

**THE AUTHORISED VERSION:
Not Archaic, but an Accurate and Timeless Translation**

The Rev. J. P. Thackway

8 October 2011, Exeter, England

Our title implies that many nowadays imagine that the Authorised Version (AV) is an archaic Bible translation. 'Archaic' means, 'old, outmoded, outdated'. So the reasoning goes, who wants a Bible translated into English that went out use centuries ago? How is this making God's Word clear and intelligible for the present generation?

This is a big complaint about the AV, and is probably the main argument people state for using one of the newer English translations. Even those sympathetic to the AV's textual and translation principles maintain we need at least the New King James Version. Alan Clifford has gone into print with strictures on the AV, claiming that 'In this new millennium, the last thing the people of God need is to be seen as an antiquarian society!'¹

We will seek to address the issues raised by such reasoning shortly. At this point, let us clear the ground and remind ourselves of what exactly our position is regarding the AV. Some negatives first.

1. We naturally do not agree with the contemptuous things said about this historic translation. For example, D.A. Carson says,

The plain truth of the matter is that the version that is cherished among senior saints who have more or less come to terms with Elizabethan English, is obscure, confusing, and sometimes even incomprehensible to many younger or poorly educated Christians.²

Then he quotes E. H. Palmer, who was on the New International Version translation Committee:

Do not give them a loaf of bread covered with an inedible, impenetrable crust fossilized by [four] centuries. Give them the Word of God as fresh and warm as the Holy Spirit gave it to the authors of the Bible.³

More colloquially, many would say of the AV, 'It is just like Shakespeare: boring'.

2. Neither are we happy with those who merely extol its literary virtues.

During this four hundredth anniversary year, eminent men have been quoted who have heaped high praise upon the AV. For example, Francis Watson, professor of New Testament at Durham, says

The King James Version is a cultural icon representing an unsurpassable level of literary excellence.⁴

David Crystal, one of the world's greatest authorities on the English language, said that it

did something that nobody else had done, or nothing else had done in the history of the language previously. Not even Shakespeare had managed to do as much...no other text in the history of the English language has done as much as the Bible to shape our modern idiom.⁵

Adam Nicolson, historian and writer, authority on the AV, who places it third from top in his ten favourite books to read, wrote,

...one quality, or at least...one combination of qualities: an absolute simplicity of vocabulary set in a rhythm of the utmost stateliness and majesty... The characteristic sound of the King James Bible is...like the ideal of majesty itself...indescribably vast and yet perfectly accessible, reaching up to the sublime and down to the immediate and the concrete, without any apparent effort.⁶

Melvyn Bragg, who wrote *Twelve Books that Changed the World*, includes the King James Bible as one of these.

Many more such testimonials are available: programmes commemorating its four hundredth anniversary on the media, sites on the Internet, along with books aplenty. All this historical, linguistic and cultural appreciation is very worthy, so far as it goes. However, although we agree that such words are just, we claim more for the AV than its literary eminence.⁷

3. We would not want an obscure Bible translation.

We believe if divine revelation is to be received, it must be understood. Therefore, any translation of the original Hebrew and Greek into our language must be accurate and clear. To obscure divine revelation is the sin of Roman Catholicism, with its Latin Vulgate Bible translation and services in Latin until recent times. We recall Nehemiah 8.8, 'So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused *them* to understand the reading'. As Miles Smith, who wrote the *Translators to the Reader*, put it,

Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtain, that we may look into the holy place; that removeth the cover of the well, that we may come by the water...⁸

We believe the AV succeeds admirably in this. It is the most accurate and reliable English Bible translation available today—and it is readable. We do not claim perfection for it, but we do claim distinction. It is the best English translation for all the right reasons,⁹ and we could wish it were still the most commonly used Bible today.

Why is this not so? Since 1978, with the advent of the New International Version, the AV has been steadily falling from favour and use among Christians, although its sales are second only to the NIV. We trust and pray that in the four hundredth anniversary year we may see the beginning of a return to the Bible translation of our fathers. Certainly, the AV has never had it so good as far as positive publicity is concerned. As a contribution to this, let us address this question of readability as being one of the main objections to using the AV today.

1. The 17th century language

The complaint is that the scholars who produced the AV were men of their time. The English they employed in translating the original Hebrew and Greek, though fine language, is impossibly dated. English has moved on so much over the four centuries since 1611... 'This is 2011! Surely we are living in the 21st century', is the cry, 'and we need to communicate the Gospel in a translation that people understand'. Such people regard the AV as a kind of literary relic—not an everyday Bible version; as someone put it, 'A single AV, in a lonely eminence with only Shakespeare for company'.

This is to overlook something important. The AV translators built on the work of William Tyndale, who translated the New Testament and around half of the Old Testament from the Hebrew and Greek. It is reckoned that the AV is about 80% from Tyndale. His translation of the New Testament appeared in 1526, 'the single most important event in the English Reformation'.¹⁰ However, it was also one of the most important events for the English language.

At that time, written English was a curious mix. It was made up of elements of older Anglo-Saxon, was heavily Norman French, and strongly Latinate (that is, derived from Latin). Latin was the language of government, the professions and religion—including, of course, the Roman Catholic Vulgate Bible and its supposed worship.

Tyndale produced an English translation that was a breath of fresh air. He turned the Hebrew and Greek into English! But it was a quality of English that conveyed God's Word to ordinary people: words remarkable for their 'great clarity, economy and power'.¹¹ And remember, the AV is around 80% Tyndale.

Tyndale, and the AV translators that followed him, gave us unique English. David Daniell writes,

Tyndale's gift to the English language is immeasurable. He translated into a register just above common speech, allied in its clarity to proverbs. It is a language which still speaks directly to the heart. His rhetorical aims were always accuracy and clarity. King James's revisers adopted his style, and his words, for a good deal of their version. At a time when European scholars and professionals communicated in Latin, Tyndale insisted on being understood by ordinary people. He preferred a simple Saxon syntax of subject-verb-object. His vocabulary is predominantly Saxon, and often monosyllabic.¹²

What is true of Tyndale is broadly true of the AV that he helped to shape. Moreover, Tyndale's English, and that of the King James translators, is actually shaped by the original languages of Scripture—their English is a language produced by the words of the Bible itself. The linguist David Norris writes,

The so-called archaic feel to the AV is generated in large part by its unusual syntax (organisation of words in sentences), something that has been brought about by following the Hebrew and Greek as closely as possible.¹³

He then quotes A. T. Robertson's *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*,

No one today speaks the English of the King James Version, or ever did for that matter, for...it reproduces to a remarkable extent the spirit and language of the Bible.¹⁴

Norris maintains this is even true of the word-order, and gives this example,

Let us look...at **Genesis 1:4**. The Hebrew reads word for word 'And-he-saw God the-light that-good'. The translators of the AV retained Tyndale's **And God saw the light, that it was good**. Whilst some may view the rather odd syntax as archaic, it reproduces the original, whereas the NIV, for example, does not. It reads: 'God saw that the light was good'. Modern version enthusiasts would doubtless argue that this is how it would be said today, perhaps so, but this is not the point... The AV translators sought at all times to let the original shine through the translation in order to retain the identical meaning.

Following Heb and Gk vocabulary and syntax enables the English reader to enter into the atmosphere and meaning of the passage as though he were reading the original.¹⁵

A compelling case can be made for saying that if the English of the AV is 'dated', it is only as dated as the language of Scripture itself—which 'liveth and abideth forever' (1 Peter 1.23).

One of the leading criticisms against the AV is its 'archaic' language, but those who make such criticisms do not understand the nature of the AV nor the issues involved. The language of the AV is not simply beautiful English prose, it is also a kind of 'biblical English', and therefore timeless and unique. The abandonment of the AV for a modern English version leaves us with an English Bible that is here today, and gone tomorrow.¹⁶

To move away from it to modern translations is a move away from, not toward, improvement.

What is antiquated English?

The allegation is often made that the AV is in the English current at the time: Elizabethan or Jacobean. However, this is not true. For a sample of that English, read an extract from the brief Dedication to James I from the translators, found in most editions of the AV.

And now at last, by the Mercy of God, and the continuance of our Labours, it being brought unto such a conclusion, as that we have great hopes that the Church of *England* shall reap good fruit thereby; we hold it our duty to offer it to Your Majesty, not only as to our King and Sovereign, but as to the principal Mover and Author of the work: humbly craving of Your most Sacred Majesty, that since things of this quality have ever been subject to the censures of ill meaning and discontented persons, it may receive approbation and Patronage from so learned and judicious a Prince as Your Highness is, whose allowance and acceptance of our labours shall more honour and encourage us, than all the calumniations and hard interpretations of other men shall dismay us.

That is one hundred and thirty-seven words in one sentence! And notice that when they address King James they say 'Your most Sacred Majesty', not 'thy'; there is not one 'thy' or 'thou' in the dedication except when they are quoting their translation of Scripture or the

words of others. Despite some long sentences, the English of the AV is not like this at all. It is far simpler: it is the Hebrew and Greek turned into their biblical-English equivalents.

Even the BBC has picked this up. On one of its radio programme on the history of the AV in January this year, it paid tribute to, 'the most striking characteristic...its simplicity'. Also, 'its majesty, clarity, beauty, directness, deep musicality and rhythm'. Truly, 'the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light' (Luke 16.8).

Here, let us touch on the many 'archaic, obsolete words'. People often tell us that the AV English of 1611 is wrapped in heavy layers of time-bound words and expressions impossible for modern people to cope with. Hence the boast that modern translations strip this away and put a plain, easier-to-read Bible into our hands. Now, we acknowledge that some words in the AV have changed their meaning over the centuries: 'trow', 'bray', 'unicorn', 'champaign', 'pate', 'leasing', 'bruit', 'collop', 'durst', 'emerods', etc. However, these are not so many. Of a total of 783,137 words in AV, there has been calculated that only about three hundred are actually archaic (outdated), and only ninety-four obsolete (not in use anymore).

These can easily be defined in public reading or preaching. Trinitarian Bible Society Bibles have a list of several hundred such words at the back of their Bibles. The new Westminster Reference Bible has these and others in the margin, with an asterisk against each of the words. And one can always consult a dictionary!

This is different from saying that the language of the AV is dated. If over the centuries our English language had evolved upwards, there might be some merit in this claim. However, the fact is that English has gradually become debased. We therefore need a Bible translation that reflects English that is redolent of biblical idioms, not one that changes with the latest slang expressions.

As if to illustrate this, much of the AV has passed into current speech. The examples are well known: 'Let there be light', 'see eye to eye', 'the apple of my eye', 'a man after my own heart', 'the skin of my teeth', 'a hair's breadth', 'salt of the earth', 'eat, drink and be merry', 'the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak', 'signs of the times', 'weak as water', 'all things to all men', 'a law unto themselves', 'o ye of little faith', 'the powers that be', 'a fly in the ointment', 'fight the good fight'. These are still heard in ordinary conversation, often spoken by people who do not even know they come from the Bible. It is estimated that there are about two hundred and fifty-seven such expressions.

2. The Pronouns and verb endings.

For our purpose, a pronoun is a word used instead of a noun to refer to someone, e.g., I, you, your, etc. The complaint here runs something like this: The AV has these old and archaic pronouns: Thee, thou, ye, etc. Not only that, but they alter the ending of verbs that follow, making sentences sound quaint and harder to understand. E.g., Psalm 50.21 'thou thoughtest that I was altogether *such an one* as thyself'—compared with, 'You thought that I was altogether such a one as yourself'. Or, sometimes these strange verb endings are there even without the pronouns, e.g., John 21.17 'He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep'.

Let us consider the pronouns first. We are thinking especially about the second person pronouns, where we are addressing someone. In modern English, we use 'you' and 'your'. This is so, whether it is one person we are addressing, or a number of people.

However, unlike in English, Hebrew and Greek have pronouns which reflect when there is a single person being addressed, and when plural. Our modern English cannot reflect this distinction. E.g., if I pointed, and said, 'You are very attentive', am I referring to one, or more than one, person? My hearers would not know unless I qualified it by also saying, 'You are an attentive listener', or 'You are an attentive congregation'.

When it comes to Bible translation, if there are English forms that are able to convey this difference, it is only right to use them in the interests of accuracy. Of course, there are: the historic pronouns. This is what the AV translators were able to use for greater accuracy. E.g.,

Luke 22.31,32: 'And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired *to have you* [Peter and the other disciples], that he may sift *you* as wheat: but I have prayed for **thee** [Peter in particular], that **thy** faith fail not: and when **thou** art converted, strengthen **thy** brethren'.

John 3.7 'Marvel not that I said unto **thee** [Nicodemus], **Ye** [all of you people] must be born again'.

Isaiah 41.13 'For I the LORD **thy** God will hold **thy** right hand, saying unto **thee**, Fear not; I will help **thee**'[wonderfully individual to each of us].

Although such distinctions were already going out of style in 1611, they were available to the translators, and were used by them. In the AV, the receptor language had a device that could more accurately render the original, and that device was taken advantage of. This is another way the AV's language became biblical English.

As Oswald T. Allis wrote:

It is incorrect to claim that the thou represents the usage of the 1611 period when the AV was prepared and that that usage is out of date and should be rejected for that very reason. Such a claim misrepresents the facts. The AV usage is not Jacobean or 17th-Century English. It is Biblical English. The Greek of the New Testament like the Hebrew of the Old Testament distinguishes between the singular and the plural forms of the second person. The AV makes this distinction simply because NT Greek does so, and because that is the only way to translate the Bible correctly.¹⁷

Again, it was not old-fashioned but accurate.

We also need to mention that it is sometimes said that addressing Deity with thee and thou makes for greater reverence compared with you and your. We can understand this, and to a certain extent is true. Note Psalm 65.2 'O thou that hearest prayer, unto thee shall all flesh come' and compare it with the New King James Version, 'O you who hear prayer, to you all flesh will come'. There is no question as to which sounds the most reverent. This also applies to our language when we address God in prayer.¹⁸ However, this is not the main importance of these pronouns. They are primarily for accuracy—and that is always a chief consideration in Bible translation.

3. The other verb endings and unusual words.

There are word-forms in the AV that seem strange to us now: e.g., 'mine', 'leadeth', 'knoweth', 'rememberest', 'goeth', etc. Why should these be used, when we have the more modern equivalents available?

This is a reasonable question since they are not necessary for accuracy or reverence. However, they have a benefit not often thought about. It is that these help create the lyrical and rhythmic quality of the AV. This again comes from Tyndale. His translation work reflected this musicality. The AV translators retained it quite deliberately because their translation was to be read aloud in churches. In the course of their work, they read passages to each other, not only to test their accuracy, but also the way they sounded.

So we have, for example, the iambic rhythm in Matthew 5.38, 'ye have heard that it hath been said, an **eye** for an **eye**, and a **tooth** for a **tooth**'—where the stress is on the second syllable. Also, there is trochaic rhythm, with the stress on the first syllable, as in Psalm 34.13, '**Keep** thy / **tongue** from / **e-vil**, and thy / **lips** from / **speak-ing** / **guile**'.

This quality is why the AV leant itself so well to oratorios like Bach's *St. Matthew Passion*, Handel's *Messiah*, Mendelssohn's *Elijah*, and Walton's *Belshazzar's Feast*. Imagine if the libretto for these was from a more modern translation, the NIV for instance!

In 1611 and afterwards, few people could read; therefore they had to rely on memorising the Scriptures they heard read and quoted. Because we more easily remember rhythms and poetic forms, the AV is so helpful for memorising and is unique in this respect. This practice is sadly missing today and is probably down to the proliferation of the modern English translations.

4. The theological jargon.

What some call theological jargon are the great words that express the mighty truths of the Faith, such as 'propitiation', 'atonement', 'righteousness', 'mercy seat', 'justification', 'sanctification', etc. Modern translations tend to avoid these words and instead seek to define their meaning.

There is a very sound reason for retaining these words. It is because of the kind of Bible translation principles the AV translators used. Basically there are two kinds of translation principles that are of importance to us (discounting paraphrase, which is not really a valid translation principle).

'Dynamic equivalence' is seen when the original language texts are rendered in a thought-by-thought way rather than word-for-for, allowing the translator to give the meaning in his own words. Leaning more toward paraphrase, this eliminates the need for those big, theological terms since a group of words can be supplied to clarify the individual word's meaning. One example is 'propitiation' in Romans 3.25: 'whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation'. In *Today's New International Version* it is, 'God presented Christ as a sacrifice of atonement'.

'Formal or exact equivalence' is translating the text word-for-word as exactly as possible from the original language texts. It is never possible to translate exactly every word because

of the differences between Hebrew/Greek and English. However, the principle and aim of the AV translators was, 'as literal as possible, as free as necessary'.¹⁹

Therefore, when it came to *hilasmos* (according to Thayer's Greek lexicon, 'an appeasing, propitiating'²⁰), the King James men used 'propitiation'. Not only is it faithful to the original, it also preserves the all-important vertical plane in atonement: that our Lord's death acted upon God for us, satisfying His justice and appeasing His wrath, thus bringing us into divine favour.

This is a very serious matter. It has to do with our view of Scripture itself. If God has inspired these pregnant words, He means us to have them as they are. The AV gives them as they are.

If we avoid translating them as they are, we weaken their meaning. Alec Motyer has said of the TNIV and propitiation: 'when the great truth of 'propitiation' becomes the imprecise 'sacrifice of atonement' (Romans 3:25; 1 John 2:2), too many unnecessary concessions are made to the supposed need to be 'modern'.²¹

Paraphrase involves rewording and sometimes adding to Holy Scripture. In the case of 'propitiation', the TNIV already has three words instead of one. Worse still, the Contemporary English Version translates it, 'the sacrifice that takes away our sins'—which now has six words instead of one. Scripture solemnly warns us about adding to it, as well as taking away from it (Revelation 22.18).

The translator exceeds his bounds. He has become an interpreter. This takes us away from plain Scripture to man's understanding of its words. But interpretation and teaching is the calling of preachers not translators.

These words are not 'theological jargon' but weighty, biblical words and terms given by God.

To conclude, let us consider these final points.

1. The readability of the AV has been put to the test.

D. A. Waite, in the USA, and others have run computer-generated statistics to show the remarkable readability of the AV. I have done a similar study in the *Bible League Quarterly*.²² I put Genesis 1 and Romans 8 from the English Standard Version and the Authorised Version, and a similar amount of text from Ken Ham's popular paperback *The Lie: Evolution*.²³ Here are the readability results.

	ESV	AV	TL
Number of words:	1,683	1,354	1,446
Number of sentences:	95	74	101
Short sentences:	42	40	47
Long sentences:	13	5	2
Simple sentences:	25	40	26
Big words:	125	96	212
Sentence complexity:	42	39	37
Vocabulary complexity:	10	6	24
Words per sentence:	17.71	18.29	14.31
Average syllables per word:	1.34	1.36	1.60
Flesch Reading Ease:	75	<u>73</u>	57

Rudolph Flesch developed the formula in the early 1940s. It measures the average sentence length in words and the average word length in syllables. You put these two numbers into an equation and get a number between 0 and 100 that shows you the difficulty of the piece of writing. The lower the score, the harder it is to read; the higher the score, the easier to read. It can be seen from the tabulated results above that the AV has come out remarkably well. Here are the scores of some reading materials Flesch tested. These are average scores of random samples.

Comics	92
Consumer ads in magazines	82
Movie screen	75
<i>Seventeen</i>	67
<i>Reader's Digest</i>	65
<i>Sports Illustrated</i>	63

The AV has come out at the level of a film at the cinema! Quite a result in the face of the constant claims that it is archaic and not suited to today's readers.

This is often confirmed by those whose first language is not even English. The following correspondence comes from a man called Isaac, received at TBS in January 2011.

I am from Indian origin now living in London. Though I was brought up studying English, my fluency and confidence was very little. One of elders whom is a well-wisher of our family asked me to read KJV to improve my English fluency. The effect of me reading KJV was significant. I became a lot more confident and I could see myself edging way from the rest of the crowd. It is a great book.

In the report of one of the other commemorative meetings, we read the following interesting account.

After lunch Pastor Pooyan Mehrshahi, originally from Iran, explained that the AV is the most relevant of Bible versions. Coming from a man for whom English is his second language this was particularly impressive. All present will forever remember Mr. Mehrshahi's oft reminders that a dictionary is all that one needs for looking up and learning unfamiliar words. Interestingly the vocabulary of the AV only numbers about half as many words as most modern versions.

2. Modern Bible translations, for the most part, make things worse.

David Daniell writes about the Contemporary English Version, which appeared in 1995, that it

has been described as 'user friendly' and a 'mission-driven' translation that can be read aloud without stumbling, heard without misunderstanding, and listened to with enjoyment and appreciation, because the style is lucid and lyrical.

One turns to the last words of Matthew 26 in CEV in the confidence that in view of the claims made, Tyndale's power of being clear and transmittable to the ear will have been preserved. Not so. The last sentence is 'Then Peter went out and cried hard'.

What can have happened? ‘Crying hard’ is what a hungry baby regularly does: there is no content of Peter’s shocked, unsearchable personal horror and grief... Can it be that the makers of CEV thought that ‘wept’ and ‘bitterly’ would not be understood? Moreover, when spoken aloud, the two stressed monosyllables of ‘cried hard’, without the descending relief in ‘bitterly’, do not transmit well—the voice has to press both ugly words unnaturally. Devastating as Peter’s experience was, it was not ugly.²⁴

3. To dismiss the AV as archaic is to forget where the real difficulty of understanding Scripture lies.

It is not in any translation, historic or modern. How does the reader ever understand the Bible? Not by having it turned into ‘readable’ English, but by the Holy Spirit: ‘the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know *them*, because they are spiritually discerned’ (1 Corinthians 2.14).

This is not a comprehension problem but a spiritual problem. We need a spiritual nature to receive a spiritual revelation. We are not talking so much about readability as we are about the new birth and illumination—being ‘taught of God’. And the Spirit of God will be pleased to do this through a Bible translation that is nearest the original He has inspired and given to us. This translation is the AV.

Alan Macgregor’s wise words form a fitting conclusion,

The AV is often dismissed as archaic and out of date, but if it were allowed to go out of print and out of use, I believe many of the gains of the Reformation would be lost. We have already seen the evidence of this among many who have embraced modern Bible versions—how they have become more tolerant of Rome and more prone to Ecumenism. We have witnessed their delight in discarding reverent forms of worship, replacing them with that which gratifies the carnal senses. And this is so even among some who claim to be Evangelical... I believe we must make a stand for the historic Reformation Texts of the Bible, and our English *Authorised Version* based on them’.²⁵

Endnotes

1. Alan Clifford, *AV or not AV: this is the question. Why Norwich Reformed Church uses the NKJV*, quoted in J. Thackway, ‘AV or not AV: The Question Reconsidered 1’ (www.bibleleaguetrust.org/articles/av.pdf) and ‘AV or not AV: The Question Reconsidered 2’ (www.bibleleaguetrust.org/articles/av2.pdf).

2. D. A. Carson, *The KJV Debate: A Plea for Realism* (Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Baker Book House, 1979), pp. 101, 102.

3. Ibid.

4. Francis Watson, ‘1611, the good ole’ days of poetry in devotion’, *Times Higher Education*, 12 December 2003,

www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storyCode=181800§ioncode=40, 10 April 2012.

5. David Crystal quoted in www.parliament.uk, 9 December 2009, www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmhansrd/cm091209/halltext/91209h0005.htm 10 April 2012.

6. Adam Nicholson, *God’s Secretaries* (New York: HarperCollins, 2003), pp. 230-231.

7. Melvin Bragg, *Twelve Books that Changed the World* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2006), pp. 261-286.
8. *The Translators to the Reader* (London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1998), p. 12.
9. 'I do not say that the translation is perfect... Particular words and passages might doubtless be somewhat more perfectly rendered. But hundreds of proposed amendments would, if made, be, in my opinion, changes for the worse and not for the better. And it is not without regret that I hear this translation, or any part of it, spoken of in a manner which is calculated, although it be not intended, to make an unlettered Christian distrust its fidelity and general accuracy. It certainly is both faithful and accurate...' (Ashbel Green, *Lectures on the Shorter Catechism*, [Philadelphia, PA, USA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1841], 1.65).
10. *Introduction to Tyndale's New Testament* (London: The British Library, 2000), p. ix.
11. William Tyndale, *The New Testament 1529* (London: The British Library, 2000), p. vi.
12. David Daniell, *The Bible in English, Its history and influence* (New Haven, CT, USA: Yale University Press, 2003), p. 158.
13. David Norris, *The Big Picture*, quoted in *Dayspring magazine*, no. 15, autumn 2011, p. 44. *The Big Picture* is available at www.authenticword.co.uk/publications.html.
14. A. T. Robertson's *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, quoted in *ibid*, p. 43.
15. *Ibid*, pp. 50, 55.
16. William O. Einwechter, 'The Excellence of the AV', *Chalcedon Report*, no. 383, June 1997, p. 19.
17. O. T. Allis, *The New English Bible, The NT of 1961, A Comparative Study* (Philadelphia, PA, USA: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1963), p. 69.
18. See John Thackway, ed., 'Archaic or Accurate?' *The Bible League Trust*, www.bibleleaguetrust.org/articles/archaic_or_accurate.pdf.
19. When the AV translators were undertaking their work, all translation was word-for-word, even in those editions such as the Douay-Rheims which were intended to present a particular slant on the Scriptures. Thus the phrase 'as literal as possible, as free as necessary' was not used until dynamic equivalence became popular in the 20th century.
20. J. H. Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Hendrickson Publishers Inc., 1995).
21. Alec Motyer, 'Review of Today's International Version', *Evangelicals Now*, Feb 2006.
22. Thackway, *Bible League Quarterly*, April-June 2004, pp. 57-67.
23. Ken Ham, *The Lie: Evolution* (Green Forest, AR, USA: New Leaf Press, 1999 and 2009). The selected text is part of Chapter 6: 'Genesis does Matter'.
24. David Daniell, *The Bible in English*, p. 771.
25. Alan Macgregor, *400 Years On: How does the Authorised Version stand up in the 21st Century?* (Belfast, NI: Vision Solutions, 2010), pp. 306,307.