not to conclude or dogmatize upon this or that peremptorily? For as it is a fault of incredulity, to doubt of those things that are evident: so to determine of such things as the Spirit of God hath left (even in the judgment of the judicious) questionable, can be no less than presumption. Therefore as S. Augustine saith, that variety of Translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures:...so diversity of signification and sense in the margin, where the text is not so clear, must needs do good, yea, is necessary, as we are persuaded... They that are wise, had rather have their judgments at liberty in differences of readings, than to be captivated to one, when it may be the other.” (“The Translators to the Reader”)

Gail repeatedly deprecates Greek-English resources as “private interpretations” of Scripture:

“Only forbidden ‘private interpretation’ can be drawn from dipping one’s nose deeply into corrupt lexicons, dictionaries, and commentaries by worldly wise men, like Strong, Vine, and Zodhiates (2 Peter 1:19, 20).” (Awe, p. 141)

To support her false teaching, she must wrest the Scriptures:

“The New Testament uses the word ‘interpretation’ to describe *translation* from one language to another (e.g. John 1:42, 9:7, Acts 9:36, 13:8; Heb. 7:2). Therefore, the ‘private interpretation’ forbidden in 2 Peter 1:20, included ‘private translation’ (e.g. TNIV, NKJV, Strong’s), as well as private ‘meaning.’” (Awe, p. 846)

“The harlot haunts *higher* education, calling bookish brooders to her leavened lexicons. Easy-chair Christians who brood over books, not the Bible, will eventually hatch ‘cockatrice’ eggs.’ (Isaiah 59:5)... First things first. According to the Holy Bible, among the first things its students need to know is that the scriptures are of no ‘private interpretation,’ that is, private translation, ‘Knowing this first,’ as Peter said, this foundational tenet is echoed repeatedly in upcoming chapters by the very men who chose to publish his word — men such as Erasmus, Wycliffe, Coverdale, Tyndale, and the King James Bible translators (2 Peter 1:20). (Awe, pp. 520, 522)

Gail does not fully quote 2 Peter 1:20 on pages 141, 522 and 846 because it would be apparent to her readers that the verse does not prove her point. When 2 Peter 1:20 finally appears on pages 899 and 955, the verse is misquoted:

“Thomas Causton and Thomas Highbed were burned at the stake in 1555; their Confession said: ‘Words...must be searched out by other open Scriptures, whereby we may come to the spiritual understanding of them, which shall be most to the glory of God: for, as the holy apostle saith, **‘There is no Scripture that hath any private interpretation’** Besides this, Scriptures are full of the like figurative speeches...[built-in dictionary]’ (Foxye, vol. 6, p. 735) (*Awe*, p. 899)

“Scrivener’s and Berry’s printed editions are not ‘authoritative’ or to be regarded as ‘the Original Greek’ ‘in the microscopic points of detail,’ where they differ from the manuscript tradition or the King James Bible and other great vernacular Bibles (*Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 2, p. 499) **The scriptures are of no ‘private interpretation’** (2 Peter 1:20)” (*Awe*, p. 955)

Anyone familiar with 2 Peter 1:20 knows that this verse states “no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.”

### **2 Peter 1:19-21**

19 We have also a more sure word of **prophecy**; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts:  
20 Knowing this first, that **no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.** 21 For the **prophecy** came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake *as they were* moved by the Holy Ghost.

Following the editorial style of Westcott and Hort, Gail “omitted” three words – “prophecy of the” – which changes the meaning of the verse. Not only did Gail misquote 2 Peter 1:20, she erroneously redefined the Greek word for “interpretation” in that verse as “translation”:

“The New Testament uses the word ‘interpretation’ to describe *translation* from one language to another (e.g. John 1:42, 9:7, Acts 9:36, 13:8; Heb. 7:2). Therefore, the ‘private interpretation,’ forbidden in 2 Peter 1:20, includes private *translation* (e.g. TNIV, NKJV, Strong’s) as well as private ‘meaning’.” (*Awe*, p. 846)

In the Greek Textus Receptus, not one of the various Greek words for “interpretation” found in John 1:42, 9:7, Acts 9:36, 13:8; Heb. 7:2 is the same Greek word used in 2 Peter 1:20. Strong’s Concordance shows the different Greek words translated “interpretation” in the KJV New Testament, and *The New Analytical Greek Lexicon* edited by Wesley J. Perschbacher defines the Greek words used in the verses which Gail cited as references (*Awe*, p. 846). In these verses, note that only in 2 Peter 1:20 is “translation” not an option, for the Greek word ἐπίλυσις (*epilusis*) is narrowly translated “interpretation”:

**2 Peter 1:20** (ἐπίλυσις – Strong’s #1955) – Perschbacher: “a loosing, liberation; metaphorically, interpretation of what is enigmatical or obscure, 2 Pet. 1:20”

John 1:42 (ἐξηγήσῃω – Strong’s #2059) – Perschbacher: “to explain, interpret, **translate**, John 1:39, 43; 9:7; Heb. 7:2”

John 9:7, (ἐρσηνέω - Strong's #2059) – Perschbacher: “to explain, interpret, **translate**, John 1:39, 43; 9:7; Heb. 7:2”

Acts 9:36 (σπερμηεύω – Strong's #1329) – Perschbacher: “to explain, interpret, **translate**, Luke 24:27; Acts 9:36; 1 Cor. 14:5, 13, 27; to be able to interpret, 1 Cor. 12:30

Acts 13:8 (μεθερμηνέω – Strong's #3177) – Perschbacher: “to **translate**, interpret, Matt. 1:23; Mark 5:41, et al.”

Heb. 7:2 (ἐρσηνέω – Strong's #2059) – Perschbacher: “to explain, interpret, **translate**, John 1:39, 43; 9:7; Heb. 7:2”

As we have just seen, Greek resources enable us to determine if there are different Greek words underlying the same English word in the KJV, and also to know their various meanings. Simply reading the English Bible does not yield this information. Therefore, depriving Christians of Greek reference books allows false teachers wide latitude to misinterpret verses to support their unbiblical teachings. 2 Peter 3:16 calls this ploy “wresting the scriptures” by “they which are unlearned and unstable...unto their own destruction.” If Gail had used a lexicon, she may have had second thoughts about “wresting” Scripture.

Strong's #[4761](#)

{streb-lo'-o} from a derivative of 4762; v

AV - wrest 1; 1

1) to twist, turn awry

2) to torture, put to the rack

3) metaph. to pervert, of one who wrests or tortures language in a false sense

Besides forbidding the use of Greek-English interlinear translations and lexicons, Gail Riplinger also discourages Christians from learning Koine Greek, and she has a surprisingly low view of the Greek Textus Receptus.

“There are *no Bible verses* that state that Bible study should be done in those ancient languages. If such were a benefit to our understanding, one would think that at least *one* verse would mention it.” (*Awe*, p. 498)

“There existed a true original Greek (i.e. Majority Text, *Textus Receptus*). It is not in print and never will be because it is unnecessary. No one on the planet speaks first century Koine Greek, so God is finished with it. He needs no ‘Dead Bible Society’ to translate it into ‘everyday English,’ using the same corrupt secularized lexicons used by the TNIV, NIV, NASB and HCSB (quote on file).” (*Awe*, p. 956)

“It must be remembered that even the 5200 existing handwritten Greek manuscripts were the product of the Greek Orthodox Church. Its membership has never been made up of true believers.... Unbelievers, Greek speaking or otherwise, cannot discern spiritual things.” (*Awe*, p. 953)

We have just been informed that God is finished with the extant copies of the Greek manuscripts authored by the Apostles, which manuscripts were collated to create the Textus Receptus. In 1603, according to Gail Riplinger and Peter Ruckman, God commissioned the Church of England and Calvinist scholars to author a new “Word of God.” Furthermore, no one may question this proclamation or dare to do with the KJV what Gail Riplinger has done with all modern versions, that is, to evaluate its accuracy. “God has not called readers to check His Holy Bible for errors” (*Awe*, p. 956) begs the question by assuming there are no errors in the KJV.

Gail Riplinger insists that, where the KJV differs from the Textus Receptus, authority rests with the “Bible in use” rather than the Greek text:

“None of these microscopic differences between the KJV and today’s printed one-man editions of the ‘Textus Receptus’ are of major consequence. They are insignificant compared to the thousands upon thousands of serious differences between the pure Textus Receptus text type and the corrupt new versions’ minority text type. Authority must remain with the Bible in use, not with the critical edition of one man or one ecclesiastical tradition.” (Awe, p. 955)

Altogether, Riplinger *ignores* the Textus Receptus except to diminish its importance or to demean it. Her attitude is that God used the Greek language in the early Church period, but English soon took its place, starting in Acts 2 with the Gothic Bible, and that English Bibles in this lineage have been the standard for translation during the Church Age.

“The English Bible’s seven purifications are...the Gothic, the Anglo-Saxon, the Pre-Wycliffe, the Wycliffe, the Tyndale / Coverdale / Great / Geneva, the Bishop’s, the King James Bible.

“Gothic, the great great grandfather of English, was a major world language at the time of Christ and the apostles. Gothic benefited from this gift, by which the Holy Ghost superintended over the preaching of the ‘word...in all the world’ (Col. 1:5, 6) and the translation of the ‘scriptures... made known to all nations’ (Rom. 16:26). ...

“The original New Testament was complete before 100 A.D.; the Gothic Bible must have been translated *immediately* to fill the need of the nearby Gothic Christians, following the pattern of the urgent multiplying of the Gospel itself.” (Awe, pp. 33-4, 622)”

According to Gail, the King James translators simply followed this tradition of translating from previous Bibles: “Unlike today’s editors, the KJV translators’ final authorities were Bibles, not lexicons.” (Awe, p. 31) Elsewhere she states: “On the title page of the KJV, the translators said that the King James Bible was ‘Translated out of the Originall Greeke.’” Which is it, Gail, English Bibles or the Original Greek? for King James Bible lovers have been led to believe that the 1611 KJV was translated directly and verbatim from the Greek Textus Receptus and the Hebrew Masoretic Text. To determine the truth of the matter, we must consider the history of the King James Version.

The Translators stated in their Preface that they availed themselves of “as great helps as were needful” in many languages, which would have included lexicons:

THE PURPOSE OF THE TRANSLATORS, WITH THEIR NUMBER, FURNITURE, CARE, ETC.

“...neither, to be short, were we the first that fell in hand with translating the Scripture into English, and consequently destitute of former helps, as it is written of Origen, that he was the first in a manner, that put his hand to write Commentaries upon the Scriptures, ...and therefore no marvel, if he overshot himself many times...Neither did we think much to consult the Translators or Commentators, Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian, Greek or Latin, no nor the Spanish, French, Italian, or Dutch; neither did we disdain to revise that which we had done, and to bring back to the anvil that which we had hammered: but having and using as great helps as were needful, and fearing no reproach for slowness, nor coveting praise for expedition, we have at length, through the good hand of the Lord upon us, brought the work to that pass that you see.” (“The Translator to the Reader”)

First, we remind the reader that John Bois’ Notes referenced various grammars and lexicons used in the translation and review process. (See: Chapter 5) The Translators also stated that the Hebrew and Greek originals, not other Bibles, must be the final authority for any translation:

“If you ask what they had before them, truly it was the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, the Greek of the New. These are the two golden pipes, or rather conduits, where-through the olive branches

empty themselves into the gold. Saint Augustine calleth them precedent, or original tongues; ... Saint Jerome, fountains... The same Saint Jerome affirmeth, ...and Gratian hath not spared to put it into his Decree, That ‘as the credit of the old Books’ (he meaneth of the Old Testament) ‘is to be tried by the Hebrew Volumes, so of the New by the Greek tongue,’ he meaneth by the original Greek. If truth be tried by these tongues, then whence should a Translation be made, but out of them? These tongues therefore, the Scriptures we say in those tongues, we set before us to translate, being the tongues wherein God was pleased to speak to his Church by the Prophets and Apostles.”

“Therefore the word of God being set forth in Greek, becometh hereby like a candle set upon a candlestick, which giveth light to all that are in the house, or like a proclamation sounded forth in the market place, which most men presently take knowledge of; and therefore that language was fittest to contain the Scriptures, both for the first Preachers of the Gospel to appeal unto for witness, and for the learners also of those times to make search and trial by.” (“The Translators to the Reader”)

At this point, we are faced with a dilemma. For although the Translators identified the Hebrew and Greek originals as the source from which any translation must be made, and state that they set before themselves the Greek New Testament and Hebrew Old Testament to translate, the fact is that these scholars had been instructed by King James to adhere as closely as possible to the Bishop’s Bible, and secondarily to previous English Bibles, when they could do so without violating the Greek and Hebrew texts:

“FOR the better ordering of the proceedings of the translators, his Majesty recommended the following rules to them, to be very carefully observed:—

1. The ordinary bible, read in the church, commonly called the Bishop’s Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit...

14. These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishop’s Bible, viz. Tyndal’s, Coverdale’s, Matthews’, Wilchurch’s, Geneva.” 1.

The final product—the 1611 King James Version—attests to the Translators’ fidelity to the Bishops’ Bible and earlier English translations, in many places *against* the Textus Receptus. Very often English words in the KJV which do not reflect the Hebrew and Greek texts can be traced to the Bishop’s, Geneva, Great, Coverdale, Matthews, Tyndale, Wycliffe and, at times, the Latin Vulgate.

Another uncomfortable fact is that that the Translator’s Preface abounds with favorable references to, quotations from and high praises for the Roman Catholic scholars, St. Jerome and St. Augustine. A few excerpts from the Preface demonstrate the Translators’ great esteem for the translator of the Latin Vulgate:

“This moved S. Jerome a most learned father, and the best linguist without controversy, of his age, or of any that went before him, to undertake the translating of the Old Testament, out of the very fountain with that evidence of great learning, judgment, industry, and faithfulness, that he had forever bound the Church unto him, in a debt of special remembrance and thankfulness...

“First S. Jerome saith,... ‘The Scripture being translated before in the languages of many Nations, doth show that those things that were added (by Lucian and Hesychius) are false.,’ [S. Jerome. praef. in 4::Evangel.] So S. Jerome in that place...

“...The same Jerome elsewhere affirmeth that he, the time was, had set forth the translation of the Seventy suae linguae hominibus, i.e., for his countrymen of Dalmatia [S. Jerome. Sophronio.] Which words not only Erasmus doth understand to purport, that S. Jerome translated the Scripture into the Dalmatian tongue, but also Sixtus Senensis [Six. Sen. lib 4], and Alphonsus a` Castro [Alphon. lb 1 ca 23] (that we speak of no more) men not to be excepted against by them of Rome, do ingenuously confess as much... So, S. Chrysostom that lived in S. Jerome’s time, giveth evidence with him:

“Many men’s mouths have been open a good while (and yet are not stopped) with speeches about

the Translation so long in hand, or rather perusals of Translations made before: and ask what may be the reason, what the necessity of the employment: Hath the Church been deceived, say they, all this while?... We will answer them both briefly: and the former, being brethren, thus, with S. Jerome, ‘Do we condemn the ancient? In no case: but after the endeavors of them that were before us, we take the best pains we can in the house of God.,’ As if he said, Being provoked by the example of the learned men that lived before my time, I have thought it my duty, to assay whether my talent in the knowledge of the tongues, may be profitable in any measure to God’s Church, lest I should seem to laboured in them in vain, and lest I should be thought to glory in men, (although ancient,) above that which was in them. Thus S. Jerome may be thought to speak.” (“The Translators to the Reader”)

The fact is that, in a number of verses, the Translators of the 1611 KJV followed the Latin Vulgate instead of the Greek Textus Receptus. These departures from the Greek text and the specific verses where the Vulgate was preferred were documented by F.H.A. Scrivener in *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611): Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*. (See: Appendix A) By way of introduction to “Appendix E. Passages wherein the text of the Authorized Bible seems to follow the Latin Vulgate” is inserted Dr. Scrivener’s explanation of the various texts used by the Translators:

“In Appendix E has been brought together all that can throw light on the critical resources at the command of our Translators in the prosecution of their version of the New Testament. ... It would be unjust to allege that the Translators failed to take advantage of the materials which were readily accessible, nor did they lack care or discernment in the application of them. Doubtless they rested mainly on the later editions of Beza’s Greek Testament, whereof his fourth (1589) was somewhat more highly esteemed than his fifth (1598), the production of his extreme old age. But besides these, the Complutensian Polyglott, together with the several editions of Erasmus, and Stephen’s of 1550, were constantly resorted to. Out of the 151 passages examined in Appendix E, wherein the differences between the texts of these books is sufficient to affect, however slightly the language of the version, our Translators abide with Beza against Stephen in 113 places, with Stephen against Beza in 59, with the Complutensian, Erasmus, or **the Vulgate against both Stephen and Beza in 80**. The influence of Beza is just as perceptible in the cases of their choice between the various readings which have been collected above (p. 58): the form approved by him is set in the text, the alternative is mostly banished to the margin. On certain occasions, it may be, the Translators yielded too much to Beza’s somewhat arbitrary decisions; but they lived at a time when his name was the very highest among Reformed theologians, when means for arriving at an independent judgment were few and scattered, and when the first principles of textual criticism had yet to be gathered from a long process of painful induction. His most obvious and glaring errors their good sense easily enabled them to avoid. (cf. Matt. i. 23; John xviii, 20).” (pp. 59-60)

“Appendix E. Passages wherein the text of the Authorized Bible seems to follow the Latin Vulgate.

“It may be useful to subjoin a list, probably quite an incomplete one, of places in which the Translators of 1611 have apparently followed the Latin Vulgate, mostly after the example of Tyndale, sometimes of Versions later than his, especially of the Rhemish of 1582, whereof the Epistle of the Translators to the Reader speaks so contemptuously... It is probable that at least some of the passages collected in the first section of the present Appendix, wherein the Authorized Version is supported by Compl., Vulg., only were derived from the Vulgate rather than the Complutensian. In I Cor. xiv. 10; I John i. 5, where Colinaeus (1534) and the Vulgate alone favour the rendering of 1611, the Vulgate is almost certainly their authority, not Colinaeus.

“Matt. xii. 24, 27; Mark iii. 22; Luke xi. 15, 18, 19, *Beelzebub*. So Tynd. (So also Compl. in Matt. x.

25). Mark xiii. 37 ὃ quod. xiv. 43 *om. ὄν*. So Tynd. Luke i. 35 *nascetur*. So Tynd. i. 49 *μεγάλα magna*. So Tynd. xx. 35 *habebuntur*. So Tynd. xxiii. 34 *sortes: but sortem* Matt. xxvii. 35; Mark xv. 24; John xix. 24, the English versions having *lots* in all four places, save that Wicklif alone keeps up the distinction of Vulg. xxiii. 46. *παρατίθεμαι commendo*. So Tynd. John vii. 9 *om. σέ*. So Tynd. x. 16 *unum ovile* Vulg. So Great Bible and Geneva 1557. xii. 26 *om, καί after εσται*. So Rhemish Version 1582. xviii. xviii. 1 τοῦ Κεδρών, Cedron. So Tynd. Acts ii. 22 *approbatum*. So Tynd. iv. 32 *cor unum* Vulg. Clementine. So Tynd. vi. 3 *καταστήσωμεν constituamus*. So Tynd. vii. 26 *συνήλλασεν reconciliabat*. So Tynd. vii. 44 *om. ὁ : loquens*. So Tynd. x. 20 *itaque (άλλά)*. So Tynd. viii. 1 Simeon (*Σίμων Er.: Simon Vulg.* in ch. xv. 14)., xiii. 15 *εἰ τις si quis*. So Tynd. xvii. 30 *hujus ignorantiae*. So Tynd. xix. 20 *Θεοῦ Dei* Vulg. Clementine. So Tynd. xxiii. 15 *aliquid certius (om. τά)*. So Tynd. xxvi. 6 *πατέρας ημών patres nostros*. So Tynd. Rom. xiv. 2 *alius enim*. So Rhemish 1582. xvi. 4 *suas cervices*. So Tynd. I Cor. xiii. 1 *velut aes sonans*. So Tynd. xvi. 23 *domini nostri*. So Geneva 1557. Gal. iv. 15 text : *ubi*. So Rhemish 1582. Eph. vi. 24 *om. Ἄμην*. Vulg. MSS. (A.V. 1611) : not Vulg. Clementine (A.V. 1616). Phil. ii. 21 *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Jesu Christi*. So Tynd. Col. i. 4 *quam habetis*. So Tynd. nearly. i. 24. *qui nunc*. So Rhemish 1582. 1 Thess. ii. 12 *qui vocavit*. So Tynd. ii. 13 *ὄχι ὡς λόγον non ut verbum*. So Tynd. ii. 16 *enim*. So Tynd. iv. 1 *ut quemadmodum*. So Rhemish 1582. I Tim. i. 17 *immortali*. So Tynd. iii. 15 *oporteat te*. So Tynd. iv. 15 *om. ἐν : manifestus sit omnibus* (A.V. *marg.* in all things). 2 Tim. i. 18 *διηκόνησέ μοι ministravit mihi* Vulg. Clementine. So Tynd. James iii. 14 *cordibus vestris*. So Tynd. I Pet. ii. 13 *om. οὖν* So Tynd. I John iii. 20 *om ὅτι* second. So Tynd. v. 8 *hi tres* Vulg. Clementine. So Tynd. 2 John 3 *ἔστω sit*. So Tynd. Rev. xxiii. 10 *qui in captivatem duxerit, in captivatem vadet*. Vulg. Clementine. So Tynd. xvi. 11 *om. ἐκ secund*. So Tynd. xvii. 9 *et hic*. So Tynd. xviii. 23 *Φάνη lucebit*. So Geneva 1557.” 2.

Despite the evidence found in the Translators’ Preface and in the KJV, that is, readings undeniably from the Vulgate, Gail Ripplinger denies that the KJV Translators *ever* consulted the Vulgate:

“Fifteen total editions of the Greek New Testament were printed by Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzivirs. They are, in the main, identical. The KJV translators availed themselves of all of these, as well as numerous Greek manuscripts and vernacular editions. On the title page of the KJV, the translators said that the King James Bible was ‘Translated out of the Originall Greeke.’ They would not have made this claim if they did not have authoritative proof or if they had followed any Latin Vulgate readings, as some critics, like Frederick Scrivener, claim.” (Awe, p. 949)

The 1611 KJV title page actually states, “*Newly Translated out of the Originall tongues: & with the former Translations diligently compared and revised, by his Majesties Special Commandment.*” That they consulted St. Jerome may be deduced from the textual evidence, their profuse praise of Jerome and his translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew, and other statements in the Preface:

“For when Your Highness had once out of deep judgment apprehended how convenient it was, that out of the Original Sacred Tongues, together with comparing of the labours, both in our own, and other foreign Languages, of many worthy men who went before us, there should be one more exact Translation of the holy Scriptures into the *English Tongue*...”

“But now the Latin Translations were too many to be all good, for they were infinite... Again they were not out of the Hebrew fountain (we speak of the Latin Translations of the Old Testament) but out of the Greek stream, therefore the Greek being not altogether clear, the Latin derived from it must needs be muddy. This moved S. Jerome a most learned father, and the best linguist without controversy, of his age, or of any that went before him, to undertake the translating of the Old Testament, out of the very fountain with that evidence of great learning, judgment, industry, and faithfulness, that he had forever bound the Church unto him, in a debt of special remembrance and thankfulness.” (“The Translators to the Reader”)

Considering Gail Riplinger’s plentiful assertions concerning the translation process of the 1611 KJV, one would expect to find the Translators’ Preface presented as a source document in the Appendix of her book. Instead of this important document, there is a 60-page Appendix on the “KJV’s ABCs” – “Bible meanings for each of the 26 letters of the English alphabet.” There seems to be a good reason for this oversight or omission, for the Preface would have revealed that her assertions altogether disagree with the views expressed by the Translators. In fact, this source document patently contradicts the entire thesis of Gail’s book – that the King James Version is perfect and inerrant, that every word, nay every letter, was directly inspired by God, that any revision of the King James Version is an attack on God’s Word and that, where the KJV differs from the Hebrew and Greek texts, the KJV is the final authority.

#### “THE ENGLISH CORRECTS THE GREEK”

The notion that the KJV corrects the Greek Textus Receptus is not only illogical, it is heretical, denying the supremacy and inerrancy of the Hebrew and Greek texts. It also contradicts the testimony of the Translators of the 1611 King James Version set forth in their Preface, which unfortunately has been missing from King James Bibles for two hundred years. “The Translators to the Reader” documents the process undertaken by the Translators to produce the 1611 King James Version, their belief in the divine inspiration and superiority of the Hebrew and Greek Texts, their conviction that no translation can be perfect, not even their own, and their purpose which was simply to improve upon other Reformation Bibles that were also based on the Textus Receptus, i.e. “...to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one...”

Gail Riplinger is a protégé of Peter Ruckman who is the founder and President of Pensacola Bible College. Notorious for his rudeness, scathing sarcasm and even profanity in his writings and sermons, Ruckman regularly blasts those who disagree with him as “idiots,” “stupid fools” and worse. Peter Ruckman has brought further reproach on the name of Jesus Christ and His Church by his personal life, which at last count includes two divorces and three marriages. Public records disclose that Gail Riplinger has also been married three times and divorced twice, after her profession of faith in Jesus Christ. (Source: <http://www.avpublications.org/>)

Peter Ruckman’s worst mischief, however, has been to launch a movement which heretically contends that the King James Version is superior to the Greek Textus Receptus. For, according to Dr. Ruckman, the King James Bible represents a *new revelation* from God to the translators of the 1611 Authorised Version. Also, states Ruckman, the KJV *alone* is the inspired Word of God (hence the term “KJV-Only”) and, in the many verses where the KJV differs from the Greek Textus Receptus, Dr. Ruckman pontificates, “the English corrects the Greek.”

“Correct the Greek with the English. It is always the best policy; the one that God will bless. Feel free (with a clear conscience) in always correcting the Greek Receptus with the Holy Bible [meaning the King James]...” 3.

“Three things should be emphasized...1. The absolute insanity of translating any Greek text literally, word for word, in order to give a reader THE WORDS God wants him to have in another language.” 4.

“The King James Bible...often contains revelations of the truth that evidently cannot be found in any Greek text.” 5.

“Moral: *Mistakes in the A.V. 1611 are advanced revelation!*” 6.

“The King James Bible was ‘GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD.’ (2 Timothy 3:16)” 7.

“The King James’ text is the last and final statement that God has given the world and He has given it in the universal language of the 20th century... The truth is God slammed the door of revelation shut in 389 B.C. and slammed it shut again in 1611.” 8.

Gail Riplinger concurs with Peter Ruckman that “the KJV corrects the Greek” text. To support this modern advance in Bible scholarship, she references an article in that scholarly publication, *The Ladies Home Journal*:

“...the November 1921 issue of the popular secular magazine, *Ladies Home Journal*, published an article entitled, ‘Human Nature in the Bible,’ by William Lyon Phelps. The article stated, “[O]ur English translation is even better than the Hebrew and Greek. There is only one way to explain this; I have no theory to account for the so-called ‘inspiration of the Bible,’ but I am confident that the Authorized Version [KJV] was inspired... all others [modern English versions] are inferior’ (pp. 8, 166, 167)” (*Awe*, p. 522)

Gail seems to have assumed the Papal mantle of proscribing the reading of the original Scriptures due to the fact that students of God’s Word are too ignorant to understand a Greek-English Interlinear translation.

“Neither Berry’s edition of Stephanus nor Scrivener’s edition should be used, as some do today, to ‘correct’ the KJV. These texts can create unnecessary confusion for students who have one of these two printed editions and are comparing it to the Received Text of the KJV.” (*Awe*, p. 952)

According to Gail, Christians will be confused by learning the meanings of the Greek words in Scripture and may therefore only read the Bible which bears the KJV-Only *Imprimatur*. We think it is Gail Riplinger who is “creating unnecessary confusion for students” of God’s Word by misleading them with deceptive terms like “Received Text of the KJV”!

Those who contend against the heretical teaching that “the KJV corrects the Greek Textus Receptus” are ridiculed as pseudo-intellectuals whose conviction of the superiority of the Textus Receptus is only “a fog of emotional steam.”

“A fog of emotional steam, that carries no substance, precedes comments such as ‘I don’t believe the KJV corrects ‘the original Greek’ or ‘I don’t believe the KJV corrects the ‘Majority Text’ or the ‘Textus Receptus.’ The desire to appear intelligent or superior by referring to ‘the

Greek' and downplaying the common man's Bible, exposes a naivety concerning textual history and those documents which today's pseudo-intellectuals call 'the critical text,' 'the original Greek,' 'the Majority Text,' or the 'Textus Receptus.'" (Awe, p. 956)

Gail is sounding less and less like the KJV Translators nowadays and more and more like Westcott and Hort, who also stigmatized those who used the Textus Receptus as the basis for correcting translations:

"The other great cause of its insufficiency [Griesbach's New Testament] we have already mentioned..., [is] his use of the Received Text as a basis for correction." 9.

By bullying many Christians who love the King James Version to a radical extreme the King James Translators never envisioned, nor would have condoned, Gail Riplinger and Peter Ruckman have functioned as agents provocateurs with whom modern version proponents love to associate the King James Version instead of addressing the serious problems with their modern versions. In reality, the Ruckman/Riplinger dogma is no less heretical than the textual theory and liberal theology of Westcott and Hort which has found its way into modern versions. Both sides of the Bible version dialectic have set aside the Greek Textus Receptus as the inerrant Word of God and the standard for Bible translation. Having dispensed with the inspired Word of God, the Greek Textus Receptus, Gail Riplinger, now unfettered by those meddlesome resources, is free to lead multitudes of King James Only readers into the Great Beyond of 'letter meanings' which ultimately leads to *Kabbalah*.

## THE ALTAR OF SACRIFICE

By strange coincidence, Jewish Kabbalism is also the core doctrine and ritual basis of Freemasonry.

"Freemasonry is a Jewish establishment, whose history, grades, official appointments, passwords, and explanations are Jewish from beginning to end." 10.

"Freemasonry is based on Judaism. Eliminate the teachings of Judaism from the Masonic ritual and what is left?" 11.

"...Leo Taxil and the Cabbalist handbook of Brother Constant, 30th Grade of Freemasonry... writes: 'This report confirms the opinion of almost all authors who have dealt with this devilish magic, that all branches and practices of sorcery have their origin in the Jewish Cabbala.'

"Since the Jews were without doubt the founder and secret leaders of Freemasonry, they also introduced into some freemasonic organisations the cult of Lucifer. This is proved by Leo Taxil, who has employed himself thoroughly within this material. Concerning the 20th Grade (degree) of certain rites he writes: 'The Prince of the Tabernacle is now prepared for the freemasonic revelation, for in the 20th degree of the Grand Patriarch he has worshipped...Lucifer, and hears the summons of the President: 'Be like the morning star, who announces the day; bring the world light, in the holy name of Lucifer, dispel the darkness'. 12.

A former 33° Freemason, the late Rev. James Shaw exposed the doctrine and rituals of Freemasonry as having their basis in Jewish Kabbalah:

“Albert Pike wrote that the ‘G’ displayed in English speaking lodges is merely a corruption of the ‘YOD’ (with which it should be replaced), and that ‘the mysterious YOD of the Kabala’ is the ‘image of the Kabalistic Phallus.’ (3) The ‘Kabalah’ he refers to here is a medieval book of the occult, a highly mystical and magical interpretation of the Bible, (4) and important sourcebook for sorcerers and magicians. (5)...

“Albert Pike, in writing on the subject of Masonry’s source-book said, ‘Masonry is a search after light. That search leads us directly back, as you see, to the Kabalah.’ (*Morals and Dogma*, page 741). The Kabalah, then, seems to be the actual sourcebook of Masonry and the Bible merely (as it is spoken of in the ritual) a piece of the ‘furniture’ of the Lodge...

3. Pike, Albert, *Morals and Dogma*, pp. 5, 757, 758, 771, 772.

4. Cabala (Kabalah) is a medieval and modern system of theosophy, mysticism and thaumatology (magic), Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary. p. 53.

5. Baskin, Wade, *The Sorcerer’s Handbook*, New York, Philosophical Library, 1974.” 13.

The Kabbalah is the sourcebook of Masonry, but is the Bible a mere “piece of furniture” in the Masonic lodge? The official Bible of Freemasonry, which is on display in Masonic lodges, is the King James Version. Why is Freemasonry “King James Only”? Is there a connection between King James Onlyism and Freemasonry?

Later chapters of this report deal with the issue of “Baptist Successionism” providing historical evidence linking the Anabaptist and Baptists, not with the New Testament Church as Baptist Successionists claim, but with Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry. We were therefore not surprised to find evidence of a Masonic nature in Peter Ruckman’s Bible Baptist Catalogue. Page 1 features a full page heraldic image of a King James Bible with two crossed swords overlaying it. This illustration is strikingly similar to a Masonic photo in the “Picture Book” supplement to John Daniel’s book, *Scarlet & The Beast*.

The Picture Book supplement is titled “Two Faces of Freemasonry” and the photo of a session of the Scottish Rite Supreme Council appears in “Section 1 – Masonic Symbology” on page 27 of that section. The captions above and below the photo state:

Figure 26. King James Version of Masonic Bible on Altar of Sacrifice.  
Masons prefer KJV because King James I was a Scottish Templar  
Mason.\*

**Crossed Swords on a Bible indicate Scottish  
Rite’s Supreme Council is in session.  
Picture from Life Magazine 10-8-56**

“Freemasonry claims that crossed swords on a Bible represents its protection of God’s Holy Word. Yet we document time and again in *Scarlet and the Beast* that Masonry plans to destroy Christianity. First, by infiltration. If that fails, by separation of church and state. If that fails, by relentless persecution.” 14.

The “King James Version...on Altar of Sacrifice”? Could this be the esoteric meaning of the cover of the Bible Baptist Catalogue? Certainly Peter Ruckman has done irreparable damage to the King James Version by his bad witness and divisive influence on the Christian community. It is also true that that rudeness and contentiousness seem to characterize King James Onlyism which is only surpassed by the deceptiveness of its more egregious

claims. With their lies and contentions the Ruckmanites have, in a most sinister way, placed the King James Bible on the Altar of Sacrifice.

\*Evidence the King James I was *not* a Scottish Templar Mason is presented in our audio series, “Did Francis Bacon Edit the KJV?”

An excerpt from a Knight Templar York Rite Initiation reveals an initiate’s solemn vow taken before a Masonic altar with a Bible on top of which are crossed swords:

“Additionally, the Candidate made a solemn obligation kneeling, upon two crossed swords, **before the altar upon which is a Bible on top of which is another pair of crossed swords** on which he lays his hands: ‘Furthermore do I promise and swear, that I will support and maintain the by-laws of the Encampment of which I may hereafter become a member, the edicts and regulations of the Grand Encampment of the United States of America, so far as the same shall come to my knowledge.’” 15.

The Knights Templar are found in the higher degrees of Freemasonry and membership is limited to Masons who profess belief in the Christian religion. Is Peter Ruckman also a Scottish Templar Mason? Echoing Ruckman and Riplinger, Dan Brown revealed in his best-seller, *The Da Vinci Code*, that the Prieuré de Sion and its network of secret brotherhoods consider English to be a *pure language*, and a *sacred, secret tongue*:

“The Priory, like many European secret societies at odds with the Church, had considered English the only European pure language for centuries. Unlike French, Spanish and Italian, which were rooted in Latin - the tongue of the Vatican - English was linguistically removed from Rome’s propaganda machine, and therefore became a sacred, secret tongue for those brotherhoods educated enough to learn it.” (*The Da Vinci Code*, p. 303)

John Daniel’s “Picture Book” reveals the esoteric interpretation of the crossed swords, which symbolizes the revival of Mystery Babylon.

“Crossed swords...have a dual meaning. First, the extended hand of fellowship at the end of one point represents a peaceful return to the Babylonian religion. The sharp point on the second sword represents the military means by which the Babylonian system will be restored, should the peaceful means fail.” 16.

The “peaceful return to the Babylonian religion” is the covert mission of a network of religious movements, such as Freemasonry, to revive the mystery religion of ancient Babylon. KJV-Only advocates have written extensively about the Babylonian Harlot, which they identify as the Roman Catholic Church. They have been mysteriously silent, however, about Freemasonry. And they have looked the other way as Gail Riplinger leads a crusade against the Textus Receptus and multitudes into the Babylonian mystery religion via her primer on Kabbalah, *In Awe of Thy Word*.

Why have KJV-Only advocates largely ignored Gail Riplinger’s false teachings? Those who have written critiques come woefully short of adequately addressing the many errors and outright heresy which Gail now propagates with impunity. David Cloud did expose her deceptive misquoting of sources in *New Age Bible Versions*. 17. He also wrote a one page critique of *In Awe of Thy Word* in which, however, he also promoted the corrupt Old Latin versions. 18. (See also Chapter 16) And he has written volumes promoting heretical medieval cults as the “true Christians” who preserved the true Greek text. (See Chapter 13 and Chapter 15) On the issue of which text should be the Christian’s final authority, the Greek Textus Receptus or the King James Bible, David Cloud stands firmly in the middle.

“My final biblical authority is the King James Bible itself. I do not correct the King James Bible and I do not support any corrections of it. I do not believe it needs to be fixed. I have never corrected the King James Bible with the Greek or the Hebrew. At the same time, I know that God gave the Scriptures in Hebrew and Greek. The holy men of old who spoke by the Holy Spirit (referred to in 2 Peter 1:21) were speaking Hebrew and Greek. Those are the languages God chose. I am not going to stand here and say God made a mistake and that it is wrong for men to go directly to those languages to find the inspired Word of God...

“...I have never been a corrector of the KJV and it has always been my final authority...

“...The AV is the authority. My writings definitely do not contain ‘corrected passages from the original Greek.’... Further, I don’t see that there are contradictions between the Received Text and the AV. If someone asks what edition of the Received Text do I believe is perfect, my answer is the King James Bible edition of the Received Text is perfect.” 19.

It is not true that “the King James Bible edition of the Received Text is perfect.” There are errors in the King James Bible which are documented in Chapter 8 through Chapter 11 of this report. On the critical issue of translating foreign language Bibles, David Cloud seems to equivocate:

“...not once have I ever corrected the King James Bible... For the Ruckmanite, though, that is not enough. To be a REAL Bible believer by their strange standards one must submit to Ruckman’s theory that the King James Bible is advanced revelation, the apex of Bible transmission, that the King James Bible itself was given by divine inspiration, that it is superior to the Hebrew and Greek in which the Scripture was originally given, and that every foreign language translation today should be based on the English King James Bible.” 20

“I founded a project in the 1980s to translate the Bible into an Asian language. One of the principles that I established for that project was that the translation would be from the KJV. The translators could use various tools to dig into the meaning of the AV, but the final authority would be the KJV itself and not some lexicon or commentary. Absolutely no textual departures from the KJV would be allowed. That has always been my position.” 21.

This statement mistakenly assumes the KJV never departs from the Greek Textus Receptus, but this is not the case as F.H.A. Scrivener has documented in his meticulous analysis of the KJV:

“There are, however, many places in which the Authorised Version is at variance with Beza’s text; chiefly because it retains language inherited from Tyndale or his successors, which had been founded on the text of other Greek editions. ...in some places the Authorised Version corresponds but loosely with any form of Greek original, while it exactly follows the Latin Vulgate. All variations from Beza’s Text of 1598, in number about 190...

“...In the following places the Latin Vulgate appears to have been the authority adopted in preference to Beza...” 22.

Please see previously documented Scrivener’s “Appendix E. Passages wherein the text of the Authorized Bible seems to follow the Latin Vulgate.”

Because the KJV departs in some places from the Greek Textus Receptus, a foreign language translation based on the KJV would also depart from the Greek text in the same places. Some of these departures will have serious consequences during the Tribulation period; therefore, using the KJV as the basis of foreign language translations will to export these errors to foreign countries. (See “Translation Errors in the KJV Which Affect the Interpretation of Bible Prophecy”) Is spreading error the goal of King James Onlyism? We suspect this is the case given the intransigence of its major proponents, who refuse to acknowledge textual differences between the KJV and the Received Text, who resist efforts by others to make these textual differences known, who

suppress the Translators' Preface and discourage the use of Hebrew and Greek resources which reveal differences between the KJV and the Textus Receptus.

It was from D.A. Waite we learned that "King James-Only" means literally "no Greek and no Hebrew." Also, that he believes the Ruckmanite teaching to be heretical. Dr. Waite's stated position on the matter of which text must be the Christian's final authority is as follows:

"You can never correct the original text of Hebrew and Greek that God authored and has preserved with English, Spanish, French or any other translation. ...you cannot corrupt and change the Greek and Hebrew text and correct it with the King James Bible or any other language version. This is illogical, unscriptural, and should never be done...

"We cannot change those original language manuscripts by the King James Bible and try to correct them that way and say they give us some kind of 'advanced revelation.' This is the position that Dr. Peter Ruckman and Dr. Samuel Gipp have taken and I believe that this is wrong...

"When Samuel Gipp says that the English is the only way to go and that the English corrects, gives 'advanced revelation,' and at times even contradicts the Hebrew and Greek, we believe that this is total heresy. God's Word in Hebrew and Greek are the very words that God spoke to the original writers, gave to us through accurate copies, and preserved for us down to the present age. To say that the only word that God has preserved for us is in English and not preserved in Hebrew and Greek and that everyone who wants to know the Word of God must learn English is blatant heresy and perversion of truth." 23.

Although Dr. Waite's stated position sounds good, his writings reveal that he uses the King James Version as the standard of version comparison instead of the Textus Receptus. (See Chapter 10) This double-mindedness seems to be true of most KJV-Only defenders who only pay lip service to the Greek Textus Receptus.

We find it exceedingly strange that the KJV-Only experts who claim to deny the false teachings of Riplinger and Ruckman seem to have never consulted the Preface of the 1611 King James Version to ascertain the views of the Translators concerning their own translation. Why do they not quote in their writings the position of the KJV Translators on the issues of divine inspiration and preservation, on the superiority of the Greek and Hebrew versus vernacular translations, on the use of Greek and Hebrew resources, on the fallibility of their translation, on the textual standard for all Bible translation? If the KJV Translators were "divinely inspired" in their work of translating the Holy Bible, as Ruckmanites claim, surely their views on the inspiration, preservation, and translation of the Bible were informed by the Holy Spirit as well.

If those who profess to defend the King James Bible ever consulted the Preface to the 1611 KJV to learn the Translators' view of their own translation, we have yet to read about it in their copious books and articles. Had King James Only advocates, from the outset, deferred to the Translators' stated views on the translation of Scripture in general, and on their own translation in particular, the Ruckmanite heresy and the damage it has done might have been averted. At this late hour, we do not expect to end the Ruckmanite madness, but for the sake of many sincere Christians who are so badly misinformed, we felt it imperative to publish the "The Translators to the Reader" and to review in the next chapter the stated beliefs of the scholars who personally translated the 1611 King James Bible.

ENDNOTES

1. Isaac H. Hall, ed., *The Revised New Testament and History of Revision, giving a literal reprint of the Authorized English Edition of the Revised New Testament, with a brief history of the origin and transmission of the New Testament Scriptures, and of its many versions and revisions that have been made, also a complete history of this last great combined movement of the best scholarship of the world; with reasons for the effort; advantages gained; sketches of the eminent men engaged upon it, etc., etc. prepared under the direction of Professor Isaac H. Hall, LL.B.; Ph. D.* Philadelphia: Hubbard Brothers; Atlanta: C.R. Blackall & Co.; New York: A.L. Bancroft & Co., 1881, <http://www.bible-researcher.com/kjvhist.html>
2. Scrivener, F.H.A. *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611): Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*, Cambridge Press, 1884, pp. 262-263.
3. Ruckman, Peter. *How to Teach the Original Greek*, Pensacola Bible Institute, 1992, p. 117.
4. Ibid. p. 124.
5. Ibid. p. 110.
6. Ruckman, Peter. *The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*, Pensacola Bible Institute, 1970, p. 126.
7. Ruckman, Peter. *The Christian's Book of Biblical Scholarship*, Pensacola Bible Inst., 1988, pp. 271-2.
8. Ruckman, Peter. *The Monarch of the Books*, Pensacola Bible Inst., 1980, p. 9.
9. Westcott, B.F. and F.J.A. Hort. *The New Testament in the Original Greek: The Text Revised by B.F. Westcott & F.J.A. Hort*, Cambridge Press, p. 184.
10. Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise, B'nai B'rith, "The Israelite of America," Aug. 3, 1866.
11. The Jewish Tribune, editorial, 1927.
12. Pinay, Maurice. *The Plot Against the Church*, St. Anthony Press, 1967, pp. 561-2.
13. Shaw, James and Tom McKinney, *The Deadly Deception*, Huntington House, 1988, p. 144.
14. Daniels, John. *Scarlet & The Beast Picture Book*, Section 1, "Masonic Symbology, 2007, <http://scarletandthebeast.com/PB%206-23-07/PB-1.pdf>
15. "Christ and Cross-Bones," Mike Restivo, Meta-Religion, [http://www.meta-religion.com/Secret\\_societies/Groups/Order\\_of\\_Skull/christ\\_and\\_cross\\_bones.htm](http://www.meta-religion.com/Secret_societies/Groups/Order_of_Skull/christ_and_cross_bones.htm)
16. Daniels, op. cit., p. 51.
17. "The Problem With New Age Bible Versions," David Cloud, Way of Life Literature, <http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/newage.htm>
18. "What About Gail Riplinger's New Book?", David Cloud, Friday Church News Notes, Aug. 12, 2005, <http://www30.pageplanet.com/media/fridaynews/pdf/2005/20050812.pdf>
19. "My Position on the King James Bible," David Cloud, Jan. 30, 2006, Fundamental Baptist News Service, <http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/fbns/fbns356.html>
20. "Ruckmanites Lying About Me Again," David Cloud, July 9, 2007, FBIS, <http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/ruckmanites-lying.html>
21. "My Position on the King James Bible," op. cit.
22. Scrivener's *Annotated Greek New Testament*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1908, pp. viii-ix.
23. Waite, D.A. *Foes of the King James Bible Refuted*, Bible For Today, 1997, pp. 6, 7, 8.

WATCH UNTO PRAYER

<http://watch-unto-prayer.org>