

51 King James Bible Objections Answered

(Bible Text: 1 Thessalonians 5:21)

BFT #4125

By Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.

Bible For Today Baptist Church

900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, NJ 08108

Phone: 856-854-4747; FAX: 856-854-2464

Audio Of The Message Found On The LINK Below:

<http://www.sermonaudio.com/sermoninfo.asp?SID=31201115936>

Website: http://www.biblefortoday.org/bft_church.htm

Online Sermons: <http://www.sermonaudio.com/biblefortoday>

This is an answer to a paper written called "The Translator #134," entitled "Translation Errors in KJV and Why Our Baptist Ancestors Rejected the Catholic Bible," by Evangelist Ed Vrell. This 5-page paper was sent to me by a man from Pennsylvania. He asked me for a reply to it. It was sent to me in July, 1991. I am putting it in manuscript form in January, 2015 around 24 years later because of the importance of the topic. I have a total of 51 comments in my answer.

1. **Comment #1 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: "The King James version was a good translation of the time of King James," implying that it is not good today. This is certainly wrong. It's not only a good translation for the time but it's also an excellent translation even today. There is no question about that.

2. **Comment #2 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: "the King James translators invented the Greek of Erasmus which Erasmus interpreted from the Vulgate back into the Greek when they could not find a Greek text to translate it correctly." That's a false allegation about the last 6 verses of the book of Revelation. There is evidence that even that charge is wrong. But it is certain that throughout the entire New Testament, Erasmus did have Greek manuscripts that he used. The King James translators did not invent the Greek of Erasmus. In fact, they did not use the 1516 Greek text of Erasmus, but that of Beza in 1598--82 years after the Erasmus Text. They used the traditional text which had been used in the church down through the centuries.

3. **Comment #3 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: "They used a text that became known as the Textus Receptus even though it never existed." The Textus Receptus has existed from the earliest days of the church and still exists to this day. It is the historical traditional text transferred down through the centuries from the early church. I have listed a total of 37 historical links which show this. I refer to these links on pages 44-48 in my book, *Defending The King James Bible*. This book is available as BFT #1594 @ \$12.00 + \$8.00 S&H. It can be ordered from our Webstore at this LINK: <http://www.biblefortoday.org/search.asp>

4. **Comment #4 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: "Now that we have more Greek texts, codices, and translations, it is easier to sort out the monkish additions." We do have more Greek texts and translations now than before. As of 1967, we had 5,255 Greek manuscripts that survive to the present day. More have been found since that time. Of the 5,255, only 45 go along with Westcott and Hort's favored Vatican and Sinai manuscripts. That's less than 1% of the preserved evidence. A total of 5,210 or over 99% of them go along with the Received Text that underlies the King James Bible. So even though we have more manuscripts, they are not used or followed by those who prefer the 45 heretical Gnostic Critical manuscripts of the Vatican and Sinai and the 43 other Greek Manuscripts that followed them.

5. **Comment #5 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*Westcott and Hort amplified the principles of Puritan and Anglican scholars that were used to make the King James version.*” No. They did not “*amplify*” the principles, they changed them completely and used other principles and other original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts. The King James scholars did not change of the Hebrew or Greek texts. They just took the Received Greek and the Received Hebrew/Aramaic texts of their day and used it for their King James Bible translation. and which is similar to the Received Text of today.

6. **Comment #6 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*Westcott and Hort are called heretics for just doing what the King James translators did.*” No. Westcott and Hort were heretics in their theology. I analyze their heresies from five of their books. It is called *The Theological Heresies Of Westcott And Hort*. It is **BFT #595 @ \$9.00 + \$6.00 S&H**. It can be ordered on line at our BFT Webstore (<http://www.biblefortoday.org/search.asp>). Or you can call us at **856-854-4452** with your credit card and order it. In that book, I take about 125 actual quotations from the books written by Westcott and Hort and show them clearly to be heretics. It's not just that we're **calling** them heretics, but since they deny cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith, they are heretical apostates. They're not orthodox, but they're heterodox indeed. They did not do what the King James translators did. Instead, they added speculation, transcriptional probability, intrinsic probability, use of genealogy, and other methods unbiblical methods which were never used by the King James translators.

7. **Comment #7 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*The textual transmission is clear that we have always had eclectic texts.*” No, the early churches did not use an “*eclectic*” Greek or Hebrew text like Westcott and Hort used or the Nestle-Aland text uses or the United Bible Societies text uses. They used the Received Hebrew and Greek Words that underlie the King James Bible.

8. **Comment #8 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*The Scofield cult uses the KJV.*” I don't believe that Dr. C. I. Scofield was a member of a cult. He believed the Bible could be best understood when various dispensations were clearly seen. He believed in “*rightly dividing the Word of truth*” (2 Timothy 2:15). This included the very long dispensations of the Mosaic Law, the present age of Grace, and the Millennial reign of the Lord Jesus Christ and four others in the Old Testament.

9. **Comment #9 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*Those who want the apostolic succession of the perfect Textus Receptus just can't prove it no matter how hard they try and so on because they admit evidence that is contrary to their opinion.*” In Comment #3 above, I have listed 37 historical links right from the apostolic church right down to the present time of churches and different groups that have used the Traditional Received Greek text.

10. **Comment #10 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*God may be working differently and from a different background than us so we need to allow for the freedom to know Christ rather than to force other people into our law for salvation.*” Well, if we're wrong, we certainly don't want to force people into our law, as he says, and we can't force people into salvation. They must believe on their own but we certainly have got to preach the word of God no matter what men may say or what they may think.

11. **Comment #11 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*If you have the perfect Bible, great.*” The inspired, preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible are perfect Words and are a perfect Bible. The King James Bible's translation of those perfect Words is the most accurate English translation every translated. It is superior in its texts, in its translators, in its translation technique, and in its theology. that we have is translated from the best Old Testament Massoretic Hebrew texts and the best New Testament received Greek texts and the finest type of translation. It is formal equivalence as to the very forms brought over from Hebrew and Greek and English and also verbal equivalence, the very words of Hebrew were possible. There are a few idioms naturally in there but more possibly it's verbal equivalence brought from Hebrew and English and Greek into English.

12. **Comment #12 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*A Pharisee of your stripe.*” That is a vicious term to use of me who am a Bible-believing Christian who exposes the unbelieving, lost, bound-for-Hell Pharisees both in

the time of the Lord Jesus Christ and in our day as well. Then he mentions “bigotry” and the “club of the bigots.” One of the meanings of “bigotry” is “dogmatism.” I plead guilty of dogmatism in the same way the Lord Jesus Christ was guilty of it. He was strongly dogmatic for the truth. I also stand up strongly and am dogmatic for the truth of the Words of God. I do not flinch. I do not seek fellowship with the heretics, the apostates, the atheists, the new evangelicals, or any of the others who compromise and laugh at the Lord Jesus Christ and others like me who follow his dogmatic stand for truth without flinching!

13. **Comment #13 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*The Baptists were the first to push for freedom of conscience from the state church, but also thought freedom to be wrong.*” We have that freedom of conscience and the author of this five-page paper has the freedom to be wrong or right as well and we do.

14. **Comment #14 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “Your bigotry wins (Matthew 23)” Well, as mentioned in #12 above, as the Lord Jesus Christ was dogmatic for truth, so am I!

15. **Comment #15 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*Before you can write me off, observe how the KJV defends the Anglican heresy.*” That’s not true. The King James Bible does not defend Anglicanism although all the translators were Anglicans. Some were Puritans and others on the committee were not Puritans, but regular Anglicans. But the King James Bible does not defend any heresy held by the Anglicans of the Church of England.

16. **Comment #16 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*King James was an Arminian.*” That’s another false charge. I don’t believe that King James was neither an Arminian nor a Calvinist. I don’t know where this false charge comes from. I don’t think he has proved his point on this because I would differ with on his background of Calvinism. He obviously has a Calvinistic background and believes, I would imagine, in the five points of the Calvinist TULIP. I would refer him to *The Other Side of Calvinism* by Dr. Lawrence Vance, which the Bible for Today carries. It’s a large and excellent book that answers the Calvinistic unscriptural errors with which I differ.

17. **Comment #17 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*Why should I want it now, that is, the King James Bible with the same errors?*” What errors? I don’t know what so-called errors he’s talking about. Later on I think he may give some of the ones he thinks to be errors. The King James Bible is an accurate translation of the preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie it.

18. **Comment #18 out of 51.** Vrell wrote that “*He is against free will.*” He’s against Arminianism he calls that “free willism.” I would differ with him on that. We’re on different parts of the spectrum on the five points of Calvinism. And as far as the alleged homosexuality of King James, that has nothing to do with the King James Bible translation even if it were true. I do not believe it is true. We have a good book about this false charge called *King James Unjustly Accused*. The translators were not homosexuals.

19. **Comment #19 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*People can’t understand the Shakespearean English.*” I don’t believe there is much Shakespearean English in the King James Bible. There is some usage of terms similar to Shakespeare, but certainly it is a very clear language indeed. John 3:16 says: “*For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*” The word “believeth” is present tense by its ending. Other than that one word, it is a perfectly understandable verse. Just tell people who use the King James Bible that verbs in the present tense end in “eth.” Psalm 23:1 says: “*The LORD is my shepherd; I shall not want.*” What’s wrong with that?

20. **Comment #20 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: that he had “*the privilege of reading his own Bible.*” He can read his own Bible if he wants to and I can read my King James Bible. That is fine.

21. **Comment #21 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*What a blessing to be free from such ungodliness.*” It seems like some of the attitudes of the author of this paper do not seem godly, it seems somewhat ungodly, including the criticisms and the name calling that he uses for his opponents. I would certainly question whether it was godliness completely.

22. **Comment #22 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*Various ones deny the Sovereign and try not to translate it correctly.*” I’d like to know where we deny the Sovereign. He is speaking about his “sovereign grace” of hyper-Calvinism. I believe God is sovereign, but I do not agree with the methodology of his five point hyper-Calvinism.

23. **Comment #23 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*King James was honest in one respect. He did it deliberately to keep his false church in business.*” No, he had nothing to do significantly with the translation. He laid down the rules and methodology for translation but he did not translate the King James Bible.

24. **Comment #24 out of 51.** Vrell wrote about some correct translation of some of his favorite verses. He talks about Genesis 4:3-4 with the Hiphil, “*cause to bring an offering*” and the hiphil of Abel, “*cause to bring an offering.*” But the hiphil form of the Hebrew verbs can many times be translated as a normal Qal which is the normal stem. It is the first stem that we learn in our Hebrew grammar. There should be an opening for some of the hiphils to be understand as Qals. He commented on Genesis 15:6 and Numbers 21:9 as well.

25. **Comment #25 out of 51.** Vrell believes in the five points of Calvinism. He says only God's elect are caused to look to the cross and the non-elect reject the command. I believe Christ died for everyone in the world and everyone is capable to receive Him as their Saviour. This is not limited to only a tiny group of what hyper-Calvinists refer to as the elect.

26. **Comment #26 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*Therefore the Arminian free offer of the Gospel is not effective if you believe in the hiphil, the dead cannot look.*” I urge Vrell and others to get *The Other Side of Calvinism* by Dr. Lawrence Vance. It is over 300 pages. It can be purchased from the Bible For today, Collingswood, New Jersey.

27. **Comment #27 out of 51.** Vrell wrote about John 1:1. He doesn’t like the King James Bible’s translation of it. He can exegete it any way that he thinks he should, but the translation of EN ARCHE EN HO LOGOS, is clearly “*in the beginning was the Word.*” is certainly A proper English translation of those five Greek Words.

28. **Comment #28 out of 51.** Vrell is against the “*free willers*” because he is a five point TULIP hyper-Calvinist, believe that people have no free will. This is a violation of the truth found in John 3:16:

“*For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*”

Vrell denies the possibility that “*whosoever believeth on him*” could happen unless the person was one of the “elect.”

29. **Comment #29 out of 51.** Vrell thinks John 3:3 should use the term “*born from above*” rather than how the King James Bible translated it, “*born-again.*” The term, “*again*” is **ANOTHER**. It fits the context of Nicodemus’s comments and questions, even though the Greek Word **ANA** can mean “*up*” or “*again.*” It occurs in the Greek word for “*read*” (**ANA**-GINOSKO) which literally means “*to know again.*”

30. **Comment #30 out of 51.** Vrell disputes the reading of Romans 8:28:

“*And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose.*”

That's the Received Text and proper reading. He follows the NIV and other new versions that change the translation. He changes the Greek text and makes it: “*God works all things together.*” This is a totally inaccurate translation of this clause. To have this be the correct translation, the word, “*God*” must be in the nominative case (THEOS) as the subject of that sentence. The Received Greek Text is in the accusative case (THEON) as the object of the verb, “*love.*” Vrell believes that the way the King James Bible rightly translates it lends itself to an Arminian freewill translation which he despises.

31. **Comment #31 out of 51.** Vrell, being a five point hyper-Calvinist, opposes “*Arminian free will*” teachings. I do not follow all of the teachings of Arminianism. They believe a genuinely saved person can

lose their salvation. This is false. But they also teach that people have free will either genuinely to accept the Lord Jesus Christ as their Saviour, or to reject Him. Vrell does not believe people have a free will either to receive or reject the Saviour. He is unscriptural in this view. Revelation 22:17, and many other verses clearly teach that “*whosoever will*” can take the water of life.

*“And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And **whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.**”*

32. **Comment #32 out of 51.** Vrell disputes the King James Bible’s translation of Romans 8:29:

“For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren.”

The Greek Word underlying “foreknow” is PRO-HORIZO which means literally “to see or find beforehand.” Being a hyper-Calvinist, he wants to make it “foreordination.”

33. **Comment #33 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*The King James Version has caused more error than any other translation in the world.*” That is incorrect. The King James Bible is the most accurately translated English Bible translated from the inspired, preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie it. I have analyzed the New King James version and found over 2,000 examples of adding, subtracting, or changing in some other way from the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek (**BFT #1442 @ \$10.00 + \$7.00 S&H**). I have also analyzed the New American Standard version and have listed over 4,000 specific examples of adding, subtracting, or changing in some other way from the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek (**BFT #1494 @ \$15.00 + \$7.00 S&H**). I have also analyzed the New International Version and have listed over 6,653 examples (and I stopped counting) of adding, subtracting, or changing in some other way from the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek (**BFT #1749 @ \$25.00 + \$8.00 S&H**). All three of these studies are available either by calling with you credit card **856-854-4452** or ordering online at <http://www.biblefortoday.org/search.asp> and following the prompts. The King James Bible is many more times more accurate than any of these other versions used by fundamentalists or Bible believing Christians today.

34. **Comment #34 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*Why do we resent papal water but accept Puritan magic water or eat Jesus in John 6?*” The King James Bible does not teach baptismal regeneration at all. It does not teach literal eating of Jesus either in John 6:48-56. The manna in the wilderness was literally eaten by the children of Israel. In John 6, the Lord Jesus Christ was very obviously speaking of a spiritual “eating” of His flesh as the Bread of life. In order for a person to genuinely saved, he or she must appropriate the Lord Jesus fully, as though one were eating food. They must make Him their own and part of them just as food is consumed and becomes a part of the eater.

John 6:48 *I am that bread of life.*

John 6:49 *Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead.*

John 6:50 *This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die.*

John 6:51 *I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.*

John 6:52 *The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?*

John 6:53 *Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.*

John 6:54 *Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.*

John 6:55 *For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.*

John 6:56 *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.*

That's a good translation of John 6. There is nothing wrong with it when you understand the meaning of making yours that which you eat. A person must appropriate the Lord Jesus Christ and make Him their own by genuine faith and trust in Him as their Saviour and Redeemer.

35. **Comment #35 out of 51.** Vrell wrongly translated a portion of Luke 2:14. In the King James Bible we have the proper and correct translation from the Textus Receptus that underlies it:

“Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will [Greek: EUDOKIA in the nominative case as the subject] toward men.”

The erroneous translation taken from the heretical Gnostic Critical Greek Text take the “good will” be translated in essence like this:

“Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, to men of good will [Greek: EUDOKIAS in the genitive case as a possessive].”

Being a hyper-Calvinist, Vrell did not like us to believe the truth that God’s peace through the Lord Jesus Christ is available toward all men, not only to a small elect group. He believes it to be available only to those men who are “of good will.” The adding of just one Greek letter (S) makes all the difference. The Textus Receptus reading has been ably defended by Dean John William Burgon.

36. **Comment #36 out of 51.** Vrell wrote against the “chiliasts” who believe in the thousand year Millennial reign of the Lord Jesus Christ that will one day come to pass. I believe the Scriptures literally that there will be a thousand year millennial reign of the Lord Jesus Christ. Apparently Vrell is an amillennialist and we would differ completely on that score and he cannot use his own theology to sandwich it into his views of the Bible and try to change the Bible to conform with it, I believe.

37. **Comment #37 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: He says the assembly of believers is the millennium. The assembly of believers is the millennium. In other words, he denies the literal thousand year reign of Christ upon the earth. It's his position. I think that's unscriptural. I think it's unbiblical. It's anti-biblical. He says that the Lord is saving all kinds of people. Until the end of the world and the return of Jesus are synonymous. The assembly of believers and the millennium, well, that's not what the Bible says. Christ will reign literally upon this earth for one thousand years. In Revelation 20:1-7, notice how many times the literal words “thousand years” are used. These words are used no less than **six times**! We must believe the Bible when it makes things as clear as this.

Revelation 20:1 *And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand.*

Revelation 20:2 *And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years,*

Revelation 20:3 *And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season.*

Revelation 20:4 *And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.*

Revelation 20:5 *But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection.*

Revelation 20:6 *Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.*

Revelation 20:7 *And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of*

his prison,

The reign of the Lord Jesus Christ for a thousand years on this earth must be taken literal. It must not be spiritualized away and denied.

38. **Comment #38 out of 51.** Vrell doesn't like what he calls "*the euphemistic Victorian age references*" of the King James Bible. He'd rather have the specific things. He doesn't like righteousnesses in Isaiah 64:6 compared to "*filthy rags.*" He'd rather have "*menstrual cloths.*" They are "*filthy rags*" no matter what they are.

39. **Comment #39 out of 51.** Vrell disagrees with the King James Bible's translation of 1 Kings 18:27: "*And it came to pass at noon, that Elijah mocked them, and said, Cry aloud: for he is a god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked.*"

He wanted the King James Bible translators to go against the sensitivities of the readers and translate "*pursuing*" as going to the bathroom.

40. **Comment #40 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: "*Abusing the marital love of the husband and wife, Christ and the church with the Song of Solomon pure stupidity.*" That book, as many have believed, might be a picture of the relationship between the Lord Jesus Christ in His church. It also may involve physical love. There is nothing wrong with the figure of Christ and His church. It is as a bride and a bridegroom.

41. **Comment #41 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: "*We should stop speaking in tongues and following some other stupid visions.*" I do not believe that the sign gift of speaking in tongues is not for this dispensation of Grace. 1 Corinthians 13:8-12 teaches that all the sign gifts, including speaking in tongues, passed away when "*that which is perfect [TO TELEION] is come.*" TO TELEION is in the neuter case. I believe it refers to TO BIBLION (the Bible). The Bible was completed in around 90 to 100 A.D. When that happened, all the sign gift were no longer needed or a part of the Christian faith.

1 Corinthians 13:8 *Charity never faileth: but whether there be **prophecies, they shall fail:** whether there be **tongues, they shall cease;** whether there be **knowledge, it shall vanish away.***

1 Corinthians 13:9 For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.

1 Corinthians 13:10 But **when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.**

1 Corinthians 13:11 *When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but **when I became a man, I put away childish things.***

42. **Comment #42 out of 51.** Vrell wrote about the Hebrew hiphil form in Exodus 3:14, "*I Am that I Am.*" He has his own translation of this and wants to change the translation of the King James Bible. That's up to him. He says the "*Hebrew has two tenses, past or future.*" Technically there is the perfect and the imperfect, not past and future. The perfect is completed action. The imperfect is incomplete action. Of course, there are WAW consecutives and WAW conversives and WAW connectives. All these different Hebrew forms change the meaning of the perfect or the imperfect as the case may be. I think the "*I Am that I Am*" is a perfectly confident translation.

43. **Comment #43 out of 51.** Vrell wrote, speaking of Exodus 3:14, "*I shall cause to be that which I shall cause to happen.*" That's speculation. If he wants inaccurately to translate that in Exodus 3:14, that's his privilege. The King James Bible translates it accurately:

"And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you."

44. **Comment #44 out of 51.** Vrell doesn't like the King James Bible's translation of "*Lucifer*" in Isaiah 14:12.

*"How art thou fallen from heaven, O **Lucifer,** son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!"*

He calls it a translation error which is a Gnostic ideas. He prefers "*shining one*" instead of "*Lucifer*." The meaning of that Latin word, "*Lucifer*," is "*light bearer*" or "*shining one*." Lucifer comes from two Latin words, LUX ("*light or shining*") and FEROS ("*to bear or carry*"). In the light of this, what's wrong with "*Lucifer*"? It's an excellent translation of the Hebrew Word, HELEL.

45. **Comment #45 out of 51.** Vrell believes that Satan was a man. He doesn't believe in what he calls the "*mythical satanic fall*." Apparently he doesn't believe that Satan fell as Lucifer, who was one of the main angels of God. I disagree with him completely on this. Isaiah 14:12 makes this clear:

*"How art thou **fallen from heaven, O Lucifer**, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!"*

On page 194, Vrell believes that the origin of Satan's fall came from the book on "*The Secrets of Enoch*." This false. Isaiah 14:12 above shows this clearly. Ezekiel 28:13-15 also shows that Satan, who we in the Garden of Eden, fell when "*iniquity*" was found in him.

Ezekiel 28:13 ***Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created.***

Ezekiel 28:14 *Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire.*

Ezekiel 28:15 *Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, **till iniquity was found in thee.***

The fall of Satan is Scriptural, but he disagrees with it as he does with many other Biblical truths.

46. **Comment #46 out of 51.** Vrell speaks out once again against the person of King James. This should not be done because King James had nothing to do with translating the King James Bible. He authorized the translation and laid down some of the rules that governed it.

47. **Comment #47 out of 51.** Vrell talked disparagingly about what he called "*Fundies*" referring to Biblical Fundamentalists. Apparently, he's not a Bible-believing Fundamentalist. Is he a new evangelical? Is he a neo-orthodox? Is he a liberal? I am a Baptist believer in all the "*fundamental*" truths taught in the Bible. As such, I am a Biblical Fundamentalist.

48. **Comment #48 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: "*If you read history as I have, you may change as I did. Why are you protecting one of the King's agents and the cause of heresy in England?*" That's absolutely wrong. He's implying that King James had "*agents*" who controlled the translation. This is false. The translators were selected on the basis of their indisputable qualifications on their knowledge of the languages of Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and English. The King did not interfere with this translations by some fictitious "*agents*" who were for the "*cause of heresy in England*." I don't know where he gets this charge.

49. **Comment #49 out of 51.** Regarding Luke 2:14, Vrell disputes the King James Bible's translation.

*"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, **good will toward men.**"* (KJB)

"Glory to God in the highest heaven, and on earth peace to those on whom his favor rests." (NIV)

"Glory to God in the highest heaven, and on earth peace among those whom he favors!" (NRSV)

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men with whom he is pleased!" (RSV)

"Glory to God in the highest, And on earth peace among men with whom He is pleased." (NASV)

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among those with whom he is pleased!"

(ESV)

In Comment #35 above, I have already answered this question as follows: Vrell wrongly translated a portion of Luke 2:14. In the King James Bible we have the proper and correct translation from the Textus Receptus that underlies it:

*“Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, **good will** [Greek: **EUDOKIA** in the nominative case as the subject] **toward men.**”*

The erroneous translation taken from the heretical Gnostic Critical Greek Text take the “*good will*” be translated in essence like this:

*“Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, to men **of good will** [Greek: **EUDOKIAS** in the genitive case as a possessive].”*

John William Burgon has showed clearly that **EUDOKIA** is the proper Greek Word in Luke 2:14.

50. **Comment 50 out of 51.** Vrell wrote: “*Good will toward men lasts for a few short days and they return to their natural meanness. Only the sheep, John 10, receive good will while the nonbeliever or non-Christian receives only his justice.*” This is his view of hyper-Calvinism that only the so-called “elect” can receive God’s “*good will*” and the ability to trust the Lord Jesus Christ and be saved. The proper rendering of this as in the King James Bible shows that the gospel is for “*whosoever*” genuinely receives it.

51. **Comment #51 out of 51.** Vrell wrote that John 12:32 is incorrectly translated in the King James Bible.

*“And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw **all** men unto me.”*

He says the word, “*all*,” should be translated to mean “*all kinds of people.*” He is incorrect in this. The drawing of the Lord Jesus Christ is to all people who have ever lived. It goes along clearly with John 3:16:

*“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that **whosoever believeth***

This verse alone puts the lie to the false teaching of the hyper-Calvinists who are gaining more ground every day all around the world.