

LETTER 12  
1969

**IS THE KING JAMES VERSION RELIABLE?**

You ask whether the King James Version can be considered a reliable Bible today, and also say: "In the light of these manuscripts, can the Williams translation and the New English Bible be considered accurate and reliable?" In answer I would say that the New English Bible is not really a translation but a paraphrase which presents the ideas that its modernistic committee thinks are either contained in the Bible, or should be. It may occasionally use expressions that are helpful in bringing out the thought of the original, but anything that it says needs to be carefully checked with other versions before one can safely place dependence upon it. Although I have not studied it as much as I have studied the Revised Standard Version, I have been informed by those who have done so that it is far less dependable than even the Revised Standard Version.

As to the Williams translation, it is my impression that it was made by a good man who tried to render the original as accurately as he could. He doubtless made mistakes, as any man will. There is apt to be a greater check on such matters in a translation made by a group than is possible when a translation is made by an individual. No doubt there are particular matters in the Williams translation that are not fully accurate, but it is my impression that it is quite generally reliable.

As to the King James Version one can safely say that there is little manuscript evidence to show inaccuracies in the King James Version. There may be particular points at which new light can be thrown on certain minor matters, but there is no point of major importance at which the King James Version is definitely unreliable. Sometimes careful study of the original can suggest a much better rendering than the King James Version contains, but these are generally at points where more than one interpretation of the original is possible.