We Should Use the Authorized KJV

By S. Franklin Logsdon * (1907-1987)

Editor's note: Logsdon was on the leading committee to create the NASV, but in his later years, he rejected it. He gave the following excerpted speech to repent of his error in being a part of creating new (per)versions of the English Bible.

May I point out to you very specifically, not that you do not know, but to stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance, we are in the end time. And this end time is characterized by a falling away, and of course that is apostasy. That is the meaning of the word: Falling away from truth. Everything we have or ever will have will be found here [in the Bible], as we have said so many times. All that God does for us, in us, with us, through us, to us must come by the way of this Word. It's the only material the Spirit of God uses to produce life and to promote it. Name, it and it has to be here.

Devil's attack on the Bible

So you can understand why the archenemy of God and man would want to do something to destroy this Book. I ought to whisper to you, and this is no compliment to the Devil, but he knows it can't be

destroyed. He tried to destroy the Living Word. You don't see this depicted on X-mas cards, but the night Jesus Christ was born the Devil was there in that stable with one third of the fallen angels whom he had dragged down, to devour the Manchild as soon as He was born (Rev. 12:5). Now he couldn't do it. Just think. Satan was there when Jesus was born, with all of those cohorts, those fallen angels, for one purpose: to devour the Manchild. He couldn't do it.

So failing to abort the Saviorhood of Jesus Christ both at the Manger and at the Cross – when he said come down from the Cross, that is, before your work is finished, come down – he is going to do what he knows is the next most effective thing, that is try to destroy the Written Word. You understand, I am sure, there are places in this book where you can't differentiate between the Living Word and the Written Word. You know that. ***"I am…the life."* – John 14:6, "*…the words that I speak unto you, … they are life."* – John l6:63.** Different life? The same life. You can't differentiate because after all the Written Word is the breath, if you please, of God, and Jesus Christ is **"God made flesh"** or the Word that came to earth.

Nevertheless, getting back to this, the Devil is too wise to try to destroy the Bible. He knows he can't. He can't destroy the Word of God. But he can do a lot of things to try to supplant it, or to corrupt it in the minds

and hearts of God's people. Now he can only do it in one of two ways: either by adding to the Scriptures or by subtracting from the Scriptures. And you mark it down in your little red book: He's too wise to add to because those who have been in the Word for a long time would say, "Wait a minute; this is not in the Bible." So he subtracts from it. The deletions are absolutely frightening.

For instance, there are in the revisions (1881 and 1901), so we are told 5,337 deletions and subtractions, if you please. And here is the way it is done. It is done so subtly that very few would discover it. For instance, in the New American Standard we are told that 16 times the word **"Christ"** is gone. When you are reading through you perhaps wouldn't miss many of them. Some you might. And 10 or 12 times the word ***"Lord"*** is gone. For instance, if you were in a church when the pastor is speaking on the words of the Lord Jesus in his temptation, ***"Get thee behind me, Satan,"*** if you have a New American Standard you wouldn't even find it. It's not even in there. And there are so many such deletions.

So this is done in order to get around it and further blind the minds and hearts of people, even though it may be done conscientiously. There isn't any worse kind of error than to have conscientious error. If you are conscientiously wrong it's a terrible situation to be in. Nevertheless, when there is an omission that might be

observed, they put in the margin, "Not in the oldest manuscripts." But they don't tell you what those oldest manuscripts are. What oldest manuscripts? Or, they say, "Not in the best manuscripts." What are the best manuscripts? They don't tell you. You see how subtle that is? The average man sees a little note in the margin which says "not in the better manuscripts" and he takes for granted they are scholars and they must know, and then he goes on. That's how easily one can be deceived.

History of the Critical Greek Text

Let's go back to say A. D. 352, when Constantine, the Old Pagan Wolf, as he was called, was concerned because his kingdom was threatened with a schism. There were those who held to the Babylon doctrine of the mother and child coming up through history, and there were others who held to the Roman doctrine of mother and child. In order to cement his kingdom, he felt he ought to bring about a Bible that would satisfy both sides which were threatening to destroy his kingdom. So he called upon Eusebius. (There were two men of that period called by this name, but I am referring to Eusebius the historian.)

Who was Eusebius? He was a protégé of Origen. And who was Origen? Origen was one who believed, like the Jehovah's Witnesses, that Christ was a created being therefore he's not divine. Now a man who studies under a teacher like that certainly would imbibe some of it.

Nevertheless, Eusebius brought into being a Bible that would somehow or other, not offend those who had the Babylonian doctrine or those who had the Roman doctrine of the mother and the child.

Rome and the Critical Text

There are two copies of those Critical Text Bibles in existence, A and B – the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Vaticanus. And where are they? They are in the custodial care of Rome. And the only copies we have are the copies that Rome decided to give to the outside world, and I don't trust them one inch. Never, never, never! And I'll tell you why in just a moment. None of our scholars today have seen Codex B [Vaticanus], unless they've seen just a page or two through a glass case. But that's not enough to get the feel of the whole thing, just to see a page that is open at one place. So here we have the stream of manuscripts and the stream of Greek texts coming down though the "custodial care" of Rome. And if it's in the custodial care of Rome, I don't want anything to do with it. I've come to this place now: I can't stand toe to toe with the scholars, with those who have delved into the manuscripts and textual criticism for years and years. I've had too many other things to do. And you haven't been able to, either. So what do you do? I don't argue with them anymore. I'm not going to argue with any of them. I'm just going to ask, on what manuscript

or manuscripts is this version based? And if it's based upon a manuscript that came down though this Roman stream, I don't want anything to do with it.

Erasmus

You say, how can we know? Well, when God was ready to tell the world through a converted monk that the just shall live by faith, he raised up a man – and I'm sure that God raised him up; couldn't be otherwise – by the name of Erasmus. Erasmus is said by those who seem to know – scholars, we have to take their word for something -- that he was the wisest man this side of Solomon that ever lived. It was said that he would do 10 days work in one day. Brilliant. I forgot how many languages he spoke; they say he was at home in 18 or 20 different languages as easily as we can move around in the English language.

He knew the manuscripts that were available, and he brought about a Greek text. Now he was so brilliant that the pope offered him – that is to keep him, I suppose, from doing this Greek text – offered him the position of a cardinal, which is a high-ranking position for those in the Catholic Church. I know a little bit about it because my father's people were from Ireland and were Roman Catholic all the way back. I have three cousins in Chicago who are priests. I have a cousin in the Chicago area who

is a nun. That was quite an offer to be offered the position of a cardinal, yet he refused it. The British government, I am told, offered him one of the highest positions possible in the British Commonwealth. And at his own price he turned it down. Germany did the same thing, but he turned it down because he felt God had called him to bring about the pure Greek text.

All of this goes off into so many areas. We have a friend in one of our Baptist churches, very delightful chap, very educated, and he speaks against Erasmus because he had some attachment to the Roman church. Peter Ruckman speaks against Erasmus. But how could you speak against a man, claiming that he is Roman, when he turned down the offer of a cardinalship and campaigned against monasticism, against the liturgy of the Catholic Church and was detested by the Catholic people? And not only that, but listen to this: Do you know one of the reasons the Jesuits came into being under Loyola? Their main project was to supplant the Erasmus text, get it out of the way somehow, just undermine it. And his is their pledge. You can go to the library and get this directly, if you care. Hy said, "In order to supplant the Erasmus text we'll send our men to Protestant seminaries, Protestant Bible schools; we'll get them into teaching positions in seminaries; we'll them into pulpits of churches." To do what?

The whole aim around the world is to destroy the Erasmus text, and the Authorized Version of course came

from the Erasmus text. Getting back to this one matter that really impresses me a great deal. When God was ready to tell the world that the just shall live by faith, he got hold of the heart of Luther and he tacked his thesis to the door – ***"the just shall live by faith"*** –and took all the persecution that comes to one who turns against the Church of Rome. If the just shall live by faith, where do we get faith? ***"Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God."*** **– Rom. 10:17.** If they're going to have pure faith they had to have the pure Word of God. Doesn't that make sense? And so God raised up Erasmus to bring about what was called the pure Greek text, and had it completed when Luther came thundering forth ***"the just shall live by faith."*** He had the Greek text of Erasmus to translate. Someone put it this way: Erasmus laid the egg and Luther hatched it. Just at the right time he had the text, and all he had to do was to translate it into German.

Accuracy of the Authorized Version

I think I mentioned the other night, since there is so much concern about these versions and paraphrases and so on, it is a marvelous opportunity for he Devil to get in his strokes, you know. Through computerized procedures they have tried to determine the accuracy right down the line. You have lists of those in various books. The Authorized Version is right at the top. Friends, you can

say the Authorized Version is absolutely correct. How correct? 100% correct! Because Biblical correctness is predicated upon doctrinal accuracy, and not one enemy of this Book of God has ever proved a wrong doctrine in the Authorized Version. You've never heard of anyone's intellect being thwarted because he believed this Authorized Version, have you? And you never will.

I tell you, I used to laugh with others when a person would try to slander the intelligence, perhaps, of some who say, "Well, if the Authorized Version was good enough for Paul it's good enough for me." You get a lot of "Ha, ha's." Say, that perhaps is true. If this is the Word of God, and Paul had the Word of God, then things equal to the same thing are equal to each other. We have the book that Paul had.

Conclusion

Think of the countless millions of dollars of God's money spent on all these versions and translations which could have been spent on God's service. There are 100 of them right now.

Some of the archaic words such as in ***"he who lets will let until he be taken out of the way"*** we don't use that way, but you can find out what it means by taking just a moment to look it up. Back in **Jer 4:22** we read, ***"My people are sottish."*** There wouldn't be two people in the congregation that would know what that means. But I like it, because when I looked it up, I found that it had more meaning than any other word you could

put there. It means thick-headed. God says, "I can't get through to you because you are thick-headed." And maybe He wants it to stay there. If a person looks it up he gets a better understanding of it than if another word were put in there to change it. There are places where I believe the Spirit of God led the translators of the Authorized Version.

You read their biographies. They were mighty men of God; spent as much as five hours daily in prayer; and some of them knew twenty some languages. And it was before modernism filled the air, and before their attention was diverted by so many other things, television and so on. Actually, after I've listened in so many places to all these arguments and I've listened to the scholars and sat with the translators, to be honest with you I haven't found anything seriously wrong anywhere with the Authorized Version. Really. Really! I personally don't think ***"thou"*** and ***"thee"*** should be changed. God's thoughts are above our thoughts, higher than our thoughts, and these words are expression of His thoughts, and I like to see it a little different here and there from men's ways and men's thoughts.

Actually I don't think there is anything wrong with this [Authorized Version]. And it has been tested for 362 years. Are you ready to throw it overboard because some scholars have come along and said, "Well now, this is better; reads better; you can understand it better?" I mean to tell you with all their self-justification [of the so-

called easier to read versions], people know less and less about God’s word.

Copied by permission from [The Voice in the Wilderness,] October 1, 2026, Vol. XLV No. 1, 286 Big Creek Road, Wayne, WV