

Is the KJV a Roman Catholic Bible?

by Bob Stokes

This may seem a ridiculous question. However, the reason for this article is to show that the arguments put forward by the 'KJV-only' folks against all non-KJV translations can be also turned back on themselves. Allow me to put together an article that suggests that the KJV is a Roman Catholic Bible. It would go like this:

First of all, the compiler of the text upon which the KJV is drawn was a Roman Catholic humanist (Desiderius Erasmus), who never left the Roman Catholic Church and never claimed to have faith in Jesus Christ. Westcott and Hort (Anglicans who professed faith in Jesus Christ) are condemned by the 'KJV-only' as heretics and therefore, their text is heretical, but no such judgment falls on the heretic Erasmus (Roman Catholic all his life).

I have seen articles by KJVO folks who, while admitting that Erasmus was not a Christian, do everything they can to elevate him to almost a saint. Lauding his honesty, integrity, intelligence and learning to try and make him a plausible translator and, yet, they will not give the same respect due to Westcott and Hort, who, at least, professed faith in Jesus Christ! Inconsistent, is it not?

Secondly, when translating the Gk. texts upon which the KJV is based, Erasmus 'borrowed' the last 6 verses of Revelation from the 'Latin Vulgate' (a Roman Catholic translation) as these were missing from the mss. that he had. This puts the KJV as a partial Roman Catholic translation, does it not?

Thirdly, the KJV uses the pagan word 'Easter' (named after Ashtoreth, the goddess of the Sidonians) in Acts 12:4 under the gk. word 'pascha'-passover. We all know that Easter is a pagan holiday adopted by Roman Catholicism and not a Christian word at all. Who 'inspired' the translators of the KJV to translate it thusly, particularly after an abomination whom God detested, as mentioned in 2 Kings 23:13?

Thankfully, all modern versions have corrected this egregious error on the part of the KJV translation committee.

If we were of the same mental attitude as the 'KJV-only' crowd, we might see this as some insidious, underhanded attempt by the KJV translators to secretly insert their paganistic practices into an unsuspecting audience? :0)

Fourthly, where did Erasmus get these Gk. mss? Did he not get them from Roman Catholic sources? The earliest and most complete copies of the bible are the 2 mss.-Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. What makes these versions so hated by the KJVO people, because they were Roman Catholic and yet the mss. that Erasmus used were, as well? They are BOTH Roman Catholic! Where was the text underlying the KJV before Erasmus produced it? If it was in the earlier versions, then why the need to make a new one? If the text that Erasmus produced was divinely inspired by God (the original writings of Paul, Peter, etc. were) where was it all through the preceding centuries until the Roman Catholic Erasmus gave it to us?

Fifthly, Why is it that the KJV nowhere tells us that we can pray directly to Jesus and yet, the modern versions do? Let us look at the following verse:

John 14:14

If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it.
(KJV)

John 14:14

You may ask **me** for anything in my name, and I will do it.
(NIV)

John 14:14

"If you ask **Me** anything in My name, I will do {it.}
(NAU)

In the KJV, it does not tell us that we can pray **to** Jesus and then He will do something for us, but suggests that we would ask the Father, and then He will get Jesus to do it for us.

This plays into Roman Catholicism, which discourages prayer to Jesus and directs it to Mary.

However, in the NIV and NASB bibles, they tell us plainly that we **can pray to** Jesus and make our requests known to Him directly, proving His deity!

One could conclude (if one were of the 'KJV-only' mindset) that "the KJV bible denies prayer to Jesus and is therefore Satanic!" Do you want to bet they wouldn't if it was the NIV that left out the word 'me' in that verse??

If Satan was behind the development of the NIV, he certainly did a poor job of it, don't you think?

Finally, Let us look at the following verses:

Phil 1:1

Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the **bishops** and deacons:
(KJV)

The term 'bishop' is a Roman Catholic term used of certain leaders in that organization. It was transferred over to the KJV under the Gk. Word 'episkopos'.

King James also adopted "No Bishop, no King" as a slogan, also encouraging the use of "Bishop" in his Bible. It would give him more godly authority.

I believe, if I were to choose one Bible that was more Roman Catholic than the others, I would look to the KJV!

This is just to show how one can make a bible translation look bad or good, depending on their point of view. I, personally, prefer the NIV bible because of its ease of use and greater accuracy, but I also use the KJV extensively. I enjoy them both. Neither one is Roman Catholic—they are both the Bible!