

King James Version Old Testament Text

by Dr. Chester W. Kulus

1. Who is Jesus? You might respond that Jesus is God, the Savior, the Way, the Truth, the Life, the Good Shepherd, the Door, the Lamb of God, and more. But what I would have you to see is that Jesus is The Word of God. When Jesus comes from heaven at the end of the tribulation the Bible says of Him that "His name is called The Word of God" (Revelation 19:13).
2. Jesus is The Word of God, which means that He is the only authority that you need to decide the matter of the printed Word of God. Jesus is the only authority that you need to decide the text issue for you. You do not need Westcott, Hort, Metzger, Custer, or even Kulus. All you need is Jesus. He is The Word of God and if you will listen to Him, then He will decide text issue for you.
3. Sadly, many do not listen to the One Who is The Word of God when it comes to the Word of God, but rather they listen to everyone else. This just ought not to be! Would you listen to Jesus? I hope you would.

I. And so what did Jesus, The Word of God, say about the text, particularly the Old Testament text? In Matthew 5:18 Jesus said, "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Let us examine this verse.

A. In this verse Jesus speaks of the law (τοῦ νόμου). To what does this refer?

1. The expression *the law* can refer to *the law of Moses* (Luke 24:44; John 7:23).
2. Also, the expression *the law* can refer to the Old Testament. How do I know?
 - a) In John 10:34 Jesus refers to Psalm 82:6, yet states that it came from the law (τῷ νόμῳ). Jesus is using *law* as a reference to the Old Testament.
 - b) In John 12:34 the people say that they have heard out of the law (τοῦ νόμου) that Christ abideth for ever. This is not something that is in the first five books of the Bible, but rather is something that is in Psalm 110:4 and in Daniel 2:44. Therefore, they are using *the law* as a reference to the Old Testament.
 - c) In John 15:25 Jesus refers to Psalm 35:19 and 69:4 and says that this is written in the law (τῷ νόμῳ). Again, Jesus is using *law* as a reference to the Old Testament.
 - d) In I Corinthians 14:21 the Bible quotes from Isaiah 28:11-12 and says that it is written in the law (τῷ νόμῳ). This is not something that is written in the first five books of the Bible, therefore this use of *the law* is referring to the Old Testament.
3. *The law* can mean either *the law of Moses* or *the Old Testament*. Which one is it in Matthew 5:18? Well, in Matthew 5:17 Jesus speaks of fulfilling the law and the prophets, a reference to the entire Old Testament (Mt 7:12; 11:13; 22:40; Acts 28:23). In this case, *the law* refers to the Pentateuch. Matthew 5:18 starts with the word *for*, which gives the basis or reason for Matthew 5:17; that is, Jesus will fulfill the law and the prophets because one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled. If *law* in Matthew 5:18 is referring only to the Pentateuch, then Matthew 5:18 would be a reason or basis for Jesus' fulfilling only the Pentateuch and not the Prophets. But in order for Matthew 5:18 to serve as a reason or basis for Jesus' fulfilling the entire Old Testament as Matthew 5:17 states, then the word *law* in Matthew 5:18 must refer to the entire Old Testament. Therefore, I conclude that the word *law* in Matthew 5:18 speaks of the entire Old Testament.

B. Jesus says of the Old Testament that one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from it.

1. *Jot* refers to the smallest consonant of the Hebrew alphabet, the *yodh* (י).
2. *Tittle* refers to the smallest Hebrew vowel, the *chirek*, which is a single dot. Many think that *tittle* refers to the smallest differences between the consonants, such as the difference between a rounded corner (𐤆) as compared to a square corner (𐤇), or an extension (𐤈) as compared to no extension (𐤉), or a gap (𐤊) as compared to no gap (𐤋). But I contend that this is not the case, why? Several reasons dictate that *tittle* refers to a vowel. These reasons are contextual, lexical, scriptural, and etymological.

a) Lexically, *tittle* can have the meaning of *point*.¹ it is interesting that *The Oxford English Dictionary* list as a meaning for the word *tittle*, "Any one of the Hebrew and Arabic vowel-points."²

b) Contextually, *tittle* must refer to a vowel.

(1) Since Jesus mentioned *jot*, the smallest consonant, then there is no need to refer to the consonants again, for if the smallest consonant is preserved, then all the other consonants are preserved as well (cf. Luke 16:10).

(2) Also, the word *or* in the expression *one jot or one tittle* is a disjunctive conjunction³ which "denotes an opposition of the ideas expressed by the words or clauses it connects."⁴ Therefore, *jot* and *tittle* are two different things. Since *jot* refers to a consonant, then *tittle* must refer to something other than a consonant.

(3) Matthew 5:18 speaks of all being fulfilled, which refers to the fulfillment of prophecy, the exact fulfillment of which depends on the vowels. For example, in Genesis 49:10, is it, "Until Shiloh come," as the vowels would read in the Traditional Hebrew Text or is it, "until tribute comes to him," if the vowels were changed? The fact that the exact fulfillment of prophecy is unsure if the vowels are not sure argues for *tittle's* referring to a vowel.⁵

c) Scripturally, God spoke words involving the use of both vowels and consonants (Genesis 22:16; Exodus 4:22; 24:4; Jeremiah 30:2; 36:1-4; Matthew 4:4). These words God's prophets wrote necessitating their having used vowels (Exodus 34:27; Matthew 22:31; Luke 24:25; John 1:23; 12:38; Acts 3:22; 7:48-49; 8:32-34; 28:25; Romans 9:29; 12:19; 14:11; I Corinthians 9:10; Hebrews 3:7; II Peter 3:2). Since Jesus guaranteed the perfect preservation of God's Words (Matthew 24:35; John 10:35; 17:17), and since words have both vowels and consonants, then the vowels must be part of the preserved text; therefore, both vowels and consonants are preserved. This would argue for *tittle* referring to a vowel.

d) Etymologically, *tittle* (κεραία) in the Greek seems to be the Greek way to refer to the Hebrew word *chirek*, the smallest Hebrew vowel. Gill states: "As the least letter in the Hebrew alphabet *Yod* is referred to, the least of the points in use, *Chirek*, is also;

¹ Joseph H. Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977), 344.

² "Tittle" in *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., prepared by J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), XVIII:159.

³ Randolph O. Yeager, *Matthew 1-7 in The Renaissance New Testament* (Gretna, LA: Pelican Publishing Co., 1986), 370.

⁴ William Allen Neilson, ed., *Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language*, 2nd ed. (Springfield, MA: G & C Merriam Company Publishers, 1961), 641.

⁵ For other examples where prophecy is adversely affected by altering the vowels, see the author's *One Tittle Shall in No Wives Pass* (Newington, CT: Emmanuel Baptist Theological Press, 2009), 326-327.

between which and the *Greek* word κεραία, used by the Evangelist, is great nearness of sound, and seems to be no other than that point made *Greek*.”⁶ In other words, Gill indicates that κεραία is a transliteration into Greek of the Hebrew חֵירֶק (*chirek*). This is a valid contention.⁷

e) Based upon these lexical, contextual, scriptural, and etymological reasons I conclude that *tittle* refers to the smallest Hebrew vowel-point.

3. Jesus' guarantee that not even one of the smallest Hebrew consonants or one of the smallest Hebrew vowels shall pass from the Old Testament ensures the complete preservation of the entire Old Testament. Jesus said, "Shall in no wise pass." This is a very strong double negative in the Greek where by Jesus is emphasizing the impossibility of such a thing. It is the same construction that Jesus uses in reference to our salvation in John 6:37. What this means is that not only are the Hebrew vowels preserved, but that also they were present in the text that Jesus had, therefore, they were not invented by the Masoretes of the ninth century, as many suppose. Rather, the Masoretes simply passed on the vowels that were present in the text that Jesus had. I come to this conclusion because local churches, which have the responsibility of being the pillar and ground of the truth (I Timothy 3:15) received the Masoretic Text with its vowels, and made it the *Textus Receptus* all of the Old Testament.⁸ Their making it the *Textus Receptus* of the Old Testament means that they recognized that it is the Old Testament Word of God.

C. Is Jesus' promise of Matthew 5:18 still valid today? Yes.

1. Jesus says, "Till heaven and earth pass." Heaven and earth have not yet passed, therefore, this promise is still in effect. In Luke 16:17 Jesus said, "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Here Jesus just refers to the very smallest part of the Hebrew Text, that is, the tittle. Jesus states that not even one little dot of the Hebrew Text will fail, that is, fall away. Jesus teaches the full preservation of the Hebrew Text. Would you hear Jesus?
2. Jesus also says, "Till all be fulfilled." All of the Old Testament has not been fulfilled, therefore, this promise is still in effect. Would you hear Jesus?
3. Since the promise of Matthew 5:18 is still in effect, would you hear Jesus? Jesus asserted that His Hebrew Old Testament had nothing missing and asserts that this Hebrew Old Testament would continue. We have this text today. Would you listen to Jesus?

II. Is there an English translation of the Old Testament that listens to Jesus? Is there an English translation of the Old Testament that accepts what Jesus, The Word of God, says about the Old Testament Word of God? Yes there is. What English translation would that be? I am glad you

⁶ Gill, *A Dissertation Concerning the Antiquity of the Hebrew Language, Letters, Vowel-Points, and Accents* (London: G. Keith, 1767), 223.

⁷ For a further discussion on *tittle* etymologically being the *chirek* see the author's *One Tittle Shall in No Wise Pass*, 310-346.

⁸ Burnett on page 170 of *From Christian Hebraism to Jewish Studies: Johannes Buxtorf (1564-1629) and Hebrew Learning in the Seventeenth Century* indicates that Jacob ben Chayyim's Hebrew text of 1525 "became accepted (at least among Christians) as the 'received text'." Ginsburg also states of this text that it "came to be recognized as the true masoretic text" (Christian D. Ginsburg, "Prolegomenon" in *Jacob Ben Chayim Inn Adonijah's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, Hebrew and English; with Explanatory Notes* (NY: KATV Publishing House, Inc., 1968), XI). The work of Jacob ben Chayyim "was the first to present a complete Masorah – the Masoretic notes on the text – and was the second Rabbinic Bible, the only authorised Masoretic recension, becoming in time the 'textus receptus' of the Old Testament" ("Preface to the Bomberg/Ginsburg Hebrew Old Testament" in *Hebrew Old Testament* (London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1998), i). Chayyim's Hebrew text included the vowel points.

asked. It is the King James Version. Let me give you a number of places where the King James Version listens to Jesus and where the modern versions do not listen to Jesus.

A. An example of the modern versions thinking that words are missing - I Samuel 13:1

1. The readings

- a) KJV, "Saul reigned one year; and when he had reigned two years over Israel."
- b) ESV, "Saul was... years old when he began to reign, and he reigned... and two years over Israel."
- c) NASV, "Saul was *thirty* years old when he began to reign, and he reigned *forty* two years over Israel."
- d) NIV, "Saul was *thirty* years old when he became king, and he reigned over Israel *forty-two* years."
- e) NRSV, "Saul was... years old when he began to reign; and he reigned... and two years over Israel."

2. The reasoning: the modern versions believe that a couple of words are missing from the text. The *English Standard Version* has two footnotes on I Samuel 13:1. The first says, "The number is lacking in Hebrew and Septuagint." The second says, "*Two* may not be the entire number: something may have dropped out."⁹

3. Conclusion: the KJV is an accurate translation of the Hebrew text. The NASV and NIV contradict Acts 13:21, which says that Saul reigned for 40 years. The modern translations do not take Jesus' words seriously when He said that not even one jot or one tittle shall pass from the law, let alone two entire words. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did. It is also interesting to note that Sir Isaac Newton took this verse and the entire passage at face value when he wrote, "Saul was made King, that he might rescue Israel out of the hand of the Philistines, who oppressed them; and in the second year of his Reign [*sic*], the Philistines brought into the field against him thirty thousand chariots [see I Samuel 13:5]."¹⁰ Isaac Newton, with all of his learning, did not try to correct the Bible in these places.

B. An example of modern versions changing a word – Jeremiah 27:1.

1. The readings

- a) KJV, "Jehoiakim."
- b) ESV, NASV, NIV, NRSV, "Zedekiah."

2. The reasoning: the chapter deals with events that occurred in Zedekiah's day and, therefore, the modern versions change the name *Jehoiakim*, which is in the Traditional Hebrew Old Testament Text to *Zedekiah*.

3. Conclusion: even if something does not make sense, it does not give a translator the right to change the reading. The translator should show faith in the promise of Christ that all the words that should be in the text are in the text. Again, the modern versions act as if Jesus does not know that about which He speaks. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.

C. An example of modern versions changing a consonant – Isaiah 9:3.

⁹ *The Holy Bible, English Standard Version* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Bibles, a division of Good News Publishers, 2001), 234.

¹⁰ Isaac Newton, *The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended* (London: T. Cadell, 1770), 167. The author updated the spelling.

1. The readings
 - a) KJV, “Not increased the joy.”
 - b) ESV and NRSV, “Have increased its joy.”
 - c) NASV, “Shall increase their gladness.”
 - d) NIV, “Increased their joy.”
 - e) NKJV, “Increased its joy.”
2. The reasoning: the modern versions do not like the word *not* (אֵין) that is in the Traditional Hebrew Text, so they change it to *its* (אֵלָיו), which they do by changing a consonant.
3. Conclusion: by changing the consonant, the modern versions, reverse the meaning of the verse and show their total disregard for Jesus’ statement that one jot shall in no wise pass from the law. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.

D. Two dozen examples of the modern versions changing vowels

1. Genesis 49:10

a) The readings

(1) KJV, “until Shiloh come.” This is a faithful translation of the Traditional Hebrew Text. Genesis 49:10 is a Messianic prophecy concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, for Jesus is from the tribe of Judah (Revelation 5:5) and the people shall be gathered together unto Him in the Millennial Kingdom (Isaiah 11:1,10).

(2) ESV, “until tribute comes to him.”

(3) NIV, “until he comes to whom it belongs.”

(4) NRSV, “until tribute comes to him.”

b) The reasoning: According to the *English Standard Version* there is no person named *Shiloh* who came from Judah in Genesis 49:10 and, therefore, the gathering of the people is not to Shiloh but to Judah. How did the *English Standard Version* arrive at its non-Messianic translation? A footnote gives the answer when it states that it arrived at *until tribute comes to him* “by a slight revocalization.”¹¹

c) Conclusion: these versions are not listening to Jesus, rather by re-vocalizing, they are treating Jesus as if He does not know what He is talking about. But would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.

2. Deuteronomy 33:27

a) The readings

(1) KJV, “The eternal God *is thy* refuge, and underneath *are* the everlasting arms.”

(2) NRSV, ““He subdues the ancient gods, shatters the forces of old.”

b) The reasoning: the NRSV bases its change on a change of the vowels. A footnote in the *English Standard Version* states: “Revocalization of verse 27 yields *He subdues the ancient gods, and shatters the forces of old.*”¹² The *New Revised Standard Version* follows the reading of the *English Standard Version* footnote.

c) Conclusion: the NRSV has little regard for Jesus' promise about the Old Testament text. Would you hear Jesus? The King James translators did.

¹¹ *English Standard Version*, 42.

¹² *Ibid.*, 177.

3. I Kings 13:12

a) The readings

(1) KJV, “Had seen.”

(2) ESV, NIV, NRSV, “Showed.”

b) The reasoning: *The Pulpit Commentary* notes: “Or *showed*. LXX.

𐤀𐤌𐤁 𐤅𐤁𐤁 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤁 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤁. Similarly most of the versions. A very slight change in the vowel points 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤁 for 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤁 would give this sense.”¹³

c) Conclusion: *had seen* and *showed* are not the same, apparently, the modern versions are giving Jesus a deaf ear. Would you hear Jesus? The King James translators did.

4. Ezra 8:26

a) The readings

(1) KJV, “And silver vessels an hundred talents.”

(2) ESV, “And silver vessels worth 200 talents.”

b) The reasoning: the ESV bases its reading on a “revocalization.”¹⁴

c) Conclusion: I guess the ESV is factoring in for inflation, while at the same time disregarding Jesus' words. Would you hear Jesus? The King James translators did.

5. Job 15:23

a) The readings

(1) KJV, “He wandereth abroad for bread.”

(2) NIV, “He wanders about-- food for vultures.”

b) The reasoning: *The Pulpit Commentary*, concerning “he wandereth about for bread,” observes: “‘He wanders abroad *to be the food of vultures*’ is a translation of the passage suggested by some moderns (as Merx), and has the support of the Septuagint, κατατέτακται δὲ εἰς σῖτα γυψίν. But it requires a slight change in the pointing.”¹⁵

c) Conclusion: while talking about food, the NIV is forgetting to eat the Words of God because it is ignoring what Jesus said. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.

6. Job 24:12

a) The readings

(1) KJV, “Men.”

(2) ESV, NIV, NRSV, NKJV, “The dying.”

b) The reasoning: Fausset writes: “Rather, ‘mortals’ (not the common Hebrew for ‘men’); so the Masoretic vowel points read as the English version (מְחִיִּים). But the vowel points are modern. The true reading is, *The dying* (מְחִיִּים): answering to ‘the wounded’ in the next clause.”¹⁶

¹³ J. Hammond, *I Kings* in vol. 5 of *The Pulpit Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, n.d.), 295.

¹⁴ *English Standard Version*, 395. It is worth noting that on these same words the *New Revised Standard Version* has, “and one hundred silver vessels worth . . . talents.” The ellipsis is a direct quote. It seems that the *New Revised Standard Version* believes that a word or words are missing in Ezra 8:26, thereby revealing its lack of faith in God’s promise of Psalm 12:6,7.

¹⁵ G. Rawlinson, *Job* in vol. 7 of *The Pulpit Commentary*, 263, 264.

¹⁶ A. R. Fausset, *Job-Isaiah*, in *A Commentary Critical, Experimental, and Practical on the Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1984), 60.

- c) Conclusion: Fausset and the modern versions give a little regard to Jesus' words about the Old Testament Text. Would you hear Jesus? The King James translators did.
7. Psalm 2:9
- a) The readings
- (1) KJV, "Thou shalt break."
 - (2) NIV, "You will rule."
- b) The reasoning: the *English Standard Version* has a footnote that states: "Revocalization yields (compare Septuagint) *You shall rule.*"¹⁷
- c) Conclusion: the NIV is not letting Jesus rule because it is disregarding His statement. Would you hear Jesus? The King James translators did.
8. Psalm 29:9
- a) The readings
- (1) KJV, "Maketh the hinds to calve."
 - (2) NIV, "Twists the oaks."
 - (3) NRSV, "Causes the oaks to whirl."
- b) The reasoning: the *English Standard Version* has a footnote that states: "Revocalization yields *makes the oaks to shake.*"¹⁸
- c) Conclusion: the NIV truly twists the Word of God. The modern versions treat Jesus as if He were a liar. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.
9. Psalm 33:7
- a) The readings
- (1) KJV, "As and heap."
 - (2) NIV, "Into jars."
 - (3) NRSV, "As in a bottle."
- b) The reasoning: Maclaren observes: "The old versions and interpreters, followed by Cheyne, read 'as in a bottle' for 'as an heap,' vocalising the text differently from the present pointing."¹⁹
- c) Conclusion: the modern versions should really put a lid on their ignoring Jesus. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.
10. Psalm 60:8
- a) The readings
- (1) KJV, "Philistia, triumph thou because of me."
 - (2) ESV, NIV, and NRSV, "Over Philistia I shout in triumph."
- b) The reasoning: the ESV bases its reading on a "revocalization."²⁰
- c) Conclusion: again, the modern versions put little stock in Jesus' words. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.

¹⁷ *English Standard Version*, 448.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 461.

¹⁹ Alexander Maclaren, *The Psalms*, in vol. 3 of *The Expositor's Bible*, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1947), 88.

²⁰ *English Standard Version*, 478.

11. Psalm 69:22

a) The readings

(1) KJV, “A snare before them: and *that which should have been for their welfare, let it become a trap.*”

(2) NIV, “A snare; may it become retribution and a trap.”

b) The reasoning: an *English Standard Version* footnote states: “A slight revocalization yields (compare Septuagint, Syriac, Jerome) *a snare, and retribution and a trap.*”²¹ The NIV follows the revocalization.

c) Conclusion: with their “slight revocalization” they are slighting Jesus. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.

12. Proverbs 21:4

a) The readings

(1) KJV, “The plowing of the wicked.”

(2) ESV, NASV, NIV, NRSV, “The lamp of the wicked.”

b) The reasoning: concerning “the plowing,” Cook comments: “The Heb. word, with a change in its vowel-points, may signify either: **(1)** the ‘fallow field,’ the ‘tillage’ of xiii. 23, or **(2)** the lamp.”²²

c) Conclusion: the modern versions follow a change in the vowels and by so doing do not shed any light on this verse. In fact, they are stumbling in the dark as they refuse to walk in the light of Christ’s Words. Would you hear Jesus? The King James translators did.

13. Proverbs 26:23

a) The readings

(1) KJV, “Silver dross.”

(2) ESV, NIV, NRSV, “Glaze.”

b) The reasoning: the *English Standard Version* “by revocalization”²³ has “glaze,” and the others follow suit.

c) Conclusion: the modern versions just glaze over Jesus’ Words about the vowels being preserved, but the KJV did not. Would you hear Jesus?

14. Proverbs 30:1

a) The readings

(1) KJV, “And Ucal.”

(2) ESV, “And worn out.”

b) The reasoning: the ESV bases its reading on a “revocalization.”²⁴

c) Conclusion: the reading of the ESV needs to be revoked and rebuked because it fails to demonstrate faith in Jesus. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.

15. Ecclesiastes 3:21

a) The readings

²¹ Ibid., 483.

²² F. C. Cook, ed., *Proverbs* in vol.5 of *Barnes’ Notes* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 59.

²³ *English Standard Version*, 548.

²⁴ *English Standard Version*, 551.

- (1) KJV, "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?"
- (2) ESV, "Who knows whether the spirit of man goes upward and the spirit of the beast goes down into the earth?"
- (3) NIV, "Who knows if the spirit of man rises upward and if the spirit of the animal goes down into the earth?"
- (4) NRSV, "Who knows whether the human spirit goes upward and the spirit of animals goes downward to the earth?"

- b) The reasoning: the modern versions arrive at their reading by changing the vowels.
- c) Conclusion: does the spirit of man go upward, or does it not? Does the spirit of an animal go downward, or does it not? The *King James Version* makes it clear that the spirit of man does go upward and that the spirit of the beast does go downward; but the other versions are ambiguous here. The point is that if God did not inspire the vowels, then there is no way of knowing for certain from Ecclesiastes 3:21 whether the spirit of man goes upward and the spirit of the beast downward. This is exactly the uncertainty that the devil would want us to have about the Word of God, for it is the devil who quipped, "Yea, hath God said?" (Genesis 3:1). But there need be no question over the Word of God if one would hear Jesus. Would you hear Jesus? The King James translators did.

16. Isaiah 1:2

- a) The readings
 - (1) KJV, "Hath spoken."
 - (2) NASV, "Speaks."
- b) The reasoning: the Hebrew has a Piel perfect third masculine singular, Clarke states: "I render it in the present time, pointing it דבר dober,"²⁵ that is, as a Qal active participle, *speaking*, which the NASV renders as *speaks*.
- c) Conclusion: the NASV is not listening to the words that Jesus speaks, but rather turns a deaf ear to them. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.

17. Isaiah 30:8

- a) The readings
 - (1) KJV, "For ever and ever."
 - (2) ESV, NASV, and NRSV, "As a witness forever."
 - (3) NIV, "An everlasting witness."
- b) The reasoning: *The Pulpit Commentary* states: "Modern critics observe that the phrase, *lâ'ad 'ad 'olâm*, [*for ever and ever*] never occurs elsewhere, and suggest a change of the pointing, which would give the sense of 'for a testimony forever'."²⁶
- c) Conclusion: the fact that *lâ'ad 'ad 'olâm*, [*for ever and ever*] does not occur elsewhere is not reason to change it as do the modern versions, but is all the more reason to trust Jesus. Those who change it are walking by sight rather than by faith. While one might initially think that *for ever and ever* and *for a testimony forever* have the same meaning,

²⁵ Clarke, *Isaiah – Malachi*, vol. 4 in *Clarke's Commentary in The Master Christian Library*, version 8 [CD-ROM] (Albany, OR: Ages Software, 1997), 37.

²⁶ G. Rawlinson, *Isaiah*, vol. 1, in vol. 10 of *The Pulpit Commentary*, 490.

they do not. Isaiah 30:8 in the Traditional Text teaches that what Isaiah wrote would be for ever and ever, that is, that the very words themselves would be for ever and ever, which speaks of verbal preservation. What the critics suggest, however, with their repointing is that Isaiah's writing would be for a testimony forever, in other words, that Isaiah's message would continue, but not necessarily Isaiah's very words. The change suggested by the critics promotes conceptual preservation, that is, preservation of the concepts, but not of the actual words. Conceptual preservation does not necessarily require the vowels, whereas verbal preservation does, and it is verbal preservation that the Bible teaches (Psalm 12:6,7). Would you hear Jesus? The King James translators did.

18. Isaiah 40:6

a) The readings

(1) KJV, "And he said."

(2) ESV, NIV, and NRSV, "And I said."

b) The reasoning: the *English Standard Version* through "revocalization based on Dead Sea Scroll, Septuagint, [and] Vulgate"²⁷ has "and I said." Both the *New Revised Standard Version* and the *New International Version* both follow suit.

c) Conclusion: the modern versions ought to listen to what Jesus said. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.

19. Jeremiah 23:17

a) The readings

(1) KJV, "Unto them that despise me, The LORD hath said."

(2) ESV and NRSV, "To those who despise the word of the LORD."

b) The reasoning: *The Pulpit Commentary* states:

The Septuagint and the Syriac render the same text (the consonants are alone the text) with different vowels, thus: "Unto those who despise the word of the Lord." In favor of this it may be urged that the phrase, "The Lord hath said," is nowhere else used in this abrupt way to introduce a real or supposed revelation, and Hitzig and Graf accordingly accept it.²⁸

c) Conclusion: the above comment disregards Jesus' statement about the title. Also, "scholars" seem to think that they can change an expression simply because it occurs nowhere else and the modern versions follow suit. But Jesus guaranteed that the words are as they ought to be. Would you hear Jesus? The King James translators did.

20. Jeremiah 48:18

a) The readings

(1) KJV, "Sit in thirst."

(2) ESV, NIV, and NRSV, "Sit on the parched ground."

b) The reasoning: *The Pulpit Commentary* states: "The expression is unexampled, and it is possible that we should alter one of the vowel points (which constitute no part of the Masoretic text), rendering, 'sit in thirsty (ground),' *i.e.* the dust (comp. the parallel

²⁷ *English Standard Version*, 599.

²⁸ T. K. Cheyne, *Jeremiah*, vol. 1, in vol. 11 of *The Pulpit Commentary*, 515.

passage, Isa. xlvii. 1).”²⁹ The modern versions give credence to the idea that the vowel points are inconsequential.

- c) Conclusion: the modern versions ought to get their views from Jesus and then they would get the point that not even a tittle shall fail from the law. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.

21. Jeremiah 49:1

a) The readings

(1) KJV, “Their king.”

(2) ESV, NRSV, and NKJV, “Milcom.”

- b) The reasoning: Cheyne in *The Pulpit Commentary* writes: “The Septuagint, the Syriac, and the Vulgate, however, read *Milcom*, which was the name of the Ammonite deity; this is only a different vocalizing of the consonants of the text.”³⁰

- c) Conclusion: once again, the modern versions do not listen to the words of Jesus, but rather follow something else. Are they really concerned about the Word of God? Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.

22. Jeremiah 51:3

a) The readings

(1) KJV, “Against *him that* bendeth let the archer bend his bow.”

(2) ESV and NRSV, “Let not the archer bend his bow.”

(3) NASV, “Let not him who bends his bow bend *it*.”

(4) NIV, “Let not the archer string his bow.”

- b) The reasoning: Fausset declares: “The Chaldean version and *Jerome*, by changing the vowel points, read (לֹא, instead of לְאֵל), ‘Let *not* him (the *Babylonian*) who bendeth his bow bend it.’”³¹

- c) Conclusion: the modern version follow the change in vowels. They obviously are not listening to Jesus. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.

23. Ezekiel 36:5

a) The readings

(1) KJV, “To cast it out for a prey.”

(2) NIV, “So that they might plunder its pastureland.”

(3) NKJV, “In order to plunder its open country.”

(4) NRSV, “Because of its pasture, to plunder it.”

- b) The reasoning: Fairbairn comments:

The common rendering of this latter clause is, “that it may be cast forth as a prey.” But this is a very unnatural expression to be used of a land. Therefore taking מְרִשָּׁה, not as an Aramaic inf., but as the substantive, and changing thus the pointing of לְבַיָּת [this is what he suggests for the new pointing, the pointing in the Traditional

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid., 247.

³¹ Fausset, *Jeremiah-Malachi*, in *A Commentary Critical, Experimental, and Practical*, 174,175.

Text is לָקַח], so as to make it the inf. instead of the noun, we have the sense: in order to plunder its pasturage; a quite suitable meaning.³²

- c) Conclusion: the modern versions follow the repointing, which, contrary to Fairbairn's comment, is not "a quite suitable meaning," for it fails to consult Jesus on the meaning of this verse. Would you listen to Jesus? The King James translators did.

24. Micah 6:9

- a) The readings

(1) KJV, "See."

(2) ESV, NASV, NIV, and NRSV, "Fear."

- b) The reasoning: Deane in *The Pulpit Commentary* observes:

The versions read "fear" for "see." Thus the LXX., ἄσπετος ἔσται ἡ σωτηρία σου τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα σου, "Shall save those that fear his Name;" Vulgate, *Salus erit timentibus Nomen tuum* [i.e., salvation shall be to the one fearing thy Name]; Syriac, "He imparts instruction to those that fear his Name;" Chaldee, "The teachers fear his Name." This reading depends upon a change of vowel pointing. Orelli renders, "Happy is he who fears thy Name."³³

- c) Conclusion: the modern versions fail to see what Jesus said. Would you see what Jesus said? The King James translators did.

CONCLUSION: The modern versions have little regard for the statement of Jesus in regard to the Hebrew Old Testament Text. They treat Jesus as if He were a liar, as if He did not know that about which He speaks, as if He is not Someone to whom they should listen, as if what He said is of little consequence, and as if they know more than He. These are serious matters. The modern versions demean and belittle the Lord Jesus Christ, The Word of God. No wonder when the modern versions come to the New Testament Text, they adopt the Critical Text, which repeatedly diminishes the deity of Christ (cf. I Timothy 3:16), the blood of Christ (cf. Colossians 1:14), the sinlessness of Christ (cf. John 7:8), and much more. Would you use a version that gives Christ the glory, that listens to Jesus? I am glad that the King James translators did and that we have a faithful translation of the *Received Texts* of both the Old Testament and New Testament into English.

³² Patrick Fairbairn, *Commentary on Ezekiel* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1989), 395, 396.

³³ W. J. Deane, *Micah* in vol. 14 of *The Pulpit Commentary*, 88.