

If You Love the KJV, You Should Know These 9 Facts

*“Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.”
1 Thessalonians 5:21,
KJV*

The KJV is a beautiful and faithful historic translation. Christians have read it, preached it, memorized it, and been nourished by it for centuries. This tract asks one narrower question: do Scripture and history require us to treat its exact English wording as the one perfectly preserved standard for every English-speaking Christian?

KJV PREFERENCE “I love and use the KJV.” A faithful choice.	TEXT-TRADITION PREFERENCE “I favor the TR or Byzantine tradition.” Christians may disagree.	CLAIM TESTED HERE “The KJV’s exact English wording alone is the perfectly preserved, finally controlling standard.”
---	---	---



WHAT THE 1611 TITLE PAGE SAYS

The Bible was “Newly Translated out of the Originall tongues” and made with former translations “diligently compared and revised.” The translators likewise described their aim as “to make a good one better.”¹ That was their stated method. Any later claim of a uniquely perfect result still needs its own biblical and historical case.

WHAT THE TRANSLATORS THEMSELVES SAID

WHAT THE TRANSLATION AND TEXT HISTORY SHOW

- 1

Other Protestant English translations could rightly be called God’s Word.

The preface says even “the very meanest translation ... in English, set forth by men of our profession” contains—and is—the Word of God. It also says “variety of Translations is profitable” for finding Scripture’s sense.¹
- 2

Imperfections did not cancel a translation’s status as God’s Word.

While defending earlier English Bibles, they acknowledged “imperfections and blemishes.” In their argument, imperfect rendering did not prevent a faithful English version from rightly being called God’s Word.¹
- 3

They placed the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures before them as the translation standard.

They identified “the Hebrew text of the Old Testament” and “the Greek of the New” as the Scriptures “set before us to translate.”¹
- 4

They openly acknowledged difficult meanings and differences of readings.

The preface defended marginal alternatives and preferred not to be “captivated to one, when it may be the other.” They did not treat an honest translation question as unbelief.¹
- 5

The KJV’s common printed form was standardized after 1611.

Article VI denied the Apocrypha authority to establish doctrine,⁷ yet the 1611 Bible printed it between the Testaments.¹ Most KJVs now omit it.⁶ Editors also corrected misprints, standardized spelling and punctuation, and made some wording changes. Major KJV editions have even varied at Ruth 3:15 (“he”/“she”); most differences remain minor.⁴
- 6

No one printed Greek edition then in existence exactly matched every KJV decision.

Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs issued related but non-identical texts. Scrivener said the AV “was not a translation of any one Greek text then in existence” and edited an evidence-limited Greek text representing its presumed basis. The label *Textus Receptus* derives from the Elzevir preface of 1633.^{2, 3}
- 7

Their work drew on a wide range of sources.

They worked from Hebrew and Greek, compared former English translations, and consulted “Translators or Commentators” across Chaldee, Hebrew, Syriac, Greek, Latin, Spanish, French, Italian, and Dutch.¹
- 8

Some TR material entered through Latin-to-Greek reconstruction.

Erasmus’s only Greek Revelation manuscript lacked 22:16b–21, so he supplied most of the gap from Latin. At 22:19, Krans finds the exact TR Greek “book” form in Erasmus-dependent copies; independent Greek witnesses read “tree.” “Book” still has older Latin versional and Latin-patristic support. The KJV remains trustworthy; the point is that its printed-text history includes reconstruction as well as transmission.⁵
- 9

Some KJV words commonly mean something different to modern readers.

These are not translation errors; English usage changed.⁸

conversation conduct 1 Pet. 1:15	prevent precede 1 Thess. 4:15	let hinder 2 Thess. 2:7	suffer allow Matt. 19:14
---	--	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Why this matters: The translators did not teach KJV exclusivity, and their history does not make it automatic.

These facts cannot disprove every providential theory. But before any doctrine binds every English-speaking Christian to one exact English form, it still needs clear biblical warrant.

Six KJV-Only Claims: What They Prove—and What They Don't

The standard should be the same for every doctrine—including doctrines about Bible translations.

Every inspired word matters. These six arguments deserve a fair hearing: do they establish one uniquely perfect English Bible? The headings summarize representative sources; no claim is attributed to every advocate.

God preserves His Word.

The Byzantine/TR case deserves a fair hearing.

Binding consciences requires biblical warrant.

1 Preservation promises plus providence identify the KJV as the perfectly preserved English Bible.

GRANT God preserves His Word (Isa. 40:8; Matt. 24:35). **TEST** Neither text identifies a future English edition. Psalm 12's "seven times" describes refined silver; even if verses 6–7 promise God's words, the passage does not name the KJV. Westminster 1.8 and the 1689 Confession 1.8 are historical witnesses, not Scripture.

They apply "kept pure" to the Hebrew OT and Greek NT, then call for vernacular translations.^{9, 10} Some advocates also appeal to reception, manuscript base, stability, and fruit. Those considerations still do not identify—without assuming the answer—which KJV form God made the final standard.

Bottom line: Preservation is true; KJV exclusivity still has to be proved.

2 Modern Bibles remove verses from God's Word.

GRANT Copyists omitted as well as added words, and modern editors can err. **TEST** "Removed" assumes the longer reading is original. Did the author write it and a copyist omit it, or did a copyist add it? Every printed Greek edition—including every TR edition—embodies textual decisions. Modern critical editions compare Greek manuscripts, early versions, and ancient citations.¹¹ Major passages such as Mark 16:9–20 and John 7:53–8:11 remain visible in many editions' brackets or notes. Familiar verse numbers are later reference tools, so a number may be absent while the disputed wording remains visible.¹⁷

Bottom line: First ask what the author wrote.

3 Modern versions weaken the Trinity, Christ's deity, the blood, and fasting.

GRANT Some variants make a doctrine less explicit in one verse; some translation choices are poor. **TEST** A reading is not original simply because it states a doctrine more explicitly. The Comma Johanneum has early Latin history but sparse, late Greek support.^{12, 13} The Trinity, deity, blood, and fasting remain clear (Matt. 28:19; 2 Cor. 13:14; John 1:1; 20:28; Col. 2:9; Eph. 1:7; 1 Pet. 1:18–19; Acts 13:2–3; 14:23). Jude 5 can even be more explicitly Christological in modern translations: several read "Jesus"; the KJV has "the Lord."²³

Bottom line: Settle the reading by evidence; build doctrine from the whole Bible.

4 The Byzantine majority outweighs a small Alexandrian minority.

GRANT Byzantine manuscripts numerically predominate and deserve serious attention; a Majority/Byzantine case is legitimate. **TEST** Byzantine, Majority, the several TR editions, and the KJV are related but not identical; the Comma and Rev. 22:19 "book" lack majority Greek support. Some appeal to the received text as a whole or to providential recognition. Even then, choosing one exact KJV form must be shown, not assumed. Witnesses are related, so totals are not independent votes; neither does "oldest automatically wins."¹⁸

Bottom line: A numerical majority deserves attention; it does not prove KJV exclusivity.

5 Modern Bibles follow corrupt Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Westcott–Hort.

GRANT Vaticanus and Sinaiticus contain individual errors and often receive substantial weight; Westcott and Hort were influential. **TEST** Both codices are usually dated to the fourth century; Nongbri permits a wider early-fourth-to-early-fifth range for Sinaiticus.^{14, 15, 16} Age does not make them infallible, but alleged defects must be tested reading by reading. Current editions are not the 1881 text and assess witnesses and relationships variant by variant.¹¹

Bottom line: A scholar's reputation or a manuscript's name cannot decide a reading.

6 The KJV's stability and extraordinary blessing show that God established it as the perfect English standard.

GRANT The KJV's literary excellence, stability, congregational continuity, and extraordinary fruit deserve celebration. **TEST** Norton documents corrections, spelling/punctuation modernization, and some wording changes. Major standardization came in 1762 and 1769.⁴

Most differences are minor, but "never changed" is inaccurate. God's blessing on a translation does not make each word choice the exclusive standard for all Christians.

Bottom line: Celebrate the KJV without making its blessing proof of exclusive perfection.

THREE CLAIMS YOU CAN CHECK IN THE KJV ITSELF

"Modern Bibles remove Lucifer."

Hebrew *hēlēl* remains; modern Bibles translate it. "Lucifer" is Latin-derived, and the Vulgate uses *lucifer* positively at 2 Pet. 1:19. Translation, not deletion.^{19, 20}

"The KJV says Easter; modern Bibles say Passover."

Pascha means Passover/Paschal feast. Luke 22:1 calls Unleavened Bread "the Passover"; Acts 12:3 places Peter's arrest during those days. "Easter" is historical English; "Passover" is not corruption.^{21, 24}

"Holy Ghost is biblical; Holy Spirit is modern."

The KJV itself uses "Holy Spirit" (Luke 11:13) and "holy Spirit" (Eph. 4:30), as well as "Holy Ghost." English usage, not doctrine.²²

Read, love, preach, and memorize the KJV. Receive it as God's Word faithfully translated. But do not bind Christian consciences to the unproved claim that its exact English wording alone is perfectly preserved.



SCAN: FULL SOURCE DOSSIER

Opens the complete 9-page dossier with all 24 sources, pinpoints, and limitations.