

King-James-Only Movement

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.
(Difference between revisions)

Revision as of 16:49, 1 July 2005

Ike9898 (Talk | contribs)
reword a sentence
? Older edit

Current revision

MollyTheCat (Talk | contribs)
add'l counterpoint re KJO variations for balance, add sentence re Burgon

Line 1:

The "King-James-Only Movement" is a **movement** within [[Protestant]] [[fundamentalist Christianity]] of [[English language|English]]-speaking countries which rejects all modern translations of the [[Bible]], and accepts only the [[King James Version]] (KJV).

This position is most prevalent within the [[Independent Baptist]] branch of the [[Baptist]] movement. The rejection is based in part on the different texts which were used as source material for the different translations of the [[New Testament]]. Most modern translations are translated mainly from the [[Alexandrian text-type|Alexandrian manuscripts]], [[Codex Vaticanus]], [[Codex Sinaiticus]] and also of the other minority texts numbered around 50, while the [[King James Version]] was translated from the <i>[[Textus Receptus]]</i>, or Received Text, which is [[Byzantine text-type]] (but "not" a "majority text"). To some extent, doubts are also expressed about the texts used to translate the [[Old Testament]], **and** in particular **the use of** the <i>[[Biblia Hebraica]]</i> and <i>[[Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia]]</i> and the variant readings in their footnotes **is** condemned.

There are variations within the King-James-Only Movement. For example, the late [[John R. Rice]], who published <i>[[The Sword of the Lord]]</i>, took a position that only the original [[Greek language|Greek]] and [[Hebrew language|Hebrew]] manuscripts are inspired scripture, and that all translations of those done in good faith are useful as scripture, but he expressed a preference toward the [[King James Version]] for aesthetic reasons. On the other extreme can be found the teachings of [[Peter Ruckman]], who believes that the King James translation constitutes an "advanced revelation" from [[God]] which is superior to even the **original** Greek and Hebrew texts. **Most** King James Only advocates hold to a position somewhere between those two extremes.

Line 1:

The so-called "King-James-Only Movement" is a **position** within [[Protestant]] [[fundamentalist Christianity]] of [[English language|English]]-speaking countries which rejects all modern translations of the [[Bible]], and accepts only the [[King James Version]] (KJV). **The nickname "King-James-Only" appears to have originated with a popular book by [[James White (theologian)|James R. White]] published in 1995 entitled "The King James Only Controversy," but it should be noted that this name and the claim that such advocacy of the KJV constitutes a "movement" have been hotly contested by some. (White himself addresses the idea that the term "KJV Only" may be an "insulting" or "inaccurate" term in "King James Only Controversy," p. 248.)**

This position is most prevalent within the [[Independent Baptist]] branch of the [[Baptist]] movement. The rejection is based in part on the different texts which were used as source material for the different translations of the [[New Testament]]. Most modern translations are translated mainly from the [[Alexandrian text-type|Alexandrian manuscripts]], [[Codex Vaticanus]], [[Codex Sinaiticus]] and also of the other minority texts numbered around 50, while the [[King James Version]] was translated from the <i>[[Textus Receptus]]</i>, or Received Text, which is [[Byzantine text-type]] (but not **identical with the "Majority Text" as that term is used currently**). To some extent, doubts are also expressed about the texts used to translate the [[Old Testament]], in particular the <i>[[Biblia Hebraica]]</i> and <i>[[Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia]]</i>, and the variant readings in their footnotes **are** condemned.

There are variations within the King-James-Only Movement. For example, the late [[John R. Rice]], who published <i>[[The Sword of the Lord]]</i>, took a position that only the original [[Greek language|Greek]] and [[Hebrew language|Hebrew]] manuscripts are inspired scripture, and that all translations of those done in good faith are useful as scripture, but he expressed a preference toward the [[King James Version]] for aesthetic reasons. On the other extreme can be found the teachings of [[Peter Ruckman]], who believes that the King James translation constitutes an "advanced revelation" from [[God]] which is superior to even the **oldest existing** Greek and Hebrew texts. **It is said that most** King-James-Only advocates hold to a position somewhere between those two extremes; **indeed, White makes five divisions of "King-James-Only" groups in his book. But it is observable that such classifications as White's and those of other critics of this belief are endlessly debatable; for example, a person who, in the manner of Rice, simply "prefers" the KJV but feels that it**

contains errors that are subject to correction would logically "not" fall under the classification established by White's book, which is meant to critique those who hold to the King James Version as the "best" translation or "only perfect" translation of the Scriptures into English.

The roots of the King-James-Only Movement can be found in the controversy over the publication of the [[Revised Standard Version]] (RSV) of the Bible in [[1952]], which was issued by the [[National Council of Churches]] (NCC). Many fundamentalists believed that the NCC was a hotbed of [[Liberal Christianity|liberal theology]] or [[Modernist Christianity|modernism]] and were suspicious of the new translation. Accusations of [[Communist]] and [[Vatican]] influence within the NCC were brought up (it being the time of the [[Second Red Scare]] and [[McCarthyism]]), and fundamentalists largely rejected the RSV, although for three decades it became the most widely used Bible translation within the [[mainline]] and [[Liberal Christianity|liberal]] Protestant [[religious denomination|denomination]]s. One particular criticism of the RSV centered around the decision made by the translators to translate a number of [[Old Testament]] [[prophecy|prophecies]], which some scholars believed referred to the coming of [[Christ]], in a manner which did not necessarily imply any connection to Christ. As a result, critics charged that the NCC, in issuing the RSV, had deliberately set out to discredit doctrines such as the [[virgin birth]].

The roots of the King-James-Only Movement are sometimes traced to the controversy over the publication of the [[Revised Standard Version]] (RSV) of the Bible in [[1952]], which was issued by the [[National Council of Churches]] (NCC). Many fundamentalists believed that the NCC was a hotbed of [[Liberal Christianity|liberal theology]] or [[Modernist Christianity|modernism]] and were suspicious of the new translation. Accusations of [[Communist]] and [[Vatican]] influence within the NCC were brought up (it being the time of the [[Second Red Scare]] and [[McCarthyism]]), and fundamentalists largely rejected the RSV, although for three decades it became the most widely used Bible translation within the [[mainline]] and [[Liberal Christianity|liberal]] Protestant [[religious denomination|denomination]]s. One particular criticism of the RSV centered on the decision made by the translators to translate a number of [[Old Testament]] [[prophecy|prophecies]], which some scholars believed referred to the coming of [[Christ]], in a manner which did not necessarily imply any connection to Christ. As a result, critics charged that the NCC, in issuing the RSV, had deliberately set out to discredit doctrines such as the [[virgin birth]].

The King-James-Only Movement as it exists today began to take form after [[conservative]] and [[evangelical]] [[Christian]] groups began producing their own modern Bible translations, including the [[New American Standard Bible]], the [[Good News Translation]], and the [[New International Version]]. Most evangelicals who were wary of the RSV readily accepted these other new translations, but some [[fundamentalists]] did not. Those who rejected all modern translations began to formulate the ideas which are held by the King James Only Movement, such as their belief that the Received Text is superior to the Alexandrian manuscripts, and that [[Codex Alexandrinus]], Vaticanus and Sinaiticus have been corrupted by [[Gnostic]]s. The King-James-Only Movement became one of the core beliefs within the growing Independent Fundamental branch of Baptists. Interestingly, even the use of only the texts available in the early 1600s for the main body of the work fails to placate the supporters of the King-James-Only Movement, who see the [[New King James Version]] (1982) as a total counterfeit unworthy of the name "King James."

At the same time, many [[conservative]] and [[evangelical]] [[Christian]] groups began producing their own modern Bible translations, including the [[New American Standard Bible]], the [[Good News Translation]], and the [[New International Version]]. Most evangelicals who were wary of the RSV readily accepted these other new translations, but some [[fundamentalists]] did not. (It is worth remarking that many concerns formerly written off by modern versions advocates as mere "KJV Only" obstinacy [see White, "passim"] have now begun to emerge from other quarters of conservative and evangelical Christianity; for example, one writer who opines that "The English-speaking world has not been brought closer to the ideal translation with the proliferation of modern translations. Readers are less sure than ever of what the original text actually says" is Leland Ryken, a professor of English at Wheaton College who served as a literary stylist for the [[ESV|English Standard Version]] and therefore hardly a "KJV Only" author [Ryken, "The Word of God in English," p. 63].)

Within broader evangelical circles, the King James Only belief is controversial and is widely rejected. Most evangelical scholars, in fact, hold that the <i>Textus Receptus</i> manuscripts which the KJV was translated from contain a number of errors, and that the modern translations are translated from the earliest and supposedly more accurate manuscript evidence which we currently have. Most scholars who support [[biblical inerrancy]] believe this applies only to the original manuscripts, e.g. the [[Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy]].

Those who rejected all modern translations began to advocate the ideas which are held by the King James Only Movement, such as their belief that the Received Text is superior to the Alexandrian manuscripts, and that [[Codex Alexandrinus]], Vaticanus and Sinaiticus have been corrupted by [[Gnostic]]s. (However, it should be pointed out that these ideas are not entirely the invention of "KJV Only" authors, being strongly foreshadowed in the works of Dean [[John William Burgon]], who vigorously opposed the [[English Revised Version]]. Although Burgon did believe that there were some KJV errors, many of the positions taken by today's KJV defenders can be traced to Burgon's arguments in "The Revision Revised" and other writings against the textual philosophies that guided the Revised Version translators--arguments that significantly

.....

predated the struggles mentioned above involving the RSV.)

+

The King-James-Only Movement became one of the core beliefs within the growing Independent Fundamental branch of Baptists. Even the use of only the texts available in the early 1600s for the main body of the work fails to satisfy the supporters of the King-James-Only Movement, who see the [[New King James Version]] (1982) as something less than a true successor to the 1611 version. Some such supporters argue that, because the New King James Version makes scores of changes to the meaning of the 1611 translators, it is not a simple "updating" but actually constitutes a new version; at the same time, the inclusion of verses found solely in the Textus Receptus (such as 1 John 5:7) in the NKJV may make this attempt at revision less than palatable to many advocates of modern versions. (Regarding this latter point see David Dewey, "A User's Guide to Bible Translations," pp. 162-3, where he quotes strong criticism of the NKJV's textual basis by Steven Sheeley and Robert Nash.)

+

Within broader evangelical circles, the King James Only belief is controversial and is widely rejected. Most evangelical scholars hold that the <i>Textus Receptus</i> manuscripts which the KJV was translated from contain a number of errors, and that the modern translations are translated from the earliest and supposedly more accurate manuscript evidence which we currently have. Most scholars who support [[biblical inerrancy]] believe this applies only to the original manuscripts, e.g. the [[Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy]]. However, there is substantial agreement between most of the Majority Text of the Greek New Testament and the Textus Receptus, and the NKJV preface testifies that there are reputable scholars who feel that the Majority Text is defensible, even if they do not support the particular form it has taken in the Textus Receptus.

Besides Independent Baptists, there are a number of other denominations which hold, to varying degrees, to a King James Only position. These include the [[United Pentecostal Church]], the [[Church of God Mountain Assembly|Church of God of the Mountain Assembly]], and some (but not all) of the more conservative denominations from the [[Anglican Communion]] tradition which collectively refer to themselves as the [[Continuing Anglican]] movement. Outside the US, the very small [[Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland]] has a King James Only position.

Besides Independent Baptists, there are a number of other denominations which hold, to varying degrees, to a King James Only position. These include the [[United Pentecostal Church]], the [[Church of God Mountain Assembly|Church of God of the Mountain Assembly]], and some (but not all) of the more conservative denominations from the [[Anglican Communion]] tradition which collectively refer to themselves as the [[Continuing Anglican]] movement. Outside the US, the very small [[Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland]] has a King James Only position.

.....
The [[Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints|The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints]], also referred to as the LDS or [[Mormon]] Church, is not part of the King-James-Only movement but encourages the use of only the KJV in its English-language churches, in an edition with Mormon-specific footnotes and appendices. The LDS preference for the KJV is primarily aesthetic, not based on the views held by other KJV-only groups regarding the accuracy of manuscripts. Indeed the LDS church believes that all Bible manuscripts have had errors introduced over time causing the gospel to be missing "many plain and precious things" (1 Nephi 13:26-28, <http://www.meridianmagazine.com/farms/010305plain.html>);

The [[Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints]], also referred to as the LDS or [[Mormon]] Church, is not part of the King-James-Only movement but encourages the use of only the KJV in its English-language churches, in an edition with Mormon-specific footnotes and appendices. The LDS preference for the KJV is primarily aesthetic, not based on the views held by other KJV-only groups regarding the accuracy of manuscripts. Indeed the LDS church believes that all Bible manuscripts have had errors introduced over time causing the gospel to be missing "many plain and precious things" (1 Nephi 13:26-28, <http://www.meridianmagazine.com/farms/010305plain.html>)

which were only recovered with the translation of the [[Book of Mormon]]. Complicating the Mormon position is the existence of the [[Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible]], which is not widely used in the Utah LDS church but is considered part of the canon of scripture by another group within Mormonism, the Missouri-based [[Community of Christ]].

Outside of the English-speaking world, some Brazilian Baptists and Pentecostals hold a similar position regarding the [[João Ferreira de Almeida]] translation, which was also based on the Textus Receptus, particularly its traditional [[Versão Revista e Corrigida]].

==External links==

* "Pro"

**Branderburg, K., et. al., 2003. "Thou Shalt Keep Them: A Biblical Theology of the Perfect Preservation of Scripture" ISBN 0-974-38170-5

**Holland, T., 2000. "Crowned With Glory: The Bible from Ancient Text to Authorized Version" ISBN 0-595-14617-1

** [<http://wayoflife.org/fbns/fbns-index/versfbns.htm> Way of Life's Electronic KJV Defense Library]

** [<http://logosresourcepages.org/uncials.htm> The Great(?) Uncials] Textual Criticism of Codex Alexandrius, Vaticanus and Siniaticus.

*** [<http://logosresourcepages.org/received.htm> Early Witnesses to the Textus Receptus]

** [<http://www.seekgod.ca/chart.htm> Topical Bible Version Comparison Charts]

** [<http://www.av1611.org/biblecom.html> Complete List of Changes in modern versions.]

** [<http://www.studytoanswer.net/bibleversions/1john5n7.html> A Defence of the Johannine Comma]

** [<http://www.studytoanswer.net/bibleversions/gnostic.html> Gnostic Corruptions in the Critical Texts]

* "Con"

**Carson, D., 1978. "The King James Version Debate: A Plea for Realism" ISBN 0-801-02427-7

Line 36:

** [<http://www.thesword.ca/kjv.htm> The KJV Debate]

** [<http://www.bibletranslation.ws/kjv.html> KJV-Onlyism Page]

** [http://www.godstruthfortoday.org/Library/priddy/ibi_4_2.htm Those Lazy Old Blokes of 1611 (from "The Idle Babblers Illustrated")]

** [<http://www.aomin.org/kjvo.html> James White critiques of KJV-Onlyism]

which were only recovered with the translation of the [[Book of Mormon]]. Complicating the Mormon position is the existence of the [[Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible]], which is not widely used in the Utah LDS church but is considered part of the canon of scripture by another group within Mormonism, the Missouri-based [[Community of Christ]].

Outside of the English-speaking world, some Brazilian Baptists and Pentecostals hold a similar position regarding the [[João Ferreira de Almeida]] translation, which was also based on the Textus Receptus, particularly its traditional [[Versão Revista e Corrigida]].

==References/External links==

* "Pro"

**Branderburg, K., et. al., 2003. "Thou Shalt Keep Them: A Biblical Theology of the Perfect Preservation of Scripture" ISBN 0-974-38170-5

**Holland, Thomas, 2000. "Crowned With Glory: The Bible from Ancient Text to Authorized Version" ISBN 0-595-14617-1

** [<http://wayoflife.org/fbns/fbns-index/versfbns.htm> Way of Life's Electronic KJV Defense Library]

** [<http://logosresourcepages.org/uncials.htm> The Great(?) Uncials] Textual Criticism of Codex Alexandrius, Vaticanus and Siniaticus.

*** [<http://logosresourcepages.org/received.htm> Early Witnesses to the Textus Receptus]

** [<http://www.seekgod.ca/chart.htm> Topical Bible Version Comparison Charts]

** [<http://www.av1611.org/biblecom.html> Complete List of Changes in modern versions.]

** [<http://www.studytoanswer.net/bibleversions/1john5n7.html> A Defence of the Johannine Comma]

** [<http://www.studytoanswer.net/bibleversions/gnostic.html> Gnostic Corruptions in the Critical Texts]

** [<http://www.biblebelievers.com/BibleVersions.html> Articles on Bible Versions from a KJV-supporter perspective]

* "Con"

**Carson, D., 1978. "The King James Version Debate: A Plea for Realism" ISBN 0-801-02427-7

Line 39:

** [<http://www.thesword.ca/kjv.htm> The KJV Debate]

** [<http://www.bibletranslation.ws/kjv.html> KJV-Onlyism Page]

** [http://www.godstruthfortoday.org/Library/priddy/ibi_4_2.htm Those Lazy Old Blokes of 1611 (from "The Idle Babblers Illustrated"; colorful polemic refers to KJV as "a Holy Rip Off")]

** [<http://www.aomin.org/kjvo.html> James White critiques of KJV-Onlyism]

* "Related Concerns"

**Ryken, Leland, 2002. "The Word of God in English: Criteria for Excellence in Bible Translation" ISBN 1581344643

+ **Dewey, David, 2004. "A User's Guide to Bible Translations" ISBN 0830832734

[[Category:Christian fundamentalism]]

[[Category:Christian fundamentalism]]

Current revision

The so-called **King-James-Only Movement** is a position within Protestant fundamentalist Christianity of English-speaking countries which rejects all modern translations of the Bible, and accepts only the King James Version (KJV). The nickname "King-James-Only" appears to have originated with a popular book by James R. White published in 1995 entitled *The King James Only Controversy*, but it should be noted that this name and the claim that such advocacy of the KJV constitutes a "movement" have been hotly contested by some. (White himself addresses the idea that the term "KJV Only" may be an "insulting" or "inaccurate" term in *King James Only Controversy*, p. 248.)

This position is most prevalent within the Independent Baptist branch of the Baptist movement. The rejection is based in part on the different texts which were used as source material for the different translations of the New Testament. Most modern translations are translated mainly from the Alexandrian manuscripts, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus and also of the other minority texts numbered around 50, while the King James Version was translated from the *Textus Receptus*, or Received Text, which is Byzantine text-type (but not identical with the "Majority Text" as that term is used currently). To some extent, doubts are also expressed about the texts used to translate the Old Testament, in particular the *Biblia Hebraica* and *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, and the variant readings in their footnotes are condemned.

There are variations within the King-James-Only Movement. For example, the late John R. Rice, who published *The Sword of the Lord*, took a position that only the original Greek and Hebrew manuscripts are inspired scripture, and that all translations of those done in good faith are useful as scripture, but he expressed a preference toward the King James Version for aesthetic reasons. On the other extreme can be found the teachings of Peter Ruckman, who believes that the King James translation constitutes an "advanced revelation" from God which is superior to even the oldest existing Greek and Hebrew texts. It is said that most King-James-Only advocates hold to a position somewhere between those two extremes; indeed, White makes five divisions of "King-James-Only" groups in his book. But it is observable that such classifications as White's and those of other critics of this belief are endlessly debatable; for example, a person who, in the manner of Rice, simply *prefers* the KJV but feels that it contains errors that are subject to correction would logically *not* fall under the classification established by White's book, which is meant to critique those who hold to the King James Version as the *best* translation or *only perfect* translation of the Scriptures into English.

The roots of the King-James-Only Movement are sometimes traced to the controversy over the publication of the Revised Standard Version (RSV) of the Bible in 1952, which was issued by the National Council of Churches (NCC). Many fundamentalists believed that the NCC was a hotbed of liberal theology or modernism and were suspicious of the new translation. Accusations of Communist and Vatican influence within the NCC were brought up (it being the time of the Second Red Scare and McCarthyism), and fundamentalists largely rejected the RSV, although for three decades it became the most widely used Bible translation within the mainline and liberal Protestant denominations. One particular criticism of the RSV centered on the decision made by the translators to translate a number of Old Testament prophecies, which some scholars believed referred to the coming of Christ, in a manner which did not necessarily imply any connection to Christ. As a result, critics charged that the NCC, in issuing the RSV, had deliberately set out to discredit doctrines such as the virgin birth.

At the same time, many conservative and evangelical Christian groups began producing their own modern Bible translations, including the New American Standard Bible, the Good News Translation, and the New International

Version. Most evangelicals who were wary of the RSV readily accepted these other new translations, but some fundamentalists did not. (It is worth remarking that many concerns formerly written off by modern versions advocates as mere "KJV Only" obstinacy [see White, *passim*] have now begun to emerge from other quarters of conservative and evangelical Christianity; for example, one writer who opines that "The English-speaking world has not been brought closer to the ideal translation with the proliferation of modern translations. Readers are less sure than ever of what the original text actually says" is Leland Ryken, a professor of English at Wheaton College who served as a literary stylist for the English Standard Version and therefore hardly a "KJV Only" author [Ryken, *The Word of God in English*, p. 63].)

Those who rejected all modern translations began to advocate the ideas which are held by the King James Only Movement, such as their belief that the Received Text is superior to the Alexandrian manuscripts, and that Codex Alexandrinus, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus have been corrupted by Gnostics. (However, it should be pointed out that these ideas are not entirely the invention of "KJV Only" authors, being strongly foreshadowed in the works of Dean John William Burgon, who vigorously opposed the English Revised Version. Although Burgon did believe that there were some KJV errors, many of the positions taken by today's KJV defenders can be traced to Burgon's arguments in *The Revision Revised* and other writings against the textual philosophies that guided the Revised Version translators--arguments that significantly predated the struggles mentioned above involving the RSV.)

The King-James-Only Movement became one of the core beliefs within the growing Independent Fundamental branch of Baptists. Even the use of only the texts available in the early 1600s for the main body of the work fails to satisfy the supporters of the King-James-Only Movement, who see the New King James Version (1982) as something less than a true successor to the 1611 version. Some such supporters argue that, because the New King James Version makes scores of changes to the meaning of the 1611 translators, it is not a simple "updating" but actually constitutes a new version; at the same time, the inclusion of verses found solely in the Textus Receptus (such as 1 John 5:7) in the NKJV may make this attempt at revision less than palatable to many advocates of modern versions. (Regarding this latter point see David Dewey, *A User's Guide to Bible Translations*, pp. 162-3, where he quotes strong criticism of the NKJV's textual basis by Steven Sheeley and Robert Nash.)

Within broader evangelical circles, the King James Only belief is controversial and is widely rejected. Most evangelical scholars hold that the *Textus Receptus* manuscripts which the KJV was translated from contain a number of errors, and that the modern translations are translated from the earliest and supposedly more accurate manuscript evidence which we currently have. Most scholars who support biblical inerrancy believe this applies only to the original manuscripts, e.g. the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy. However, there is substantial agreement between most of the Majority Text of the Greek New Testament and the Textus Receptus, and the NKJV preface testifies that there are reputable scholars who feel that the Majority Text is defensible, even if they do not support the particular form it has taken in the Textus Receptus.

Besides Independent Baptists, there are a number of other denominations which hold, to varying degrees, to a King James Only position. These include the United Pentecostal Church, the Church of God of the Mountain Assembly, and some (but not all) of the more conservative denominations from the Anglican Communion tradition which collectively refer to themselves as the Continuing Anglican movement. Outside the US, the very small Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland has a King James Only position.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, also referred to as the LDS or Mormon Church, is not part of the King-James-Only movement but encourages the use of only the KJV in its English-language churches, in an edition with Mormon-specific footnotes and appendices. The LDS preference for the KJV is primarily aesthetic, not based on the views held by other KJV-only groups regarding the accuracy of manuscripts. Indeed the LDS church believes that all Bible manuscripts have had errors introduced over time causing the gospel to be missing "many plain and precious things" (1 Nephi 13:26-28, [1] (<http://www.meridianmagazine.com/farms/010305plain.html>)) which were only recovered with the translation of

the Book of Mormon. Complicating the Mormon position is the existence of the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible, which is not widely used in the Utah LDS church but is considered part of the canon of scripture by another group within Mormonism, the Missouri-based Community of Christ.

Outside of the English-speaking world, some Brazilian Baptists and Pentecostals hold a similar position regarding the João Ferreira de Almeida translation, which was also based on the Textus Receptus, particularly its traditional *Versão Revista e Corrigida*.

References/External links

n Pro

- n Branderburg, K., et. al., 2003. *Thou Shalt Keep Them: A Biblical Theology of the Perfect Preservation of Scripture* ISBN 0-974-38170-5
- n Holland, Thomas, 2000. *Crowned With Glory: The Bible from Ancient Text to Authorized Version* ISBN 0-595-14617-1
- n Way of Life's Electronic KJV Defense Library (<http://wayoflife.org/fbns/fbns-index/versfbns.htm>)
- n Topical Bible Version Comparison Charts (<http://www.seekgod.ca/chart.htm>)
- n Complete List of Changes in modern versions. (<http://www.av1611.org/biblecom.html>)
- n A Defence of the Johannine Comma (<http://www.studytoanswer.net/bibleversions/1john5n7.html>)
- n Gnostic Corruptions in the Critical Texts (<http://www.studytoanswer.net/bibleversions/gnostic.html>)
- n Articles on Bible Versions from a KJV-supporter perspective (<http://www.biblebelievers.com/BibleVersions.html>)

n Con

- n Carson, D., 1978. *The King James Version Debate: A Plea for Realism* ISBN 0-801-02427-7
- n White, James, 1995. *The King James Only Controversy: Can You Trust the Modern Translations?* ISBN 1-556-61575-2
- n Ankerberg, J. & Weldon, J., 2003. *The Facts on the King James Only Debate* ISBN 0-736-91111-1
- n When the Bible Becomes an Idol: Problems with the KJV-Only Doctrine (<http://www.atlantaapologist.org/kjv.html>)
- n The KJV Debate (<http://www.thesword.ca/kjv.htm>)
- n KJV-Onlyism Page (<http://www.bibletranslation.ws/kjv.html>)
- n Those Lazy Old Blokes of 1611 (from *The Idle Babblers Illustrated*; colorful polemic refers to KJV as "a Holy Rip Off") (http://www.godstruthfortoday.org/Library/priddy/ibi_4_2.htm)
- n James White critiques of KJV-Onlyism (<http://www.aomin.org/kjvo.html>)

n Related Concerns

- n Ryken, Leland, 2002. *The Word of God in English: Criteria for Excellence in Bible Translation* ISBN 1581344643
- n Dewey, David, 2004. *A User's Guide to Bible Translations* ISBN 0830832734

Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/King-James-Only_Movement"

Categories: Christian fundamentalism

-
- n This page was last modified 23:22, 17 July 2005.
 - n All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License (see **Copyrights** for details).