

# King James Only

Part 1 of 3

**King James Only?**

**Part 1 ([Part 2](#))**

**By Dan Baxley**

[www.servantsofyahshua.com](http://www.servantsofyahshua.com)

[www.yahshuaservant.com](http://www.yahshuaservant.com)

[dan@servantsofyahshua.com](mailto:dan@servantsofyahshua.com)

King James Version only? So what? What is the big deal? Hasn't the King James Version been the standard for hundreds and hundreds of years, I mean since the Apostles of the Christ (joking)? Doesn't it make sense that the Creator would have only one Bible? Why do we need all of those other versions anyway? And if this is true doesn't it make sense all those modern versions are an assault on the truth? These questions are but the tip of the issue. *And, forgive me for being, well, sarcastic in the above questions.*

I hope to show, by this study, a danger in accepting such a simple thought as "King James Only". Limiting the Words of God to a single version or translation is a diabolical plan by the unseen spirit world to actually discredit the Words of our Creator and Savior, YaHshua.

Perhaps some are unaware there is a movement circulating through parts of the Christian community promoting the "King James Only" doctrine and this is not something new, it has been around for some time now, ever since the King James Version came into being as a matter of fact . What is astounding is it is being held high as sound doctrine, proclaimed to be the only way to understanding the true "salvation" of the Living God. All other versions are boldly proclaimed as the works of the Satan. We are not talking about just any KJV, no, we are talking about the 1611 version, the original version, which has gone through several revisions.

**Update 09/01/2011** -- Perry Stone in his book, Breaking the Jewish Code, pages 44-45, gives a very good report on just how exacting the Jewish scribes were in their duties of copying the ancient writings. He points out how they counted the letters to make sure the total used corresponded with the text they were copying. He lists the rules they followed in copying text and how it was reported the scribe would rise from the copy table and go wash his hands every

time he came to the Name of the God of Israel before copying it. The list of rules Perry outlines demonstrates the seriousness in the craft of the scribes and their adherence to accuracy.

Perry reports on the famous "Isaiah scroll", which is on display at the Israel Museum Jerusalem - ([http://www.imj.org.il/shrine\\_center/Isaiah\\_Scrolling/index.html](http://www.imj.org.il/shrine_center/Isaiah_Scrolling/index.html)) -- this scroll, when compared to the KJV, as Perry reports, "...they were both parallel..." Astonishing and true, to a point that is, Perry goes on to say, "...with the only exceptions being a few minor spelling differences and tense-oriented scribal errors." In other words, it is accurate "except for these errors". It is true, the Isaiah Scroll is the most complete copy of the Hebrew Scripture found to date and it does prove an accuracy of our modern day translations (not just the KJV) and has nearly put a stop to the incessant criticism charging the Holy Bible is only a work of men -- which is true -- an inspired work -- but the argument is the *words* of this book, the Holy Bible, could not be trusted, historically, because men could not be trusted to report correctly -- if this be true, then we cannot trust the words of the critics either. The Isaiah Scroll, however, proves them wrong as the errors are so minor in comparison to the modern day translations, which include the KJV 1611, as to seem a miracle, and it is. But the KJV-only teachers say the KJV is without error, Inerrant -- that the mistakes and scribal errors by the translators of the KJV is inspired and therefore without error! Can this be true? Hardly, and to suggest our Creator deliberately put errors on our way is totally wrong. What man supposes to be an error and later finds to be true point to the fact the supposed error was not an error at all. Findings such as the Isaiah Scroll correct later copies, like the KJV, not the other way around. Most, if not all of the modern translations of the Hebrew and the Christian New Testament, have made changes in the language for easier reading and to correct text better understood and brought to light by recognized findings exposing other, earlier translation mistakes.

Perry travels down this same road with the Isaiah Scroll and goes on to tell us that even the spelling errors are inspired and that the Jewish rabbis discovered these supposed spelling and scribal errors actually turn out to be some kind of code and revelation not understood at the time. Anyone not agreeing with this is called ignorant? My friends, be forewarned -- when someone, like Perry Stone, or Gail Riplinger (KJV-only writings and books) start telling you the errors are secret messages, or code, run for the hills, get out of their city, don't even look back. Why? Because they have exposed themselves, and are not teaching, the very thing we, as believers were warned against -- chasing after Jewish Fables and Jewish Kabbalah.

*(Tit 1:13-15) This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith; **Not giving heed to Jewish fables**, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth. Unto the pure all things are pure: but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled. (KJV)*

### **Errors That End Up Not Being Errors**

First we need to let common sense rule and proceed with caution. What the Rabbis did not understand was that the *supposed errors* were not errors at all, it was merely something they did not yet understand at the time, so, they made stuff up to fill in their lack of understanding, after

all, the people looked to them to be "inspired by, even talking with, Elohim". This led to defending their misunderstandings as secret knowledge but when the "supposed" errors true meanings were uncovered by the diligent work of the archaeologist's spade certain groups defended the old writings of the ancient Rabbis, saying and teaching that the Rabbis secret knowledge superceded later understandings, even the writings of the Torah, claiming the Torah of Moses was only a partial revelation, only a piece of what was taught Adam and passed on to the Super Rabbis. Some, Orthodox and Ultra Orthodox placed the Torah in second seat to the fantastic fantasy writings of the old Pharisee, the Jewish Fables, found in the Jerusalem Talmud and the Babylonian Talmud. This is the very thing our Savior, YaHshua, faced when He spoke with the Pharisees and Sadducees of that day.

### **Ultra Religious Jews cannot be our Source nor our Authority**

Even to this day the Pharisees of old, before the Christ, and their writings and opinions (*oral traditions, supposedly passed down through the ages, one master Rabbi to another eventually put in writing -- thus the Talmuds*). These writings are considered, by the Orthodox and Ultra-Orthodox Jews, as *holy writings* and even trump the Scriptures recognized by the Christian Community as Holy. If you think this is all made up all you have to do is engage any Orthodox Jew, especially an Ultra-Orthodox Jew in debate and you will soon find that they think the prophecies of the scriptures, in the book the followers of YaHshua call the Holy Bible, are considered finished since the destruction of the second Temple. They do not study the Holy Bible in the way you may think, it is the study of the Talmud and other writings from the Rabbis -- many of them are ignorant when it comes to the Holy Bible. This is not true of all Jews, of course, but when we go to them for our authority we need to be cautious. There are many divisions among the Jewish religion, as there is among the Christian groups. The teachings of the Super Rabbis despise our Savior, YaHshua., and are only too happy to help the Christians follow in a name different from a Name that might have the Name of the Living God in it.

### **By the Authority of Men**

By giving men authority over the true Word of the Living God (our Heavenly Father) and over the Words of YaHshua and the eye witnesses, His Apostles, as do the KJV-only teachers, man become the authority as opposed to the Written Words He gave us. There are errors, scribal errors, and at times comments by translators have been inadvertently added into the copying the translation into English, 1 John 5:8 is a prefect example of this. This verse supports, without doubt, the Trinity Doctrine, but this verse is not found in any New Testament copies and fragments until around the 16th century. Another example of a KJV-only goof is in Mark 16:9-20, these verse are not found in any of the earlier writings. There is out right mistakes, added material, and errors mistaken as errors with attempts to explain them as some kind of secret message. On and on it goes, but the Message, and the instructions, the guidance delivered, the challenge to improve, and the message of what is to come is all there.

There is a difference, between "error" and "supposed error", as mentioned earlier. Perry reports that the Rabbis left certain errors in place because they did not understand them. Why would they do that? What is true and undeniable is that the Scribes and the Priests, in their fastidious approach to copying text, while assuming certain things written were possible errors they feared

changing them not knowing what to change due to a lack of understanding and, to their credit, did not take things into their own hands begin changing or dropping and adding words willy-nilly as did the KJV translators did at times. You see, they, the old Scribes and Priests, did not understand certain things concerning the "plan" of YHWH and out of fear of making a "perceived error" worse they left the text as is -- for this they should be congratulated, or perhaps they had no choice and were inspired to leave it alone. This was only for those things they admitted being ignorant of. When it came to errors they felt confident in they made changes to align with what they felt they knew. An error that is not an error and proves to be truth, later, was never an error in the first place.

It is the practice of some to call anything they don't understand as an error, or a mistake, or to include things that should not be included because it fits their view -- the King James translators did that -- in every case where you find *italicized words* you are looking at words that were added by the translators and it is to their credit that they followed this practice -- I repeat, every word found in *ITALICS* is an added word not found in the so called, originals. Today, in our writings, we use italicized word for emphasis but this is not the case in the KJV Bible -- try reading some of the verses without the italicized words. This can be unsettling when doctrine is set, only to discover the doctrine is based on a proven error, or is proven to be a mistake the translators inadvertently placed in the text. Some will cling to the doctrinal error, unwilling to admit a mistake or to make the change to the truth -- the once supposed error now exposed, not as a mistake, but as a truth. (Stick with me on this and I will reveal a major example of this very thing).

Another major point in what Perry Stone reports, which is not just his position of understanding but also according to Jewish methods in scribal text, the scribes wrote in "consonants" only, meaning they did not supply "vowels" and so, when read, the "vowel" sounds had to be supplied by the reader and also when reading aloud or mentally in a private reading or from behind the lectern (pulpit).

The "vowels" were added later and this is the twist, which Perry neglects to mention, the vowels were used to hide certain pronunciations, like the Name of the God of Israel. We find this in the Jewish name for our Savior. This name, Yeshua, has place a "vowel" (e) after the "consonant" Y and dropped the consonant, H, which the knowing reader is to supply mentally, but few do and most now merely leave the "H" out and continue mispronouncing His Name as *Yeshua* (*Yes shua*) as opposed to the original, *YaHshua* -- some say, *YeHoshua*, either way the "H" is restored. This is a huge example of good intentions going wrong, creating an error, concerning the truth of our Creator's true Identity and the Identity of our Savior, *YaHshua*. When you see this you then see the great and terrible error of the KJV, especially the 1611 version which is nearly unreadable to the modern reader. The 1611 has a major error and it concerns the true identity of our Savior. The 1611 KJV tells us our Savior's name is "IESVS", later revisions, which are not to be accepted, change this to IESUS, and then again to JESUS. Not one of these names is correct and if we are to believe Perry Stone and others claiming the 1611 KJV is identical with the original Hebrew then why do they use the bogus name JESUS when the 1611 plainly has it as IESVS? Go to these links for more on the Name of our Lord and Savior, *YaHshua* -- [The Name Origin](#) -- [Original Name](#) and [Names do Matter](#)

Please if you have never heard of this before, bare with me and continue reading because the day is coming when you will hear of this KJV Only movement and may even receive pressure to conform to this error. Already the vast majority of Christians have accepted the bogus name, Jesus, in place of our Savior's birth name. It is amazing how this false teaching has gained in popularity, as witnessed in Perry Stone's book and a many others claiming the KJV is the only "inspired" version, or suggests that, or lets you believe that. Make no mistake, books like Perry Stone's can be beneficial in challenging out thinking and filled with good, useful, information and can be a great read, but we need to be on our guard for the sleight of hand used by some to direct you into accepting something the masses may accept as fact but you, as a follower of YaHshua, must reject, uncover and be willing to expose. You need to be aware and be prepared with an answer to this and other false teachings. With a little forethought on the subject you should be able to protect yourself. With the rest of this study I hope to encourage and help you do just that.

### **Modern Versions Are Bad, Evil, and Corrupt ?**

Articles have been written, pamphlets printed and books published demonizing “modern versions” of the Holy Bible and giving unquestioned loyalty to the King James Version Bible. It is touted as being the only Holy Spirit **Authorized** Version. It is claimed to be the only Bible Version God Almighty has “*authorized*” and to use of any other version is the work of the Devil. I have heard preachers on internet radio puffed up in self-righteous indignation in the promotion of this evil idea that the KJV is the "only authorized version" of God's Word. The very thing they accuse others of they are guilty and that is the distortion of the Word. First, my friends, the King James Version was not "Authorized" by God but by King James of England. You might say the KJV Bible is a "government" bible, commissioned by the government, paid for by the government, distributed to the churches by the government and deemed by the King as the only "Authorized" version acceptable to the government of England for readings on the Sunday Sabbath (more on this later). We have today, teachers attempting to push the modern translations aside as works of devils and promoting a *government issued bible* as the sole work of the Living God. This is following in the foot steps of the Roman Church, which for centuries before 1611, claimed the Latin as the only "authorized" holy language and the Latin Bible the only "authorized" Bible.

The pride of these self-appointed linguist is in stark contrast to the attitudes I have seen among those involved in the work of translating the scriptures into modern language, or modern tongue, if you please -- following in the foot prints of greats like William Tyndale, producing translations in the language of the common people . Certainly I have had some strong words for the translators myself, but my gripe goes back to the “revisionist” and I personally see the King James Version as that, a “revision”, in fact it is a multiple “revision” – you will see why later. For now let me give you a couple or three references from the ‘King James Only’ camp that you might want to look up for yourself:

1. **God Wrote Only One Bible**, by Jasper James Ray, copyright 1955-1970. Published by The Eye Opener, Junction City Oregon.

**2. Bible Versions – Which is the REAL Word of God?** By David B Loughran.  
Copyright 1999 -- Published by DeaconBrothers, Scotland

**3. New Age Bible Versions**, by G. A. Riplinger. Copyright 1995 -- Published by A/V Publications, Virginia (*690 pages of misinformation, false logic, misconceptions and misdirection. A favorite of the conspiratorial TV preacher, Texe Marrs -- if that means anything?*)

I will not attempt to cover all of the material mentioned as the volume of information is not an indication of correctness and at times is used as an attempt to so inundate the reader in an attitude of, *“it must be true, there is so much material”*, when in fact the opposite is true (“Thou does protest too much” -- comes to mind -- and they do). So, for my purposes here I will use some quotes and examples from their material but in the end it will be logic and pure common sense that will prevail as their stance does not stand on Scripture but on the words and actions of men.

### **KJV ONLY 1611 Edition**

The beauty and elegance of the King James Version Bible cannot be denied, and boy is it hard to read, in fact, the original 1611 is near impossible for the modern reader to read let alone understand. As eloquent as it may be, in its Shakespearean pattern, it is not a version for today’s modern reader. The modern reader may even disagree with the “beauty and elegance” statement, finding it awkward and difficult or impossible to read, nearly impossible to understand. If you have never seen a 1611 edition I have presented an image of the first page of Matthew at the end of this article.

Several “revisions” of the 1611 edition have appeared down through the years which are problematic for those teaching the KJV Only concept. I have a “word-for-word” reprint of the original 1611 and it is going back into reprint by popular demand. To me this is like going back to button shoes, interesting, yes, and part of the history of the Holy Bible's progression to the improved translations we have today. These new reprints of the 1611 edition are virtually all "word revisions" attempting to make the KJV of 1611 a little more palatable. Most in the Christian Communities are familiar with the 1982 revision.

### **Revisions and more Revisions**

Here is a brief record of the 1611 KJ revision: From 1611 to the first revision of 1616, then 1629 followed by the 1638 revision and it does not stop there, another revision in 1762, again in 1769 and after this it really gets crazy with the 1881 New Testament revision, followed by 1885 then leading into the American Standard Version. For the KJV the latest revision was in 1982, and, of course, there is the New King James Version attempting to update the KJV bringing it into the 20-21st centuries. As you can see the need for revision of the original 1611 began right away, within 5 years, then again 13 years later and again, 9 years later.

One defender of the KJV makes the statement that there were only 421 word changes from the 1611 down to the modern day, revised, KJV Bible. Turning this into a small percentage of the total, thus pointing out how insignificant this is. The problem with this reasoning, while I agree

with it, is that the KJV only people do not allow for any such changes. They knit pick all modern translations, whether they are themselves literal or word or word translations or not. How about this for a stat -- in the 1611 KJV our Savior is named, IESUS, in later revision it is changed to, JESUS, and this is a change of only one word, or name, 983 times. Also, neither of these names, IESUS and JESUS are found in the Old Testament, the very book, or writings declaring the coming of the Messiah. The OT does, however, contain the Name of our Savior, of the Messiah that was to come, and the Name given Him at birth is found in the OT, 216 times, one whole Book, the book of Joshua is the Old English transliteration of His Name, today pronounced YaHshua (Yoshua). No similarity to the bogus name IESUS or JESUS phonetically at all. The KJV perpetrates the deception, the lie of another Messiah, a different Messiah in a different name -- In modern translations, like the ESV and the NIV we find this name, Joshua, restored in the New Testament only 3 times -- how odd is that?

The major revisions most common among the Christian population is the 1881 (Westcott & Hort New Testament) but the KJV Only preachers and teachers would have us all revert back to the original 1611 edition based in an obsolete language far removed from present day English. Why? Because their position is that the original KJV, commissioned by King James, is really the only Bible the God of Heaven recognizes the only "inspired" words. Let's take a look at the dedication page of the 1611 KJV. This "dedication" page is dropped from most newer printings of the KJV and is rarely mentioned by other translations -- in fact it is never mentioned.

### **The Epiftle Dedicatorie**

Beginning with a little common sense let me quote from "The Epiftle Dedicatorie" of the 1611 Edition (in other words, "The Dedication" pages to King James) – I will present this quote just as it is seen in the original 1611 Edition, and please understand, this "dedication" page has been removed from the "modern" KJV -- you will see why – King James is called the Most High and Mighty, a title reserved, in the Christian mind of today, for our Creator – times were different then.

*Please note the spelling in the following is not in error. The apparent misspellings are from the original, dating 400 years ago, was correct, for that time, and this leads to some interesting word types.*

\*\*\*\*\*

### **The Epiftlee Dedicatorie:**

**“TO THE MOST HIGH AND MIGHTIE**

**Prince, IAMES, by the grace of God King of Great Britaine, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith &c.**

**THE TRANSLATORS OF THE BIBLE,**

Wish Grace, Mercie, and Peace, through IESVS

Christ our LORD.”

\*\*\*\*

*Servant’s Note: I will not quote the full two pages, except for this last paragraph as it gives you the flavor of everything before. Again, just as originally printed, the spelling is in the old English and you can see how certain letters have changes; most notable is the letter “u” for “v”.*

\*\*\*\*

“The LORD of Heauen and earth blesse your Maiestie with many and happy dayes, that as his Heauenly hand hath enriched your Highnesse with many singular, and extraordinary Graces; so you may be the wonder of the world in this later age, for happinesse and true felicitie, to the honour of the Great God, and the good of his Church, through IESVS Christ our LORD and onely Sauour.”

\*\*\*\*

### **The J has it**

Isn’t it interesting How the “i” is used in place of the letter “J”. The reason for this is, of course, the “J” as we know it today did not exist as a consonant and was an “i” with a tail and eventually becoming a different letter with a sound of its own. Some point to Martin Luther and his German translation as responsible for changing the name, Iesvs, to Jesus, because he used the “i” with the tail. The problem with that is, however, the original translation of the KJV "authorized", the 1611, used the “i”, following the Latin in this. Later, it is my opinion, the name was changed by the English revisionist in order to make the break with the Roman Church even more certain. Go to this link for more on this -- [“Jesus is Not His Name”](#).

Common sense will tell you that there is a need for modern translations, or revisions, no one speaks old English anymore much less write it. The letters have changed and in some cases dropped from word types we use today. Notice the use of the “v” in place of the “u” and the “u” in place of the “v”. See how the name of our Savior is presented, IESVS, not even close to His birth name, YaHshua. This corrupted spelling of our Savior’s name is throughout the whole text of the original 1611 Edition and is only similar to the modern version of JESUS. How do the KJV Only people answer this? They don’t, they use the “revised” name of JESUS instead of the original 1611 IESVS. Just from this alone I believe common sense will tell you what the truth is. If you need additional help from the Spirit then pray about it. Sometimes what seems so plain to one may not be so plain to another. Certainly we are not all given the same degree of “discernment” at the same level, nor at the same time. But I believe this is not really a matter of “discernment”. Surely common sense must prevail here. The Chinese do not speak Old English any more than we do here in the United States. There is most definitely a need for modern translations whether in English or Chinese. What is the Savior’s name in Chinese? Simple, it is the same as it is in English, YaHshua, the transliteration into Chinese the letters would appear different to us but when spoken the name would remain the same, the Chinese letters would

cause the Chinese speaker to say His Name just as we do by the same sounding out, or the same phonetic value.

### **Ban the KJV?**

No, of course not, and yes, everyone should have a copy, it is a wonderful version and a great achievement coming out of the dark ages. Perhaps not a 1611 edition as it is very difficult to read. For bible study a modern "revision" of the KJV alongside a good modern translation I believe is a good start toward studying the recorded Words of our Creator. We should all give due respect to the KJV as it is really the culmination of many translations before it. The KJV bible we have today, beginning with the 1611 edition owes its life to the works of men like Wycliffe, Luther, Tyndale, Cloverdale, and Rodgers to name but a few. Many gave their lives at the burn stake. Wycliffe was one of the first to buck the establishment and while he survived to die of natural causes, unlike many that followed after him, the religious powers of the day had his bones dug up and burned. Government approved they were, yes indeed, the "Roman" Church leaders could reach into the grave to punish the innocent. They didn't get to do that while he was alive but they were not to be denied, burn him they would and they did.

Now, who would do such a thing? The established *government approved religion* of course, heady men frocked in their own righteousness given too much authority -- one would have to say they were drunk on the blood of the Saints, perhaps, acting like a crowd of drunken men they took pride in self-righteous revenge against any that dared say they were wrong or challenge their authority -- a wonderful seed bed for Satan to water.

They, those men of religion, did not want anyone producing copies of the sacred word putting it into the common vernacular, on penalty of death -- can you imagine such a thing today? Certainly they had to protect the purity of the Holy inspired word by keeping it out to the hands of the common reader, after all, what could the common, low people, make of it? In their exuberance they murdered God fearing men for attempting to educate the public and undermining their precious authority. Does this sound familiar? I wonder what the KJV Only preachers would do if they had absolute power, as did the Roman Church in those days? How big would their book burning fires be and how long would it be before they would be burning fellow Christians in those fires? Believe me, I have listened to some of the sermons given by some of these KJV Only preachers and heard "praise the Lord" shout outs from the audience as these men pounded the pulpit, literally, and verbally.

The Mother Church of Rome wanted to keep the holiness of the writings they possessed -- holy inspired words the masses could not possibly understand -- after all, they could hardly understand them themselves. They had the scriptures under lock and key to be read and studied by selected priest, after all these word were dangerous if allowed to fall into the wrong hands. They, the Roman Church, owned nearly all of the ancient manuscripts and one of the only complete Bibles in Old and New Testaments, the Codex Vaticanus. The Latin Language, you see, had been considered the holy language and must be protected at all cost. Forget the languages coming to them from ancient sources are in Greek, or Aramaic or Hebrew, the Mother Church, by authority of the Pope (Papa, of the Papacy or Papa see?) would decide the fate of many that would go against her (him), refusing Latin as the language of angels and begin

translating from the Greek and Hebrew into languages of the common people would result in the death penalty. This attitude of a *holy language*, like the Roman Church of old, is still alive, found among the teachers of this false doctrine of Holy Language, carrying it on with the perceived holiness of the KJV.

The King James Version Bible has been "revised" several times, and still proves difficult for today's modern reader. The Bible tells us that in the end days, "*knowledge shall be increased*" (*Dan 12:4*), that is a true prophetic statement. No one can deny that in these modern days knowledge is increasing faster than anyone can track. What this means for the King James Version, or should, is modern translations should be superior to that of the KJV. Anyone holding to the KJV as being inspired above all other works must then answer the question as to which of the KJV "revisions" do they read and study? The three main revisions of this work -- 1638, 1769, 1982? Believe me, the original KJV of 1611 is nearly unreadable, it is hard on the eye and distracting in its odd appearance and spellings thus the need for revisions. But, should the revisions have stopped? There is a version of the KJV that is called the New King James Version (NKJV) that actually updates the old English style into the modern style of speaking while doing its best to maintain and preserved the "word for word" status assigned to the KJV.

Let me recommend a very good book on this subject, by Donald L. Brake, "A Visual History of the English Bible" and as I review this Book for my readers I would like to quote from page 190

--

*"It may be a surprising to learn that the King James translators did not work directly from the Greek and Hebrews texts. The King James Version revised the many previous English versions and was guided by the Greek and Hebrew. By now a fully developed philosophy of translation and emerged from previous work on translations. Richard Bancroft, bishop of London, set the ground rules for the new translation. Unlike Wycliffe, these men incorporated various established rules and principles for guiding the style and accuracy of their work. Bancroft constructed fifteen translation principles to cover the work. The first of these stated that the Bishops' version would form the foundation Bible to act as the guideline and would be altered only when the truth demanded it.*

*It is well known today that the King James Version is not in modern English. But neither did the translation of 1611 use the common language of its day. The application of translation rule fifteen prevented the use of extensive modern language (the English used in 1611). This rule lists the earlier English versions to be used when they agree and represent the original text. They included Tyndale's (1506), Matthew's (1537), Coverdale's (1535), the Great Bible (1539), and the Geneva (1560).*

Page 193, of this same work under the title: **"Whatever happened to the original manuscript to the 1611 version?"** And the answer is --

*"Could it be that it was destroyed in the great fire of 1666?"* Followed by -- *"Others believe the original "manuscript copy" was a fully annotated Bishops' Bible rather than an actual handwritten copy."* In other words, they do not know.

It seems no one has a clue, but what is consistent is a fact most disturbing, or should be for the KJV Only preachers, there was no known original copy of the original production of the first KJV bible turned over to the printer. It is assumed there must have been such a copy and most likely there was but it seems to be lost. While the KJV is a tremendous work it is not God writing the Bible, it actually is a work being completed with a *message* for all mankind, held miraculously intact in spite of all the faults.

The genius of this is like that of “The Adversary” (Satan) being used to refine those chosen in each age to enter the Kingdom, the very being wanting to see mankind destroyed is himself used as a tool to perfect the saints. Using the enemy to deliver the message and to reveal things hidden, for if Satan or devious men could see the hidden things clearly they would know exactly where to pollute word, but they are in the dark so men stumble around making mistakes and entering errors by accident and under the influence of Satan (the Adversary) our Savior’s Name gets changed over time but even Satan must wait to see what the future holds, he is only guessing. You see, most of this confusion concerning the KJV is to cover the change made to our Savior's Identity. He desires to have men worship him, or anything else seeming to be a god and most of all, to call on any name but the original birth name of our Savior, the only Name by which we must be saved (Acts 4:12) and to encourage men to call on a name that never existed in the first century. The KJV is used as a cover for this astounding truth, that YaHshua is Savior, not Jesus and not Iesus or Iesous but YaHshua (Rom 14:11, Joh 3:18, Php 2:9-11), the KJV, of course, replaces the original Name of our Savior with the bogus name, Jesus (1611, Iesvs).

While the KJV is a tremendous work and has stood the test of time, it is not God writing the Bible, it actually is a work being completed with a Message for all mankind held miraculously intact in spite of all the faults and interference from men. The genius of this is like that of “The Adversary” (Satan) used to refine those chosen in each age to enter the Kingdom. Imagine, if you can, using the enemy to deliver the message and to reveal things hidden, for if Satan or devious men could see the hidden things clearly they would know exactly where to pollute the word, they would not be able to help themselves, but luckily they are in the dark, so men stumble around in the dark making mistakes and entering errors by accident. This, of course, give the Adversary, Satan, the opportunity to add his bit and it is a dozy -- under the influence of Satan (the Adversary) our Savior’s Name get changed, not changed really, but replaced.

Still, the KJV Only people reject this. King James and only King James, attempting to press the 1611 version back into service. Some accept the modern revisions of the KJV but others do reject these modern revisions, to their own harm and that of their followers, claiming the 1611 version is the only one to use as all others are of Satan. When some, so called Christian leaders, take this position I do not have to wonder about who the wolves are. If you are being duped by these types get away as soon as possible, they are not true servants, how could they be, they try to tell you our Creator is inspiring error, the KJV is not perfect and the 1611 version is less perfect than all other revisions. You may as well go back to the Latin, or even the ancient Greek which no one uses today, and only a few scholars can read. Even then the Latin and the Greek corrupt the Name of our Savior, a Name by which we must all be saved (Acts 4:12). The idea that the Greek is an inspired language is the same as the claim Latin is the language of angels, or a holy language. Both ideas are wrong and when taken as truth other error enters in and the denial of our true Savior is usually the result.

The false teacher's position is plain, KJV Only, everything else is a Satanic plot -- ridiculous. The exact same argument the Mother Church of Rome used to slay anyone for producing any translation other than in Latin, and then only by whom they approved. Of course the Mother Church finally capitulated and began to fight fire with fire, no, the other fire, the fire of words as the PaPacy began losing control over England. The representatives of Mother Church burned as many as they could, believers and non-believers alike, all in the name of their god (Iesvs) but were unable to stop men such as Tyndale, whom they eventually caught and out of respect, first strangled, then burned at the stake.

The fire of words would ultimately lead to the production of a translation into the English language from the "Latin" – in 1582 a Roman Catholic New testament version published in Rhemes, France. The Old Testament was published later around 1609 at Douy, France. Both of these translations were drawn from the Latin Bible, held for so long as the only truly inspired Bible. Ironically, the Latin Bible proved to be pretty accurate when compared to the, so called, inspired Greek, and why not, the Roman Church possessed some of the oldest, if not the oldest complete Manuscripts of complete Greek translations from which the Latin copies were made. Also, this translation, the Rhemes Douy, drew on others before it also, such as, the English Geneva Bible and the Coverdale's Regault, a French edition used in comparisons of their work, all in an attempt to demonstrate the accuracy of their Latin version to the English, which actually turned out pretty good. Imagine all of those courageous men delivered to the burn stake by the very people that would capitulate and begin doing the same thing -- translating the Holy Bible into other languages.

It is difficult for me to understand this kind of thinking, then I remember, not too long ago I too had fallen into this trap, thinking the KJV, taken from the "inspired" Greek, had to be the inspired, Holy Spirit approved Scriptures -- It is beyond me, today, to continue in this confused line of thinking. The idea the KJV has Holy approval and is inspired over other translations seemed plausible considering the doctrines I had accepted while affiliated with a Church group claiming divine inspiration itself – after all, the doctrinal issues being taught had the KJV as the center piece in support of their flawed teachings. They, the group I once supported (not a KJV only) did not teach the other modern translations were of the Devil but they did play on words based on the KJV expressions and confused wording, in some cases, to teach pet doctrines. They did accept and teach the KJV as a word for word straight from the Original Inspired Greek which, it turns out, is not true. If anything the KJV is from many other previous translations, like that known as the Bishops Bible.

### **God of Israel Denied**

The idea had never occurred to me that all other versions are of the Devil. It never entered my mind then or now, but that is what these KJV preachers and teachers are stressing, and that is what sent my radar up. My biggest eye opener came when I began to understand that all of the translations, save a couple of obscure versions, had abandon the use of the Holy Name of our Savior, mentioned earlier, and are, in fact, denying the true identity of the God of Israel, YHWH, replacing His Name with a title (LORD).

### **Our Savior Denied**

Lacking this information, changing, dropping or using titles as opposed to His given Birth Name, or replacing the Name of our Creator in the Hebrew Scriptures with a "title" effectively hiding His Name and going to great lengths to cover this truth up, brought all of the translations, versions, and even the Greek writings (copies) into question for me. It seemed obvious our Creator, our Savior, allowed this to happen as there is absolutely no pure written text recording His Words, none, not one, only copies of copies. I could see the error of accepting the false teaching KJV as the only Holy Inspired bible translation -- it denied the only Name by which we must be saved (Acts 4:12, Rom 10:13, Acts 2:21) -- seeing doctrines based on obscure, hard to understand wording of the KJV -- making it necessary for the student to rely on the teacher to explain it to you -- I could see that, but the ultimate insult -- to ignore the Holy Name of our God and Savior? Now, that, if anything, appears to be Satanic, and I hesitate to say that but what else could be the answer when all translations universally deny His Birth Name, even changing His Name? The modern translations diminish much of the KJV error but do nothing to correct the avoidance and practice of substitution of His Name -- anything but His true Identity. If the KJV were the only version "authorized" by the one and only Living Deity of all the Universe ..... It would not deny His revealed NAME and the Name of His Son, our Savior. Even the Scriptures make this challenge -- ignored by the translators following in the traditions set by the KJV (Pro 30:4, Mark 7:9). Go to this link for more on this -- [Names do Matter](#)

I did use the KJV as my main study bible but I was willing to use modern translations like the NIV as a helper and seeing the benefit in this, as my knowledge grew, I obtained several other translations to assist in the understanding of the KJV, I also used various dictionaries and word study guides, of which most, were based on the KJV. One day I began to notice that all of the wording corrections and clarifications I had made in the borders of my KJV study bible were all confirmed by the notes, and sometimes the literal translations, found within the margins, and text, of the newer translations. I do not include heavily biased "paraphrase" translations, however. Obviously it became apparent to my small mind that my study bible was inferior to the newer translations and study bibles available -- I was playing catch-up. I had spent hours clarifying the wording and the meanings of the KJV by the use of all of the study aides provided for this translation, only to find those much smarter than myself had already done the work and had really made it much easier to read and understand in the process as was evident in the Modern translations such as the NKJV, NIV, NASV and others. I was wasting my time, it seemed -- not really, in retrospect, I was verifying the work and accuracy of the modern translators. Still, to this day, the bible study aides use the KJV as their center piece of study. I am still using my KJV and the Commentaries and other works, like the Strong's concordance Dictionary in my studies as indispensable tools. We are seeing some break through advances in this area, such as the "Expositor's Bible Commentary" using the NIV as its base.

I must say, however, I had been using the KJV for so many years that in reading it my mind would automatically convert all of the "thees" and "thous" and other archaic words into modern, up to date, usage, but that only worked on the latest revisions of the KJV, which the KJV Only groups condemn, as the 1611, original version, is nearly unreadable. Gradually I began to wean myself off of the KJV (revised version) and its many errors in language, and away from dubious verses that had found their way into the pages of scripture from unknown sources -- marginal

notes, scribal bias and some outright false entries. In my studies I began to discover that notes from translators of the past had crept into the main text of the KJV, as some of the scribal margin notes ended up in the main body of text. When you read a copy of the KJV you will notice many words *italicized*, and in a bit of honesty, or conscience, the translators taking credit for the KJV, point out that these *Italicized* words are not found in the original text (so called). Now, try reading many of the New Testament text excluding these added *italicized* an you will see how this can influence meanings, or add biased opinions. Okay, some of you might call that being inspired but I call it the work of men, but thanks to the modern translations much of this has been uncovered and made note of in their own notes. We must remember, notes are not Scripture, they are only notes.

Let me give you an example of innocent tampering with the scriptures. Before the KJV, Wycliff, Martin Luther, and others like William Tyndale had spent years producing translations into their native languages, this, of course, as mentioned earlier, drove the Roman Church mad, so mad the authorities in that Church wanted to kill everyone that dared to make a common translation of the words of God -- These pioneers of biblical criticism, going against the Roman Church, would write notes in the margins of the translations they worked on. (I do not feel the need to go into all of the historical points as these are easily accessed in any book on the history of the church in Europe, and in the numerous books on how we got the Bible -- I will list a couple at the bottom of the page). By the time the KJV bible came into production, under the commission of King James as a government approved Bible, these scholars, used the translations of earlier works, and used many of the notes found in the margins of those earlier copies to aid in explaining what they thought the scriptures were saying -- the bias of the translators. These notes were later worked into the word to aid in understanding how and why the translator came to the translation of a particular verse from another language, even to the point of adding his own belief on a particular subject, a biased opinion, just like a modern bible student might add a marginal note to his or her own study bible. Later, when the "revisionist" were at work and some translators too, they incorporated many of these notes into the original text -- after all they agreed with them, for the most part. Some dubious worker, or workers, actually inserted doctrines of their own, right into the body of the text and it has taken years of biblical scholarship to search these things out and correct them, or at least to enter a foot note to alert the reader to the, sometimes, obvious error.

Check out the forward found in many KJV bibles and you will see a comment concerning words and phrases placed in *italic* as an indicator this word or words **is not found in the original** -- as I mentioned before. The words are from the original authors, found in the Greek copies, called "word for word" versions and the KJV is supposed to be one of these "word for word" translations from the Greek, but seeing the difficulty in understanding a direct "word for word" the translators began adding word of their own to make sense of what they were translating into the English. The Jews of the first century would have recognized what was being said in their own language and when the letters of the Apostles were circulated throughout the New Testament Church, which was becoming more and more Gentile in population and these writings being copied into Greek. The original "word for word" translation would have been the Greek from Aramaic, the language of our Lord and His disciples, of that day. Yes, I know, some of the letters and a Gospel message (Luke) may were most likely written in Greek originally, we know Paul was fluent in Greek as well as the language of the Hebrews and he did direct much of his writings to the Gentiles. After all, he called himself the Apostle to the Gentiles, a title no other

Apostle took on, not even Peter (Acts 9:15, Acts 22:21, Rom 11:13 - Gal 2:8 For *God, who was at work in the ministry of Peter as an apostle to the Jews, was also at work in my (Paul's) ministry as an apostle to the Gentiles. (NIV).*

With all of this being considered we should have no problem deducing the originals were a mixture of Aramaic writings and Greek writings, but not all one or the other. If Peter is the Apostle to the Jews, what of the other Apostles? We know James, the brother of YaHshua, was the leader of the Jerusalem Church, but what of the other Apostles? We hear very little from them, but one thing is sure, they were not writing in Old English. We have the original writings either in Aramaic or Greek, then translated into Latin, then German, then English and French. Word for Word translations is not what they seem -- even word for word translations have additional words added by the translator. Here is the caveated, the modern translations claiming "word for word" status, when compared to the KJV, fit that description better than does the KJV. The modern translations, basing their translations on the earliest copies from Greek and Aramaic and from the earliest manuscripts available, that were not available when the KJV was put together.

The KJV was not a translation from the so called original Greek as a "word for word". The Greek and Hebrew were used as guides but were not the declared "word for word" some have bought into. We find, in the history of the Christian, Hebrew Bible, that the KJV is really a copy of works that came before it. Comparing a couple of previous versions, the Bishops Bible and that of Tyndale New Testament one can see a nearly word for word from these two, especially the Tyndale version of the New Testament. What do the KJV Only people say in answer to this? "That even the "errors" and the extra words, the *italicized* words and the addition of whole verses are "inspired" – what else can they say? What a justification for following obvious error, and how can you argue against such flawed logic? Someone tells you, "God spoke to me and told me .... ", what can you say, after all God is talking to them. When the KJV people are backed into this corner of truth and logic, that is there answer, "It is all inspired and therefore even the errors are truth".

### **Some examples of scribal error:**

The teaching of the Trinity doctrine is based almost entirely on a bogus scriptural insertion – "*For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.*" (1 John 5:7 KJV) -- this verse is not found in the inspired (so called) earlier Greek manuscripts. It does not appear in any manuscripts before 1600AD. Do you think the Holy Spirit waited that long to add additional inspired words, to reveal the trinity doctrine ?

Here is a note from the NIV: k7, 8 "*Late manuscripts of the Vulgate testify in heaven: the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one. And there are three that testify on earth:* (not found in any Greek manuscript before the sixteenth century)

Another note from the NIV Study Bible: "5:7 *three*. The OT law required 'two or three witnesses' (Dt 17:6; 19:15; see 1ti 5:19). At the end of this verse, some older English versions add the words found in the NIV text note. But the addition is not found in any Greek manuscript or NT translation prior to the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

This is the very thing that drives the KJV Only teacher's nuts and pushes them to slander the modern translations as the works of Satan. How can you argue against such logic, you can't. They see the NIV and other modern translations, ferreting out the errors of the beloved KJV, and they feel the need to defend precious doctrines they have been teaching their captives, pointing their crooked finger and in trembling voice proclaim, "See, the work of the Devil". None are so blind as those that will not see – the blind leading the blind I guess you could say -- the deceived being deceived themselves (2Ti 3:13) "...while evil men and impostors will go from bad to worse, **deceiving and being deceived**), these are not my words, you be the judge.

Remember, the purpose of this article is not to argue with those convinced in the infallibility of the KJV but to help you, in the body of the Messiah, to be prepared when and if you run into this false teaching, these deceived teachers and that you have an answer, or at least you are forewarned to stir clear of such faulty reasoning. They are very aggressive in their accusations and speak from a thoroughly righteous heart convinced of their own error to be true -- to repeat -- **deceiving and being deceived** (2 Tim 3:13). The accusations they hurl against modern language translations and translators, teaching their people, and anyone that will listen are guilty of the very things they accuse others of.

### **Gospel of Mark Tainted**

Here is another, much bigger, example of a major KJV error, found in Mark 16:9-20. Please turn to your own Bible and read it. Those verses are not found in the earliest manuscripts, nor any other ancient witnesses. In other words, there is no evidence any of the early Church leaders ever quoted these verses, wrote these verses or used these verse -- ever. If you read these verses as inspired truths then I ask you, when was the last time you picked up "*deadly snakes*" as proof of your conversion? When did you last drink poison? There is a lot wrong with these verses, but still, verse 15 has been quoted over and over by later preachers as a command from the Messiah to preach the Gospel to the world. Someone has pulled a real joke on unsuspecting, new babes in the Christ, first commanding you to go into all the world preaching the Gospel to every creature then saying, "*and these signs will accompany those who believe, in my name they will drive out demons; they will speak in new tongues, they will pick up snakes with their hands; and when they drink deadly poison, it will not hurt them at all, they will place their hands on sick people, and they will get well.*" (Mark 16:15-16) This all flies in the face of what happens in Acts 1:3, YaHshua appeared and taught His followers for 40 days after His crucifixion. Notice in the verses of Mark, the Messiah is supposedly taken up into heaven but this is not according the Acts, no in the book of Acts we see our Savior still with the disciples and other believers for 40 days more. Obviously there is a problem here as at that time His command to them was to wait in Jerusalem until Pentecost and no mention of a command for these disciples to go into the world preaching, least of all playing with poison snakes and drinking poison. Whoever added these verses, that appeared in verse around 1100AD, it is a good guess it was someone trying to prove the gullibility of believers or was trying to get rid of as many believers as possible -- or both. Also, the suggesting these signs in Mark 16:9-20 would following the believers, leads to "*tempting our Lord*", our God.

## **Last Command of our Lord, YaHshua**

Do you want to read the **last command** of our Savior? Then go to Revelation 22:10-11 (recorded by the Apostle John around 90 AD) and see what the angel of YaHshua commanded. This is a far cry from what we are told by all of the preachers. Preachers, by the way, picking and choosing only those things of Mark 16, they are comfortable with, ignoring the snake and poison thing. Yes, there are some small groups in the south that do practice such things, and some of them die and some don't, being rushed to the hospital for their salvation, they tempt God and some pay the price. Judging by Mark 16 I would have to say they are the true believers, however, not Benny Hinn, not Billy Graham, not any of the preachers on TBN -- when was the last time you saw them handling snakes and drinking poison? Common sense, remember, tells you that there is something wrong with those verses and one of the first things should be -- there is no witnesses supporting these verses encouraging believers to use snakes and poison to prove their faith. The source of such nonsense should be obvious -- Satan has his prints all over it. Satan is an artist at telling the truth with just the right amount of lies. Of course you could always put this to the test if you are a KJV Only supporter and believe that even this error is inspired by the Holy Spirit, or should I say Holy Ghost, as the original KJV says? I would not recommend drinking poison, however, let alone handling deadly snakes, that would be foolish, indeed. So, I would recommend that you do not attempt such activity -- but, you know, if you really believe these words were inspired by the Holy Ghost, well, I'm just saying. Please, do not do this. Then again, following the Last command of our Savior, I will not interfere with such activity

## **Authorized Version?**

Ever wonder why the KJV is called the "Authorized Version"? Well, the simple fact is that the KJV is a governmental authorization of the printed Bible. That is where it gets its name, King James Version. There is some very disturbing history surrounding King James and it has been the work of some to twist history in an attempt to paint King James as a true man of God -- after all, he did commission the production of the KJV Bible. We do not need to get into the colored past of King James. It is enough to know that if the government of today were to commission a panel of priests to put together a government approved Bible, paid for by the tax payers, a cry would go up that would be heard around the world. The one World conspiracy buffs would have a field day. Imagine, the Beast commissioning the writing, possibly the rewriting of the scriptures -- well, that is just exactly what happened, the Greeks had their Bible, though in pieces except for the Codex Vaticanus in the possession of the Vatican (possibly the oldest, near complete Bible both OT and NT dating around 325 AD), and the Romans had their Latin versions, then English King approved, then later the other versions approved by the Roman government given the seal of approval, albeit against their will initially, then the KJV a government approved Bible.

The Bible, the Holy Scriptures is a miracle indeed. It is amazing that through it all it has survived and still to this day contains the purity of the message of salvation. You do realize our Savior, the Creator of all things, could easily have given us a flawless book, what then? We would have the same arguments and the same critics. Do you suppose a book that everyone could read in their own language telling of the way to Salvation through and by the Creator of all things and revealing the Heavenly Father to all believers that will listen would change the hearts of the

critics, or the hard-hearted scientist of evolution? Do you suppose the atheist would suddenly find faith? And with this perfect book would you be able to explain it any better? Isn't it better we argue over an inspired message that has the hands of man all over it as opposed to trampling on a truly Holy book written from heaven? We, my friends, would not be worthy of such a book so we have what we have and it is a miraculous book even at that. The Bible becomes a lot clearer and better understood as time presses closer toward the coming of our Savior. With each new revision comes a better understanding, removing the cloud of ignorance as the older versions are fine tuned. Certainly Satan would have us living in the past, way in the past when he went about destroying the people of the Living God at will. We may see that day again and while the first century believers had close acquaintance with the original message, giving them the strength to face the hardships of temptations, some eye witnesses, we in the closing years have a more perfect word delivered to us that we can rely on to be as close to the truth as we can get as human beings -- trusting then in a more sure word of our Salvation.

So, there you have it, the KJV, as an historic translation, was and is not the final word in the Word. I finally quit making the correction in my own KJV as the work had already been done and continues to be done as more light is shed on the words spoken so long ago. Now, I find, I spend more time studying the word and what is being said than on proof reading the text.

This has led to my collecting as many differing translations as I can afford. In this something of a miracle happened, well not a miracle really but then again – I could plainly see the Message of Salvation in each and every translation I owned. The message of the Old and New Covenant is intact in each and every translation I have examined. The Message of the Gospel is in every one of these translations – I cannot repeat that enough. A "miracle", that's what I say. Some, I admit, I like better than others and I do prefer the NIV Study Bible as my study bible. It is a bible I found at a thrift store. I still use the KJV and several others. Imagine, if you will, the Holy Bible being translated into Chinese, what a blessing that would be for the called ones in China and far removed from the KJV. I saw one once and it is a strange looking thing and to think the Gospel message of Salvation is in the pages of that funny looking writing and it becomes ever so obvious the arguing over the KJV is ridiculous.

Here are some links to sites on this subject if you wish more information:

[KJV-Only Exposed](#)

[KJV Only or Not?](#)

My email: [servant@yahshuaservant.com](mailto:servant@yahshuaservant.com) From any one of these sites you will find everything you need for an in-depth study of this subject.



THE GOSPEL ACCORDING to S. Matthew.

CHAP. I.

The genealogy of Christ from Abraham to Joseph. 18 Hee was conceived by the holy Ghost, and borne of the Virgin Mary when she was espoused to Joseph. 19 The Angel setteth the understanding thoughts of Joseph, and interpreteth the names of Christ.



HEE booke of the \*genera- tion of Iesus Christ, the sonne of Dauid, the sonne of Abraham.

1 \* Abraham begate Isaac, and Isaac begate Iacob, and Iacob begate Iudas and his brethren. 2 \* Iudas begate Phares and Zara of Thamar, and Phares begate Eron, and Eron begate Aram. 3 And Aram begate Aminadab, and Aminadab begate Naasson, and Naasson begate Salmon. 4 And Salmon begate Boos of Rachab, and Boos begate Obed of Ruth, and Obed begate Iesse. 5 And Iesse begate Dauid the King, & Dauid the King begate Solomon of her that had bin the wife of Urias. 6 And Solomon begate Roboam, and Roboam begate Abia, and Abia begate Aas. 7 And Aas begate Iouaphat, and Iouaphat begate Ioraz, and Ioraz begate Ozias. 8 And Ozias begate Iotham, and Iotham begate Achas, and Achas begate Easias. 9 And Easias begate Manasses,

and Manasses begate Amos, and Amos begate Iosias.

11 And Iosias begate Iechonias and his brethren, about the time they were caried away to Babylon.

12 And after they were brought to Babylon, Iechonias begate Salathiel, and Salathiel begate Zerobabel.

13 And Zerobabel begate Abiud, and Abiud begate Eliakim, and Eliakim begate Asser.

14 And Asser begate Sadoc, & Sadoc begate Achim, and Achim begate Eliud.

15 And Eliud begate Eleasar, and Eleasar begate Matthan, and Matthan begate Iacob.

16 And Iacob begate Ioseph the husband of Mary, of whom was borne Iesus, who is called Christ.

17 So all the generations from Abraham to Dauid, are foureteene generations: and from Dauid vntill the carrying away into Babylon, are foureteene generations: and from the carrying away into Babylon vnto Christ, are foureteene generations.

18 ¶ Now the \*birth of Iesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Ioseph (before they came together) shee was found with childe of the holy Ghost.

19 Then Ioseph her husband being a iust man, and not willing to make her a publique example, was minded to put her away priuily.

20 But while hee thought on these things, behoid, the Angel of the Lord appeared vnto him in a dresse, saying, Ioseph thou sonne of Dauid, feare not to take vnto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her, is of the holy Ghost.

21 And

\* Luke read, Iosias begate Iechonias, and Iechonias begate Salathiel.

\* S. Chrys. 2. 16, 17.

\* Luke 1.

